



## On exempt anaphors

Namkil Kang

Far East University, South Korea

\* Corresponding Author: **Namkil Kang**

### Article Info

**ISSN (online):** 2582-7138

**Volume:** 03

**Issue:** 01

January-February 2022

**Received:** 27-12-2021;

**Accepted:** 14-01-2022

**Page No:** 277-281

### Abstract

The main purpose of this paper is to show that anaphors can be exempt from locality constraint. A major point to note is that *caki* 'self' corefers with its antecedent through intended reference, whereas *ku-casin* 'he-self' and *caki-casin* 'self-self' corefer with their antecedent through reference inheritance. A further point to note is that the Korean reflexives *caki* 'self' and *ne-casin* 'yourself' can be exempt since they have their own reference. Thus, *caki* 'self' and *ne-casin* 'yourself' behave in the same way regarding the logophoric use. It is worth noting that in the case of intentional expressions, their argument has the feature of [+agent] like the nominative agent *John*, so reference tracking is easy. It is interesting to note, on the other hand, that in the case of non-intentional expressions, their argument has [-agent], so reference tracking is not easy. For this reason, non-intentional expressions require demonstratives. More specifically, intentional expressions such as according to and in his opinion permit anaphor binding, whereas non-intentional expressions such as speaking of and when it comes to permit only demonstrative binding.

**Keywords:** anaphor, logophor, binding condition A, exempt anaphor, reference, intended reference, reference inheritance

### 1. Introduction

The main goal of this paper is to show that anaphors can be exempt from locality constraint. We can distinguish between plain and exempt anaphors in terms of a logophor. Chomsky's Binding Theory (1981, 1986) captures the distribution of all anaphors without exception. On the other hand, predicate-based approaches and logophor-based approaches to anaphor binding (Pollard & Sag 1992, Reinhart & Reuland 1993, Safir 2004, Pollard 2005, Reuland 2011, Charnavel and Zlogar (2015) <sup>[1]</sup>, Charnavel (2016) <sup>[5, 8, 6, 7, 2]</sup> offer a theory of exception from condition A. The organization of this paper is as follows. In section 2, we show that as in the case of the English SELF anaphor, Korean anaphors can be used as a logophoric reflexive. In section 3, we argue that *caki* 'self' corefers with its antecedent through intended reference. We further argue that *ku-casin* 'he-self' and *caki-casin* 'self-self' corefer with their antecedent since they inherit their reference from their antecedent. We contend that the Korean reflexives *caki* 'self' and *ne-casin* 'yourself' can be exempt since they have their own reference. Thus, *caki* 'self' and *ne-casin* 'yourself' behave in the same way regarding the logophoric use. In section 4, we maintain that in the case of intentional expressions, their argument has the feature of [+agent] like the nominative agent *John*, so reference tracking is easy. We also maintain that in the case of non-intentional expressions, their argument has [-agent], so reference tracking is not easy. Thus, non-intentional expressions require demonstratives. Finally, we show that intentional expressions such as according to and in his opinion permit anaphor binding, whereas non-intentional expressions such as speaking of and when it comes to permit only demonstrative binding.

### 2. A Logophor

Anaphors are supposed to be non-referential. DPs without reference have no meaning. Thus, for full interpretation, anaphors must acquire their reference. However, cases where anaphors do not obey the Binding Theory have been reported extensively. Especially, Reinhart and Reuland (1993) <sup>[7]</sup> argue that SELF anaphors can be used as a logophor. To be more specific, argument SELFs behave as a reflexivizer, whereas non-argument SELFs behave as a logophor. As convincingly argued by Reinhart and

Reuland (1993) [7] and Charnavel and Zlogar (2015) [1], non-argument SELFs are not subcategorized by predicates. More interestingly, just as in the case of English anaphors, Korean SELFs can be used as a logophor. As C & Z (2015) [1] point out, relevant cases call for a theory of exemption from condition A:

1. A. In her<sub>i</sub> opinion, physicists like herself<sub>i</sub> are rare.
- B. Max<sub>i</sub> boasted that the queen invited Lucie and himself<sub>i</sub> for a drink.

