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Terminology, anaphor vs. pronoun complementarity, {c-command}, {A- vs. A’-binding}, {locality} “Tensed S Constraint”, “Nominative Island Constraint”, “R-expressions”, etc.

1. a. ANAPHORS:
   1. myself, yourself, himself, herself, ...
   2. each other, one another, ...
   3. traces of A-movement (as in, e.g., John was liked t_i)?
   4. PRO (as in, e.g., She wants to PRO_i to dance), ...

   b. PRONOUNS:
      1. I, me, you, she, her, he, him, we, ...
      2. pro (as in, e.g., Spanish pro_i canto ‘I sing’)
      3. PRO (as in, e.g. PRO_α to try it is PRO_α to like it)?, ...

   c. R-EXPRESSIONS (NAMES):
      1. John, Mary, ...
      2. The man that I saw yesterday, That professor
      3. traces of wh-movement (as in, e.g., Who_j does she_i like t_j)?, ...

2. a. John_i likes himself_i</sub>/</sub>
   b. John_i likes him_j</sub>/</sub>

3. a. [John_i’s mother]_j likes herself_j
   b. *[John_i’s mother]_j likes himself_i
   c. *[The mother of John]_j likes himself_i

4. John_i’s mother likes him_i

5. a. * John, I like himself
   b. John, I like him
(6)  a. *Nixon_i wanted the American people to like himself_i 
    b. Nixon_i wanted the American people to like him_i 

(7)  a. *[Schwarzenegger and Shriver], expect that [each other]_i will win 
    b. [Schwarzenegger and Shriver], expect [each other]_i to win 

(8)  a. [Schwarzenegger and Shriver], expect that [they]_i will win 
    b. *[Schwarzenegger and Shriver], expect [them]_i to win 

(9)  a. *He_i likes John_i 
    b. His_i mother likes John_i 

(10) a. *He_i thinks that Mary likes John_i 

**Binding Theory post-1980**

(11) a. An anaphor is A-bound in some local domain (which?). 
    b. A pronoun is A-free in some local domain (which?). 
    c. An R-expression is free (everywhere?). 

(12) a. α is A-bound by β iff α and β are coindexed, β c-commands α, and β is in a so-called “A position” (a potential argument position? what’s that?). 
    b. α is A-free iff it is not A-bound. 

“Local domain” in Chomsky 1981 (LGB): 

(13) α is the governing category (GC) for β iff α is the minimal category containing β and a governor of β, where α = NP or S. 

(14) α governs β iff: 
    a. α is a potential governor (=Case-assigner?)—α ∈ {V, P, P^0[tense], D^0[genitive], ... } 
    b. α m-commands β (i.e., every maximal projection XP that dominates α also dominates β) 
    c. there is no maximal projection XP such that X^0 is a potential governor, XP dominates β and XP does not dominate α (i.e., there is no potential governor that is closer to β than α is). 

Problem: The “Specified Subject Condition”

(15) a. Mary dislikes criticism of herself 
    b. *Mary dislikes Bill’s criticism of herself
Governing Category refined:

(16) a. \( \alpha \) is the governing category (GC) for \( \beta \) if \( \alpha \) is the minimal category containing \( \beta \), a governor of \( \beta \), and a SUBJECT accessible to \( \beta \).

\[ \text{SUBJECT} \in \{ \text{Spec}(XP) \text{ with } X^0 \text{ a lexical head, AGR in } I_0[^+\text{Tense}] \} \]

A root sentence is a governing category for a governed element.

b. \( \alpha \) is accessible to \( \beta \) if \( \beta \) is in the c-command domain of \( \alpha \) and assignment to \( \beta \) of the index of \( \alpha \) would not violate the “i-within-i” condition in (17).

(17) \(*_1 \ldots \delta_i \ldots |_i \gamma \) and \( \delta \) (\( \delta \) a constituent of \( \gamma \)) bear the same index.

(18) a. *There is \( \text{NP} \) a picture of itself\( |_i \) on the mantelpiece

b. * \( \text{NP} \) the owner of his\( |_i \) boat\( |_i \)

(19) a. * Mary realized that herself\( |_i \) INFL\( |_i \) would win

b. Mary realized that \( \text{a picture of herself\( |_i \) INFL\( |_i \) was on sale}

(20) Consider \( \text{IP} \) XP \( \text{INFL} \ldots \] [How] Does AGR in \( I_0 \) become “accessible” to XP in Spec(IP)?

One residual problem (among many others): Cases of non-complementarity between anaphors and pronouns

(21) a. \( \text{The candidates\( |_i \) expect that \| each other\( |_i \) s spouses will be supportive} \]

b. \( \text{The candidates\( |_i \) expect that \| their\( |_i \) spouses will be supportive} \]

(22) a. \( \text{The students\( |_i \) are enjoying each other\( |_i \) s participation in this class} \]

b. \( \text{The students\( |_i \) are enjoying their\( |_i \) participation in this class} \]

Governing Category in Chomsky 1986 Knowledge of Language

(23) “A governing category is a “complete functional complex” (CFC) in the sense that all grammatical functions compatible with its head are realized within it. ... The local domain for an anaphor or pronominal \( \alpha \) ... is the least CFC [COMPLETE FUNCTIONAL COMPLEX] containing a lexical governor of \( \alpha \).”

Problem: “Nominative Island Constraint”

(24) *John\( |_i \) believes (that) \( \text{himself\( |_i \) is intelligent} \]

(25) a. John\( |_i \) is believed \( |t_i \text{ to be intelligent} \]

b. *John\( |_i \) is believed (that) \( |t_i \text{ is intelligent} \]
(26)  \textit{Jean se_{i} croit \ [t_{i} intelligent]}  \quad \text{(French)}

John 3sg-REFL believes intelligent
“John believes himself intelligent”

Other problem: Are R-expressions really free everywhere?

(27)  \textit{John_{i} is tough} [\text{O}_{i} [\text{PRO}_{arb} \text{ to please } t_{i}]]

(28)  An R-expression must be A-free in the domain of the operator that A'-binds it (= in the domain of the head of its maximal chain).