

Problem set due Wednesday

first version has a mistake; not all the problems involve movement. New version was posted on Thursday.

next stop: anaphora. What are the conditions on anaphors?

Condition A, first pass: anaphors must have an antecedent
...a c-commanding antecedent → a **binder**

Condition B, first pass: pronouns must be free

but it's more complicated...

(locality: we ended up with 'an anaphor must be bound by a DP which is not separated from it by any vP boundaries (i.e., there must be no vP which dominates the anaphor and not the antecedent)'; plus *nominative anaphor (the Nominative Island Condition))

Condition A: anaphors must be bound in D

Condition B: pronouns must be free in D

Condition C: R-expressions must be free everywhere

language variation; there are languages with nominative anaphors, and there are anaphors that can be bound long-distance. I'll put up a reading that reviews some of this, for people who are interested.

now, binding theory is going to be useful for all kinds of things; it's a new probe into structure. Now we know that if X binds Y, X must c-command Y.

DP structure (possessor c-commands complement)

VP structure (indirect object c-commands direct object) → no ternary branching

The psychiatrist showed me myself / *myself me

I gave the parents each other's children

*I gave each other's parents the children

a topic we'll come back to again later, but we can get started now; when must this be true? cf. EPP (true at some point in the derivation), Projection Principle or what's left of it (constrains initial Merge)

John seems to himself to be a genius.

And in fact we can use BT to find intermediate steps of derivations, though this takes a little bit of extra work.

it seems to John that these pictures of himself are good.

mystery! *John* seems to be able to bind out of PP here.

*John seems to Mary to like herself

John seems to Mary to like himself

- raising; *John* looks further away from the anaphor than *Mary*, but he's really closer, as far as the binding conditions are concerned.

[why doesn't *Mary* become able to bind the anaphor after *John* moves out of the way? various theories about movement; we'll do copy theory]

now:

John seems to Mary to seem to himself to be smart

*John seems to Mary to seem to herself to be smart

(put in "be likely to" if somebody objects that the second one's just semantically anomalous)

in the last pair, we decided that *John* had left a trace/copy between *Mary* and *herself/himself*. Same thing here; there must be a copy of *John* between *to Mary* and *to herself*—that is, movement needs to be successive-cyclic.