In (1), the SELF anaphors are not subcategorized by the predicates, thus implying that they are exempt from condition A. In (1), the English reflexives *herself* and *himself* are logophoric reflexives since they do not serve as an argument of the relevant predicates. Just as in the case of the English SELF anaphor, Korean anaphors can be used as a logophoric reflexive:

- (2) a. Tom<sub>i</sub>-i caki-casin<sub>i</sub>-uy chayk-ul ilkessta.  
NOM self-self-GEN book-ACC read  
(Tom read a book of self-self.)
- a. Tom<sub>i</sub>-i ku-casin<sub>i</sub>-uy chayk-ul ilkessta.  
NOM he-self-GEN book-ACC read  
(Tom read a book of self-self.)
- a. Tom<sub>i</sub>-i caki-uy chayk-ul ilkessta.  
NOM self-GEN book-ACC read  
(Tom read a book of self-self.)

With respect to the logophoric use, Korean anaphors and English anaphors behave in the same way. In (2), Korean anaphors are not subcategorized by the predicate, so they are exempt from condition A.

### 3. A Logophor, Reference Inheritance, and Intended Reference

In what follows, we argue that the Korean anaphors *caki-casin* 'self-self' and *ku-casin* 'he-self' corefer with their antecedents through reference inheritance, whereas *caki* 'self' corefers with its antecedent through intended reference. This difference distinguishes between *caki-casin* 'self-self'/*ku-casin* 'he-self' and *caki* 'self' in the logophoric use:

- (3) a. Reference inheritance: X corefers with Y through reference inheritance.
- b. Intended reference: X corefers with Y through the speaker's intention.

The following sentence is ungrammatical just like the violation of condition A, excluding *Tom* as *caki*'s 'self' referent even when *caki* 'self' is locally bound:

- (4) \*John<sub>i</sub>-i caki<sub>i</sub> (points to the hearer)-lul onghohayssta.  
NOM self-ACC defended  
(John defended self.)

In this example, *caki* 'self' behaves like a pronominal since it cannot be bound by its antecedent in local domain. Note that intended reference is supported by cases that contain the speaker's intention. In stating (4), I may talk of the hearer as the referent of *caki* 'self'.

#### Now let us consider the following sentences

- (5) a. John<sub>i</sub>-i caki-casin<sub>i</sub> (points to the hearer)-ul

onghohayssta.

NOM self-self-ACC defended

(John defended self-self.)

- b. John<sub>i</sub>-i ku-casin<sub>i</sub> (points to the hearer)-ul onghohayssta.

NOM he-self-ACC defended

(John defended he-self.)

More interestingly, in (5), the Korean reflexives *caki-casin* 'self-self' and *ku-casin* 'he-self', unlike *caki* 'self' must be bound by their linguistic antecedent *John*. Thus, the hearer cannot be the referent of *caki-casin* 'self-self' and *ku-casin* 'he-self'. We thus conclude that *caki* 'self' corefers with its antecedent through intended reference, whereas *ku-casin* 'he-self' and *caki-casin* 'self-self' corefer with their antecedents through reference inheritance.

Now attention is paid to non-argument SELFs. Note that non-argument SELFs behave as a logophor:

- (6) Physicists like yourself are rare.

As alluded to in (6), the English anaphor *yourself* is not subcategorized by the predicate. Thus, the English anaphor *yourself* is exempt from condition A. However, English anaphors and Korean anaphors do not behave in the same way regarding their logophoric use:

- (7) a. Caki katun mwulihakcatul-un tumwulta.  
self like physicists-TOP rare  
(Physicists like self are rare.)
- b. \*Ku-casin katun mwulihakcatul-un tumwulta.  
he-self like physicists-TOP rare  
(Physicists like he-self are rare.)
- c. \*Caki-casin katun mwulihakcatul-un tumwulta.  
self-self like physicists-TOP rare  
(Physicists like he-self are rare.)

