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1. Government and Binding theory – problems
   ▪ Locality domains

   Binding Domains and Binding Factors (Buring (2005)):
   Of the 4 constituents containing the pronoun $p$ – A, B, C, D, C as the minimal constituent containing the Binding Factor $F$, is the Binding Domain for $p$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Binding Factor</th>
<th>D(omain)</th>
<th>Languages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. all arguments of $C$</td>
<td>Coargument D</td>
<td>Danish, Dutch, Marathi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. an (accessible) subject</td>
<td>Subject D</td>
<td>English reflexives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. a finite clause</td>
<td>Tense D</td>
<td>Danish, Finnish, French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. the entire sentence</td>
<td>Root D</td>
<td>Japanese, Chinese</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   Problems:
   • In one language different forms of reflexive, reciprocal and personal pronouns may require different locality domains (cf. Russian, Icelandic, lexical reflexives vs. morphological reflexives vs. clitics in many languages),
   • Long distance binding and sentential locality domains for reflexives,
   • Subject oriented reflexives.

   ▪ No complementary distribution

   Principles A and B predict complementary distribution for anaphors and personal pronouns

   (1)
   a. Max criticized himself/ *him.
   b. Some people talk to themselves/ *them.
   c. Lucie’s pictures of herself/ *her.

   Exceptions:

   (2) For long distance reflexives (examples from Testelets (2005))
   Jane, ne swataahkartaa, //aaplyaakartaa, //ticyaakartaa, saadi ghet li
   Jane ERG self.LOC.DAT //self.LD.DAT //her.DAT sari buy AUX
   ‘Jane bought a sari for herself.’ (Marathi, attributed to Dalrymple (1993))

   Within smaller constituents → non-complementary positions:
   • NP-internal (‘picture contexts’),
   • Adjuncts,
   • Coordinations.

   (3)
   a. Lucie saw a picture of herself/ her.
   b. Mary likes jokes about herself/ her.
   c. Max keeps a gun near himself/ him.
   d. Max boasted that the queen had invited Lucie and himself/him for a drink.
Binding Theory response → to try to adjust the domains for Conditions A and B so that the domain in which non-reflexives must be free is smaller than the domain in which reflexives must be bound.

- Acquisition pattern

According to Universal Grammar, binding conditions are innate.

“The Binding Principles are constraints. They represent negative information. … This is critical, as it is argued that children's linguistic input does not include the data necessary for learning syntactic constraints.” → (Chomsky, 1977)

What about language acquisition? → Delay of Principle B effect (DPBE): children allow pronouns to take intra-clausal antecedents, violating Principle B (for example, allowing coreference in (4)).

(4) *John, likes him.

See results of multiple experiments reported by McKee (1992), Grodzinsky and Reinhart (1993), Elbourne (2005), a.o.


Observation: long-distance reflexives (Dutch zich, Norwegian seg) are always morphologically simplex; ‘local’ reflexives may be simplex or complex (English himself, Norwegian seg selv).

→ Two types: “SE anaphors” (“Simplex Expressions”) and “SELF anaphors” → three-way distinction among SELF-anaphors, SE-anaphors, and pronouns.

Hypothesis: SELF anaphors function to reflexivize predicates, plain pronouns have a ‘referential’ function, and SE anaphors do neither.

SE anaphors need not be locally bound, but are always subject-oriented.

☼ Reinhart and Reuland’s Condition A: A reflexive-marked syntactic predicate is reflexive.

Where (i) a predicate is reflexive if it has two co-indexed arguments, and (ii) a predicate P is reflexive-marked if either P is lexically reflexive or one of P’s arguments is a SELF anaphor.

Reinhart (1993): co-indexing does not necessarily mark coreference.

☼ Reinhart and Reuland’s Condition B: A reflexive semantic predicate is reflexive-marked.

In short, it is not sufficient to look only at pronouns. The predicates must be considered; the most important question is whether or not a reflexive predicate is formed.

Let’s try it:

(5) a. Lucie saw a picture of herself/ her. a’. */?Lucie liked [your picture of herself].
   b. Mary likes jokes about herself/ her. b’. *Mary likes [your jokes about herself].
   c. Max keeps a gun near himself/ him.
   d. Max boasted that the queen had invited Lucie and himself/him for a drink.

Syntactic vs. semantic predicates:

(6) a. The queen, invited both Max and herself to our party.
   b. *The queen, invited both Max and her, to our party.

(7) a. Max; and Lucie talked about him.
b. *Both Max, and Lucie talked about him.

Note 1. Not all PP’s are equal:

   b. *Max, relies on him. ← thematic arguments of the verb

Note 2. Unrealized thematic roles of N and Condition B:

(9) a. Lucie, saw a picture of her.  
   b. *Lucie, took a picture of her.  
   c. Max, heard a story about him.  
   d. *Max, told a story about him.

**Why SELF is so special?** → in addition to moving to the I/V head and functioning as a binding operator, SELF serves as a protective shell: from the logical perspective the arguments remain distinct (R&R (1993) and their later works).

**What about SE-anaphors?** They can be used …

(10) With lexically reflexive predicates

Alice gedraagt zich ("zelf") goed  
Alice behaves (herself) well

(11) When they are not arguments of the main predicated

Alice zette het flesje naast zich  
(Dutch)  
Alice put the bottle next to SE

How SE anaphors are licensed? Why are they usually subject oriented?

R&R’s assumption: SE anaphors are structurally similar to personal pronouns except that they lack some of the fi-features → Reinhart and Reuland (1989, 1991): SE anaphors can adjoin to I (Agr), where they inherit the subject's features.

**Remaining question:**

- ‘Weird’ cases: SE or SELF reflexive?

(12) a. Petja uvidel sebja v zerkale.  
   Peter saw himself.ACC in mirror  
   ‘Peter saw himself in a mirror.’

b. Petja zastavil Mašu uvidet’ sebja v zerkale  
   Peter forced Mary.ACC see.INF himself/herself.ACC in mirror  
   ‘Peter forced Mary to saw him / herself in a mirror.’

3. Pollard & Sag’s (1992) Binding Theory

☼ Binding Condition A: A reflexive/reciprocal must be bound by a less oblique coargument, if there is one.

☼ Exempt Anaphor Condition: A reflexive/reciprocal that doesn’t have a less oblique coargument must denote a designated participant.

Exempt position – a position without a less oblique coargument.
Buring (2005) on a designated participant: (i) First and second person exempt anaphors don’t need linguistic antecedents at all; speaker and hearer are automatically designated participants, (ii) Third person exempt anaphors do need an antecedent (+ intervention and perspective).

(13) a. She gave both Brenda and myself a dirty look.
    b. It angered him that she …. tried to attract a man like himself.