



The binding behavior of Korean SE anaphors

Namkil Kang

Far East University, South Korea

* Corresponding Author: **Namkil Kang**

Article Info

ISSN (online): 2582-7138

Volume: 03

Issue: 02

March-April 2022

Received: 28-01-2022

Accepted: 15-02-2022

Page No: 20-24

Abstract

The ultimate goal of this paper is to show that Korean binding does not back up predicate-based binding theories. We provide six arguments that do not entertain predicate-based binding theories. First, Korean anaphors cannot be divided into local anaphors and non-local anaphors. Second, the Korean SE anaphor *caki* 'self' is associated with its antecedent by the speaker's intention, whereas the Korean SE anaphor *casin* 'self' is associated with its antecedent by reference inheritance. Third, the Korean SE anaphors *caki* 'self' and *casin* 'self' behave like SELF anaphors since they are used as a logophor. Fourth, with respect to a QP, local *caki* 'self' functions as a SE anaphor, whereas non-local *caki* 'self' functions as a SELF anaphor. On the other hand, with respect to a QP, local and non-local *casin* 'self' functions as a SELF anaphor. Fifth, the Korean SE anaphors *caki* 'self' and *casin* 'self' indicate the absence of the TSC and SSC effect in Korean. Sixth, predicate-based binding theories are silent about two occurrences of *caki* 'self' and *casin* 'self' in the sentence.

Keywords: SE anaphors, SELF anaphors, binding, predicate-based binding theories

1. Introduction

The main goal of this paper is to demonstrate that as far as Korean binding is concerned, predicate-based binding theories are not correct. As Charnavel & Sportiche (2016) ^[1] point out, for twenty or so, two influential versions of condition A of the Binding Theory have coexisted: Chomsky's version (1981, 1986) and versions of predicate-based binding theories (Pollard & Sag 1992 ^[4], Reinhart & Reuland (1993) ^[5], Reuland 2005 ^[6], Reuland 2011) ^[7]. This paper lends its support to Charnavel & Sportiche's (2016) ^[1] claim that the coargument view is not only weak but also strong. The organization of this paper is as follows. In section 2.1, we argue that Korean anaphors cannot be divided into local anaphors and non-local anaphors. In section 2.2, we further argue that the Korean SE anaphor *caki* 'self' is associated with its antecedent by intended reference (the speaker's intention), whereas the Korean SE anaphor *casin* 'self' is associated with its antecedent by reference inheritance. In section 2.3, we maintain that the Korean SE anaphors *caki* 'self' and *casin* 'self' behave like SELF anaphors since they are used as a logophor. In section 2.4, we contend that local *caki* 'self' functions as a SE anaphor, whereas non-local *caki* 'self' functions as a SELF anaphor. We contend, on the other hand, that local and non-local *casin* 'self' functions as a SELF anaphor. In section 2.5, we argue that *caki* 'self' and *casin* 'self' demonstrate the absence of the TSC and SSC effect in Korean. In section 2.6, we further argue that predicate-based binding theories are silent about two occurrences of *caki* 'self' and *casin* 'self' in the subject/object position.

2. SE Anaphors and Binding Domain

2.1. SE Anaphors

In what follows, we show that the Korean monomorphemic anaphors *caki* 'self' and *casin* 'self' belong to SE-anaphors (simplex expression) and SELF anaphors. Reinhart & Reuland (1993) ^[5] and Reuland (2011) ^[7] argue that typological differences between the two are as follows:

(1) SE anaphors: subject-oriented, long-distance, monomorphemic
(Dutch *zich*, Italian *se*, Norwegian *seg*)

Self-anaphors: no subject-orientation, local, polymorphemic (English himself, Norwegian seg selv, Dutch zichzelf)

According to R & R (1993)^[5] and Reuland (2011)^[7], *zichzelf* can occur freely in the object position, whereas *zich* cannot. Note that the Korean monomorphemic anaphor *caki* 'self' can be locally bound as well as non-locally bound:

(2) Tom_i-i Mary_j-ka caki_{i/j}-lul kwachanhayssta-ko
NOM NOM self-ACC overpraised
Malhayssta.
Said
(Tom said that Mary overpraised caki)

The *caki*-binding by the matrix subject *Tom* indicates *caki*'s property of LD-binding. On the other hand, the *caki*-binding by the embedded subject *Mary* demonstrates that *caki* 'self' can be locally bound. Likewise, the Korean monomorphemic anaphor *casin* 'self' can be locally bound as well as non-locally bound:

(3) Tom_i-i Mary_j-ka casin_{i/j}-ul kwachanhayssta-ko
NOM NOM self-ACC overpraised
Malhayssta.
Said
(Tom said that Mary overpraised casin.)

The *casin*-binding by the matrix subject *Tom* and the embedded subject *Mary* indicates *caki*'s property of LD-binding and local binding. This in turn indicates that the Korean monomorphemic anaphors *caki* 'self' and *casin* 'self' belong to SE anaphors and SELF anaphors. From this it is clear that Korean anaphors cannot be divided into local anaphors and non-local anaphors. It is thus reasonable to assume that the Korean monomorphemic anaphors *caki* 'self' and *casin* 'self' do not support predicate-based binding theories.