The Korean reflexives *caki* 'self', *ku-casin* 'he-self', and *caki-casin* 'self-self' appear as a non-argument of the predicate. However, *caki* 'self' behaves as a logophor, whereas *ku-casin* 'he-self' and *caki-casin* 'self-self' do not. Why does this take place? We wish to argue that anaphors which are bound by their antecedent through intended reference have a discourse element as their referent, whereas anaphors which inherit their reference may have a linguistic antecedent. Thus, this amounts to saying that *caki-casin* 'self-self' and *ku-casin* 'he-self' are real anaphors, whereas *caki* 'self' is not. The following examples lend their support to this hypothesis:

- (8) a. Tom-i caki<sub>Tom or hearer</sub>-lul onghohayssta.  
NOM self-ACC defended  
Tom defended self.)
- b Tom-i ku-casin<sub>Tom or \*hearer</sub>-ul onghohayssta.  
NOM self-ACC defended  
(Tom defended he-self.)
- a. Tom-i caki-casin<sub>Tom or \*hearer</sub>-ul onghohayssta.  
NOM self-self-ACC defended (Tom defended self-self.)

In (8a), the reflexive *caki* 'self' refers to the linguistic antecedent *Tom* as well as the hearer. On the other hand, *ku-casin* 'he-self' and *caki-casin* 'self-self' only refer to the linguistic antecedent *Tom*. We wish to argue that the reason why *caki* 'self' can refer to the hearer is that it has its own reference like you. Interestingly, when a DP appears as the antecedent of *caki* 'self' as in (8a), the linguistic antecedent

is preferred over the hearer, but when a QP appears as the antecedent, we can say the opposite:

- (9) a. Nwukwuna caki<sub>hearer/???everyone</sub>-lul onghohayssta.  
everyone self-ACC defended  
(Everyone defended self.)  
b. Nwukwuna ku-casin<sub>\*hearer/everyone</sub>-ul onghohayssta.  
everyone he-self-ACC defended  
(Everyone defended he-self.)  
c. Nwukwuna caki-casin<sub>\*hearer/everyone</sub>-ul onghohayssta.  
everyone self-self-ACC defended  
(Everyone defended self-self.)

This result in (9a) is predictable, given the assumption that the Korean reflexive *caki* 'self' cannot corefer with a QP antecedent through intended reference (the speaker's intention). On the other hand, *caki-casin* 'self-self' and *ku-casin* 'he-self' can corefer with a QP through reference inheritance. Thus, anaphors which inherit their reference cannot take a discourse element.

The following sentences also lend their support to the assumption that the hearer is preferred over the linguistic antecedent as the referent of *caki* 'self' since *caki* 'self' corefers with its antecedent through intended reference:

- (10) a. Tom kwa Bill-i caki<sub>hearer/???Tom and Bill</sub>-lul piphanhayssta. and NOM self-ACC criticized  
(Tom and Bill criticized self.)  
b. Tom kwa Bill-i caki-casin<sub>\*hearer/Tom and Bill</sub>-ul piphanhayssta. NOM self-self-ACC criticized  
(Tom and Bill criticized self-self.)  
c. Tom kwa Bill-i ku-casin<sub>\*hearer/Tom and Bill</sub>-ul piphanhayssta. NOM self-ACC criticized  
(Tom and Bill criticized he-self.)

When a conjunct NP appears as the antecedent, the hearer is preferred over the linguistic antecedent of *caki* 'self'. Conversely, the hearer as the referent of *ku-casin* 'he-self' and *caki-casin* 'self-self' is unavailable since they corefer with their antecedent through reference inheritance.

