

A Bound-Variable Account of the Korean Reflexive *caki*

Problem It has been argued that the binding of long-distance reflexives can be reduced to a series of local dependencies by cyclic head movement of the reflexive to a matrix I^0 position (Chomsky, 1986; Reinhart and Reuland, 1993). As a consequence, these reflexives are predicted to be subject-oriented. In Korean, the so-called long-distance reflexive *caki* is not strictly subject oriented, able to be bound by local and non-subject arguments (1), or even extra-sententially (2). Furthermore, *caki* can be bound by a non-c-commanding antecedent within the same sentence (3). After examining the interpretations of singular *caki* and the plural *caki-tul*, I develop a bound variable account of *caki* which avoids the need for LF movement of the reflexive.

The Data *Caki* and *caki-tul* are also interpreted differently depending upon their antecedents, or lack thereof. An often overlooked fact is that when *caki* has no antecedent, it takes on an inherent reference of second person (Sohng, 2003), which extends to the plural *caki-tul* (4). When there is a plural antecedent available, *caki-tul* is directly bound by it, as a matching of plural-to-plural (5). Where *caki-tul* has only a singular antecedent, it is interpreted as representing a contextually-defined set to which that singular antecedent belongs (6), identified as inclusive reference by Madigan and Yamada (2006). Cho (1996) argues that purported observations of split antecedence with *caki-tul* are inclusive reference cases where another entity in the sentence happens to be a part of the contextually-defined group. Taking all of these together, it emerges that the only criterion that needs to be met is that the antecedent precede *caki*.

Analysis A requirement of precedence suggests that discourse salience is an important factor in *caki* binding. Kim (2000) proposes a ranked hierarchy of potential antecedents for *caki*, naming topics as the most preferred. Gil (1998) makes an even stronger claim, arguing that *caki* is always bound by a topic, either overt, marked by *-(n)un* on a DP in a topic position above TP, or covert. Covert topicality would entail LF movement of a salient DP to that same topic position high in the tree. Testing this LF movement hypothesis is simply a matter of determining whether *caki* can be bound by a DP within an island that is opaque to A' movement (7). Here, *caki* only gets the inherent reference reading, unable to be bound by either argument of the embedded clause. With antecedents becoming available through an LF A' movement, *caki* behaves more like a bound variable, entering into a tripartite structure, similar to the result of QR. Still, cases such as (3) indicate that even movement constraints will not be a foolproof test, as the genitive DP may be an antecedent for *caki*. For the extra-sentential cases (and presumably extendable to island-violating cases), Gil (1998) proposes a gap in the topic position which co-refers with a salient entity in the discourse, binding *caki*. Inherent reference can be similarly treated, with the addressee becoming the covert topic which binds *caki*. To account for the plurals, I adapt ideas from Rullmann (2003), wherein plurals are sets of singular entities, and the entire domain of individuals (D_e) is comprised of the union of the set of all singular entities and the set of plurals. This allows singulars and plurals to behave the same way in terms of binding a variable. To maintain a unified account of *caki*, the matched plural and inclusive reference readings for *caki-tul* are thus ascribed to the plural morpheme *-tul*. The role of *-tul* is to introduce a plural set to which *caki* belongs. This membership relation is transitive, with the antecedent of *caki* being interpreted as a member of the plural set. For the cases where *caki-tul* is bound by a plural antecedent, it saturates the plural set introduced by *-tul*, and a matched reading results. Where there is only a singular antecedent for *caki-tul*, that singular antecedent belongs to the plural set, the rest of which is defined by context. The plural version of inherent reference could be explained by either of these phenomena, depending on whether there is a plurality of salient addressees.

Conclusion In presenting an analysis which relies upon the topichood of *caki*'s antecedent, this paper advances an analysis of *caki* as a bound variable. This obviates the need to posit LF movement of *caki* itself, a welcome result as *caki* has been widely shown to violate the subject-orientedness consequence of that analysis. Furthermore, the analysis of the plural forms retains the definition of *caki* as a simple bound variable, ascribing the various interpretations of *caki-tul* to the interaction between *-tul* and the antecedent of *caki*.

Examples

- (1) John₄-i Mary₅-eykey Tom₆-i caki_{4,5,6}-lul coaha-n-ta-ko malha-yess-ta.
John-NOM Mary-DAT Tom-NOM SELF-ACC like-PRES-DECL-COMP say-PST-DECL
'John told Mary that Tom likes self.'
- (2) Na-nun Suni₄-eykey chayk-ul pilye cwu-ess-ta. Kulendey sasil ku chayk-un
I-TOP Suni-DAT book-ACC lend give-PST-DECL. and yet in fact that book-TOP
caki₄ oppa-ka ceney nay-key pilye cwun kes ita.
SELF elder brother-NOM before me-DAT lend give thing be
'I lent a book to Suni. But the fact is that self's brother had lent it to me before.'
- (3) Suni₅-uy sinpal-un caki-uy pal-pota hwelssin kuta.
Suni-GEN shoes-TOP self-GEN foot-than a lot big
'Suni's shoes are a lot bigger than self's feet.'
- (4) Caki-tul₂₊-i chakhay.
SELF-PL-NOM good
'You all are good.'
- (5) John₄-i Bill₅-wa-Mary₆-eykey caki-tul₅₊₆-ul piphan-ha-yess-ta.
John-NOM Bill-and-Mary-DAT SELF-PL-ACC criticise-do-PST-DECL
'John criticised them/selves to Bill and Mary.'
- (6) John₄-i caki-tul_{4+α}-ul sokay-ha-yess-ta.
John-NOM SELF-PL-ACC introduce-do-PST-DECL
'John introduced selves.'
- (7) [Tom₄-i Mary₅-lul salang-ha-n-ta-nun] sasil-i caki₂-lul
Tom-NOM Mary-ACC love-do-PRES-DECL-TOP fact-NOM SELF-ACC
nolayk-yess-ta.
surprise-PAST-DECL.
'The fact that Tom loves Mary surprised self.'

References

- Cho, Dong-In. 1996. Anaphor or pronominal. *Language Research* 32:621-636.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1986. *Knowledge of language*. Praeger.
- Gil, Kook-Hee. 1998. Topic and binding in Korean. In *University of Edinburgh Post-Graduate Conference Proceedings*, 1-12.
- Kim, Soo-Yeon. 2000. Acceptability and preference in the interpretation of anaphors. *Linguistics* 38:315-353.
- Madigan, Sean, and Masahiro Yamada. 2006. Asymmetry in anaphoric dependency: A crosslinguistic study of inclusive reference. In *Proceedings of Penn Linguistics Colloquium 30*.
- Reinhart, Tanya, and Eric Reuland. 1993. Reflexivity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 24:657-720.
- Rullmann, Hotze. 2003. Bound-variable pronouns and the semantics of number. In *Proceedings of the Western Conference on Linguistics (WECOL 2002)*, ed. Brian Agbayani et al, 243254. Fresno, CA: Department of Linguistics, California State University.
- Sohng, Hong Ki. 2003. *Topics in the syntax of East Asian languages: Long-distance anaphora and adverbial case*. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Washington.