Backward Binding

- Typically, antecedents of anaphoric expressions must c-command them. This is (part of) the classical formulation of Principle A of the binding theory.
- **Backward binding** refers to cases when this requirement is apparently flouted, and an anaphoric expression is bound by a DP below it.

Such configurations have been noted previously for stative psych-verbs, as well as periphrastic psychological predicates and more complex construction analyses [1, 2, 3, 4, a.o.]

(1) a. Sally wanted John, to kick himself,
   b. Sally wanted himself, to kick John,

(2) a. Each other,’s constituents annoy the politicians,
   b. Each other,’s parents make every couple, nervous.
   c. Those nasty pictures of himself, shattered John,’s fragile ego.

Previous Accounts

- **Structural** approaches posit that binding can be licensed at intermediate steps in the derivation of a sentence, and that one such step in the derivation of sentences like the above satisfies the c-command requirement. Belletti & Rizzi [1], Pesetsky [3], and Cheung & Larson [5, 6] take this kind of approach.
- **Logophoric** approaches posit that certain contexts allow the c-command requirement to be relaxed. In particular, anaphoric expressions that refer to animate perspective takers, and only these, may be exempt. Landau [4], Zlogar & Charnavel [7], and Charnavel & Sportiche [8] take this kind of approach.

(3) Anonymous posts about herself, on the Internet hurt Lucy,’s feelings. [9]’s (4b) Anonymous posts about herself, on the Internet hurt the camera,’s sales. [9]’s (4a)

(4) a. “Backward binding in psych contexts is always amenable to a logophoric approach, since psych contexts invoke experiencers, which are by definition animate perspective takers. This has led to the dominant theory of the most noted existing cases of backward binding being the logophoric approach.
   b. Can backward binding occur outside psych contexts?

New Cases: Non-Logophoric Backward Binding

- The logophoric approach requires antecedents of backward-bound anaphors to refer to animate perspective takers. Any case where a backward-bound anaphor refers to something inanimate cannot be accounted for with a logophoric approach. Consider the following:

(5) a. A picture of itself, blocked every monitor.,
   b. Each other,’s lids completely covered the pans.,
   c. At Mandello’s beach, miniature replicas of itself, surround every sand castle,

- For some speakers, these are judged grammatical. Since the anaphors in these cases do not refer to animate perspective takers, they must be genuine cases of structural backward binding.

Two Assumptions

- Relativized Minimality: [Y ... X ...] ⋆ if X and Y have identical (relevant) features. [10]
- Principle A: (Non-exempt) anaphors are bound by a local c-commanding DP.

Two Ways to Derive Structural Backward Binding

- Call the binder DP, and the DP containing the anaphor DP. Principle A means that a step in any licit derivation will involve DP (asymmetrically) c-commanding DP. (Non-logophoric) backward binding is defined as when DP, moves to a position that c-commands DP,

(6) DP ⋆
   (7) DP ⋆

- If DP, and DP, have the same set of features relevant to the probe that triggers movement, (7) will violate Relativized Minimality as previously defined. One way to avoid this is to simply say that DP, and DP, have different feature sets, so that DP, won’t intervene.
- The other way of avoiding this uses Smuggling movement [11]. DP, can move past DP, as part of a larger phrase without violating RM, and then move out of that phrase as the closest target for a higher movement operation:

(8) RM and Principle A limit us to deriving any non-logophoric backward binding in one of these two ways: featural differences between binder and bindee, or Smuggling movement.

Particle Verbs: Idiosyncratic Case Assignment

- Crucial data distinguishing the two approaches comes from stative location particle verbs: a particle can appear either before or after the verb.

(9) A picture of itself, covered up every pail,
   (10) A picture of itself, covered every pail, up

- Assumption: particles occur within a phrase headed by the verb (e.g., [12]).
- Principle A will mean that a parse with the relevant properties of the structure in (11) will be a part of the derivation.

(11) DP ⋆
     VP ⋆
     cover ⋆
     every pail
   (12) DP ⋆
     VP ⋆
     up ⋆
     a picture of itself

- (12) will violate RM if every pail and a picture of itself have the same relevant features.
- Following [1], we could say that this is avoided because the verb assigns lexical accusative Case to every pail.
- Pre- and post-object particles are derived in (12) by whether the bigger V or the smaller V moves to ⋆
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