Now let us turn to the question of why (7a) is acceptable, whereas why (7b) and (7c) are not acceptable. We wish to argue that *caki* 'self' corefers with the hearer through intended reference since *caki* 'self' has its own reference. We wish to argue, on the other hand, that *ku-casin* 'he-self' and *caki-casin* 'self-self' cannot corefer with the hearer since they inherit their reference from their antecedent. As in the case of *caki* 'self', the Korean reflexive *ne-casin* 'yourself' has its own reference. As expected, *ne-casin* 'yourself' behaves in the same way regarding the logophoric use:

- (11) a. Caki katun mwulihakcatul-un tumwulta.  
self like physicists-TOP rare  
(Physicists like self are rare.)  
b. \*Ku-casin katun mwulihakcatul-un tumwulta.  
he-self like physicists-TOP rare  
(Physicists like he-self are rare.)  
c. \*Caki-casin katun mwulihakcatul-un tumwulta.  
self-self like physicists-TOP rare  
(Physicists like he-self are rare.)  
d. Ne-casin katun mwulihakcatul-un tumwulta.  
yourself like physicists-TOP rare  
(Physicists like yourself are rare.)

As illustrated in (11), *ne-casin* 'yourself' and *caki* 'self' can refer to a discourse element since they have their own reference, whereas *ku-casin* 'he-self' and *caki-casin* 'self-self' cannot refer to it since they have no reference. Thus, *caki* 'self' and *ne-casin* 'yourself' are exempt from condition A, whereas *ku-casin* 'he-self' and *caki-casin* 'self-self' are not.

#### 4. Intentional Expressions and Non-intentional Expressions

C & Z (2015) <sup>[1]</sup> argue that many exempt anaphors occur in attitude contexts created by intentional expressions such as *said*, *opinion* or *boasted*, as in (12):

- (12) a. Bill<sub>i</sub> said that [the rain had damaged pictures of himself<sub>i</sub>].  
b. In her<sub>i</sub> opinion, physicists like herself<sub>i</sub> are rare.  
c. Max<sub>i</sub> boasted that [the queen invited Lucie and himself<sub>i</sub>].  
(C & Z 2015)

This is further illustrated in (13):

- (13) According to John<sub>i</sub>, the article was written by Ann and himself<sub>i</sub>.

As C & Z point out, the exempt anaphor *himself* appears with the intentional expression *according to*. They also argue that an epithet like *the idiot* cannot occur with the intentional expression *according to*, but the epithet can occur with the non-intentional expression *speaking of*:

- (14) a. \*According to John<sub>i</sub>, the idiot<sub>i</sub> is married to a genius.  
b. Speaking of John<sub>i</sub>, the idiot<sub>i</sub> is married to a genius.

C & Z observe this difference, but they have no idea why two sentences show the opposite. For this, we wish to argue that intentional expressions permit only anaphor binding, whereas non-intentional expressions permit only demonstrative binding. We wish to argue that in the case of intentional expressions, their argument has the feature of [+agent] like the nominative agent *John*, so reference tracking is easy. On the other hand, in the case of non-intentional expressions, their argument has [-agent], so reference tracking is not easy. Thus, non-intentional expressions require demonstratives. The following Korean examples support our assumption:

- (15) a. John<sub>i</sub>-ey ttalумыen ku-nonmwun-un Ann kwa ku-casin<sub>i</sub>-ey uy ssyecyessta.  
according to the article-TOP and he-self by written  
(According to John, the article was written by Ann and he-self.)  
b. John<sub>i</sub>-ey ttalумыen ku-nonmwun-un Ann kwa caki-casin<sub>i</sub>-ey uy ssyecyessta.  
according to the article-TOP and self-self by written  
(According to John, the article was written by Ann and self-self.)  
c. John<sub>i</sub>-ey ttalумыen ku-nonmwun-un Ann kwa caki-ey uy ssyecyessta.  
according to the article-TOP and self by written  
(According to John, the article was written by Ann and self.)

