

## Thoughts on Binding Theory: 'Sneaky' Derivations Sneak Rule-I In

Yael Sharvit, UCLA

Condition B of the Binding Theory (BT) seems to under- and over-generate. This talk examines two ways that have been proposed to tackle these problems. One is the post-grammatical solution – the familiar Rule-I first proposed in Reinhart (1983) – which roughly says that when two LFs have the same semantic interpretation, they compete with each other, and if one of them is a bound-variable LF and the other is not, the non-bound-variable LF loses the competition. The other, perhaps less familiar solution, is the grammatical solution spelled out in Heim (2007), which is based on global (and non-violable) constraints on indexing and variable assignments. There seem to be at least two groups of examples that are problematic for Condition B: Group 1 – cases whose acceptability seems to be context-dependent (as first noticed by Evans 1980; see (1)), yet Condition B seems incapable of distinguishing between those contexts where its “violation” is acceptable and those where it is not; and Group 2 – cases which seem to be always unacceptable (as noticed by Partee and Bach 1981 and Higginbotham 1983; see (2)), yet Condition B rules them in.

- (1) a. \*This candidate is Zelda. **She** is praising **her** to the skies.
- b. Is this candidate Zelda? She must be. **She** is praising **her** to the skies. No competing candidate would do that.
- c. [<sub>LD</sub> *she*<sub>1</sub> *is praising her*<sub>2/\*1</sub> *to the skies*] LD = ‘local domain’
- (2) a. **Every man** said that **he** knew that **he** pointed at **him**.
- b. [*every man*<sub>1</sub> [1 [*t*<sub>1</sub> *said he*<sub>1</sub> [3 [*t*<sub>3</sub> *knew he*<sub>1</sub> [5 [<sub>LD</sub> *t*<sub>5</sub> *pointed at him*<sub>3</sub>]]]]]]]]]]]

Rule-I deals successfully with Group 1. Group 2 raises the following issue: since the lack of a ‘bound’ reading of (2a) seems to be context-independent, shouldn’t the grammar itself rule out the LF in (2b)? And indeed, Heim (2007) proposes a strictly grammatical account of Group 2 (as well as Group 1). In this talk I argue, contra Heim (2007), as follows:

- (i) The acceptability of (2a) is also context-dependent: it is acceptable in contexts reminiscent of those contexts where (1a) is acceptable (e.g., when each man says: “Guy 1 knows that Guy2 pointed at Guy1”, failing to acknowledge that he himself is both Guy 1 and Guy2);
- (ii) Global grammatical constraints can account for the context-dependency of (2a), but crucially not for all the cases that comprise Group 2;
- (iii) Rule-I deals successfully with ALL the cases in Group 2; therefore:
- (iv) Rule-I – i.e., the post-grammatical approach to anaphora – cannot be dispensed with.