In (15), *John* is the argument of the intentional expression *according to*. Thus, *John* has the feature of [+agent] like the nominative agent *John*, which permits only anaphor binding.

In the case of non-intentional expressions, however, reference tracking is not easy with anaphors:

(16) a. \*John<sub>i</sub>-ey tayhayse malhalkesskatumyen ku-nonmwun-un Ann

speaking of the article-TOP  
kwa ku-casin<sub>i</sub>-ey uy ssyecyessta.

and he-self by written

(Speaking of John, the article was written by Ann and he-self.)

b. \*John<sub>i</sub>-ey tayhayse malhalkesskatumyen ku-nonmwun-un Ann

speaking of the article-TOP  
kwa caki-casin<sub>i</sub>-ey uy ssyecyessta.

and he-self by written

(Speaking of John, the article was written by Ann and self-self.)

a. \*John<sub>i</sub>-ey tayhayse malhalkesskatumyen ku-nonmwun-un Ann

speaking of the article-TOP  
kwa caki<sub>i</sub>-ey uy ssyecyessta.

and he-self by written

(Speaking of John, the article was written by Ann and self.)

As expected, the argument *John* of non-intentional expressions has the feature of [-agent]. Thus, reference tracking is not easy with anaphors. For this reason, non-intentional expressions require demonstratives, as illustrated in (17):

(17) a. John<sub>i</sub>-ey tayhayse malhalkesskatumyen ku-nonmwun-un Ann

speaking of the article-TOP  
kwa ku-papo<sub>i</sub>-ey uy ssyecyessta.

and the idiot by written

(Speaking of John, the article was written by Ann and the idiot.)

b. John<sub>i</sub>-ey tayhayse malhalkesskatumyen ku-nonmwun-un Ann

speaking of the article-TOP  
kwa ku-salam<sub>i</sub>-ey uy ssyecyessta.

and the person by written

(Speaking of John, the article was written by Ann and the person.)

c. John<sub>i</sub>-ey tayhayse malhalkesskatumyen ku-nonmwun-un Ann

speaking of the article-TOP  
kwa ku-namca<sub>i</sub>-ey uy ssyecyessta.

and the man by written

(Speaking of John, the article was written by Ann and the man.)

In the case of non-intentional expressions, their argument has [-agent], so reference tracking is not easy. Thus, non-intentional expressions require only demonstratives. This is why (17a), (17b), and (17c) are acceptable. In (17), only demonstrative binding is available with non-intentional expressions.

The following examples support the assumption that non-intentional expressions have the feature of [-agent]:

(18) a. \*John<sub>i</sub>-ey kwanhaysemalhamyen ku nonmwun-un

when it comes to the article-NOM

Ann kwa caki<sub>i</sub>-ey uy ssyecyessta.

and self by written

(When it comes to John, the article was written by Ann and self.)

b. \*John<sub>i</sub>-ey kwanhaysemalhamyen ku nonmwun-un

when it comes to the article-NOM

Ann kwa ku-casin<sub>i</sub>-ey uy ssyecyessta.

and self by written

(When it comes to John, the article was written by Ann and he-self.)

c. \*John<sub>i</sub>-ey kwanhaysemalhamyen ku nonmwun-un

when it comes to the article-NOM

Ann kwa caki-casin<sub>i</sub> ey uy ssyecyessta.

and self by written

(When it comes to John, the article was written by Ann and self-self.)

As illustrated in (18), non-intentional expressions do not permit anaphor binding since they have the feature of [-agent]. That is to say, in the case of non-intentional expressions, reference tracking is not possible with anaphors. Note, however, that reference tracking is possible with demonstratives:

(19) a. John<sub>i</sub>-ey kwanhaysemalhamyen ku nonmwun-un

when it comes to the article-NOM

Ann kwa ku-salam<sub>i</sub> ey uy ssyecyessta.

and that person by written

(When it comes to John, the article was written by Ann and that person.)

b. John<sub>i</sub>-ey kwanhaysemalhamyen ku nonmwun-un

when it comes to the article-NOM

Ann kwa ku-papo<sub>i</sub> ey uy ssyecyessta.

and that idiot by written

(When it comes to John, the article was written by Ann and that idiot.)

Notice that demonstratives are employed by the speaker to refer to an entity or entities. As illustrated in (19), non-intentional expressions which take [-agent] require demonstratives to be licensed by antecedents.

Again, the following examples support the assumption that intentional expressions permit anaphor binding:

(20) a. Ku<sub>i</sub>-uy kyenhaylo caki<sub>i</sub> katun mwulihakcatul-nun tumwulta.

he-GEN opinion self like physicists-TOP rare

(In his opinion, physicists like self are rare.)

b. Ku<sub>i</sub>-uy kyenhaylo caki-casin<sub>i</sub> katun mwulihakcatul-nun tumwulta.

he-GEN opinion self-self like physicists-TOP rare

(In his opinion, physicists like self-self are rare.)

c. Ku<sub>i</sub>-uy kyenhaylo ku-casin<sub>i</sub> katun mwulihakcatul-nun tumwulta. He-GEN opinion he-self like physicists-TOP rare

(In his opinion, physicists like he-self are rare.)

As expected, intentional expressions permit anaphor binding. This may be due to the fact that the anaphoric expression *his* has the feature of [+agent] like the nominative agent *ku* 'he'. We thus conclude that intentional expressions allow anaphor binding since they carry [+agent], whereas non-intentional expressions allow demonstratives since they carry [-agent].

## 5. Conclusion

To sum up, we have shown that anaphors can be exempt from

locality constraint. In section 2, we have argued that just as in the case of the English SELF anaphor, Korean anaphors can be used as a logophoric reflexive. In section 3, we have contended that *caki* 'self' corefers with the hearer through intended reference since *caki* 'self' has its own reference. We have shown, on the other hand, that *ku-casin* 'he-self' and *caki-casin* 'self-self' cannot corefer with the hearer since they inherit their reference from their antecedent. As in the case of *caki* 'self', the Korean reflexive *ne-casin* 'yourself' has its own reference. Thus, *caki* 'self' and *ne-casin* 'yourself' behave in the same way regarding the logophoric use. In section 4, we have maintained that in the case of intentional expressions, their argument has the feature of [+agent] like the nominative agent *John*, so reference tracking is easy. We have also maintained that in the case of non-intentional expressions, their argument has [-agent], so reference tracking is not easy. Thus, non-intentional expressions require demonstratives. Finally, we have shown that intentional expressions such as according to and in his opinion permit anaphor binding, whereas non-intentional expressions such as speaking of and when it comes to permit only demonstrative binding.

## 6. References

1. Charnavel I, Zlogar C. English reflexive logophors. In: Proceedings of the 51st Annual Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society; c2015.
2. Chicago, IL. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society; c2015. p. 100-115.
3. Charnavel I, Sportiche D. Anaphor binding: What French inanimate anaphors show. *Linguistic Inquiry*. 2016;47(1):35-87.
4. Chomsky N. Lectures on government and binding. Dordrecht: Foris; c1981.
5. Chomsky N. Barriers. *Linguistic Inquiry Monograph* 13. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press; c1986.
6. Pollard C, Sag I. Anaphors and the scope of binding theory. *Linguistic Inquiry*. 1992;23(2):261-303.
7. Pollard C. Remarks on binding theory. In: Müller S, editor. Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on HPSG; 2005 Aug 22-24; Lisbon, Portugal. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications; c2005. p. 561-577.
8. Reinhart T, Reuland E. Reflexivity. *Linguistic Inquiry*. 1993;24(4):657-720.
9. Reuland E. Anaphora and language design. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press; c2011.
10. Safir K. The syntax of anaphora. Oxford: Oxford University Press; c2004.