More interestingly, the Korean monomorphemic anaphor *caki* 'self' shows the property of subject-orientation:

(4) Tom_i-i James_j-ka Bill_k-eykey caki_{i/j/*k} ekwanhayse
NOM NOM DAT self about
Malhayssta-ko sayngkakhanta.
Said COMP think
(Tom thinks that James told Bill about caki.)

The ungrammaticality of the coindexation between *caki* 'self' and the non-subject *Bill* discloses that the Korean monomorphemic anaphor *caki* 'self' is subject-oriented. Likewise, the Korean monomorphemic anaphor *casin* 'self' shows the property of subject-orientation:

(5) Tom_i-i James_j-ka Bill_k-eykey casin_{i/j/*k} ekwanhayse
NOM NOM DAT self about
Malhayssta-ko sayngkakhanta.
Said COMP think
(Tom thinks that James told Bill about casin.)

In (5), coindexing *casin* 'self' with the non-subject *Bill* is not acceptable but coindexing *casin* 'self' with the matrix subject *Tom* and the embedded subject *James* is acceptable. By this contrast it becomes evident that *casin* 'self' subject-oriented. This in turn suggests that the Korean monomorphemic

anaphor *casin* belongs to SE anaphors and SELF anaphors.

2.2. The predicate-based binding theories are too weak

The Korean monomorphemic anaphor *caki* 'self' is associated with its antecedent by the speaker's intention (intended reference), whereas the Korean monomorphemic anaphor *casin* 'self' is associated with its antecedent by reference inheritance. As illustrated in (6), the Korean anaphor *caki* 'self' can be locally bound as well as LD-bound:

(6) Tom_i-i Bill_j-eykey Mary_k-ka caki_{i/*j/k}-lul
NOM DAT NOM self-ACC
Piphanhayssta-ko malhayssta.
Criticize-COMP said
(Tom said to Bill that Mary criticized caki.)

In (6), the *caki*-binding by the matrix subject *Tom* indicates *caki*'s property of LD-binding and the *caki*-binding by the embedded subject *Mary* indicates that the Korean monomorphemic anaphor *caki* 'self' can be locally bound. The Korean anaphor *caki* 'self' in (6) cannot however refer to *Bill*. It indicates the property of subject-orientation of the Korean anaphor *caki* 'self'. Notice, however, that since the utterance of (7) is accompanied by the speaker's intention, *caki* 'self' cannot refer to *Tom*:

(7) Tom-i caki (points to the hearer)-lul onghohayssta.
NOM self-ACC defended
(Tom defended self.)

Because of the speaker's intention, *caki* 'self' cannot refer to *Tom*. According to the predicate-based binding theories, SELF anaphors can occur freely in the object position, whereas SE anaphors cannot. As observed in (7), the Korean monomorphemic anaphor *caki* 'self' cannot refer to its linguistic antecedent. Thus, condition A must function so that it may include the possibility of the speaker's intention. The Korean monomorphemic anaphor *casin* 'self' is associated with its antecedent by reference inheritance. To begin with, let us consider the following example:

(8) Tom_i-i Bill_j-eykey Mary_k-ka casin_{i/*j/k}-ul
NOM DAT NOM self-ACC
Piphanhayssta-ko malhayssta.
Criticize COMP said
(Tom said to Bill that Mary criticized casin.)

In (8), *casin* 'self' can refer to the matrix subject *Tom* and the embedded subject *Mary*, which indicates that *casin* 'self' is locally bound as well as non-locally bound. However, *casin* 'self' cannot refer to *Bill*, thus implying that *casin* 'self' is subject-oriented. More interestingly, the following sentence does not support predicate-based binding theories:

(9) Tom_i-i casin_i-ul onghohayssta.
NOM self-ACC defended
(Tom defended self.)

The SE anaphor *casin* 'self' can occur freely in the object position. That is to say, the Korean anaphor *casin* 'self' can refer to its linguistic antecedent *Tom*, thus implying that *casin* 'self' behaves like a SELF anaphor. Thus, our example does not lend its support to predicate-based binding theories. Note

that the speaker's intention does not work for *casin* 'self':

- (10) Tom_i-i casin_i (points to Mary)-ul onghohayssta.
 NOM self-ACC defended
 (Tom defended self.)

Even though the speaker's intention in (10) is supplied through ostention, *casin* 'self' cannot refer to *Mary*. Thus, condition A must function so that it may include the speaker's intention and reference inheritance. We thus conclude that the Korean anaphors *caki* 'self' and *casin* 'self' behave differently. That is to say, *caki* 'self' is associated with its antecedent by the speaker's intention, whereas *casin* 'self' is associated with its antecedent by reference inheritance.

2.3. Weak Hypotheses

The Korean SE anaphors *caki* 'self' and *casin* 'self' can occur in the prenominal possessive position, whereas the English SELF anaphor *himself* cannot:

- (11) a. *Tom likes himself's friends.
 b. Tom_i-i caki_i-uy chinkwu-tul-ul cohahanta.
 NOM self-GEN friend-pl-ACC like
 (Tom likes caki's friends.)
 c. Tom_i-i casin_i-uy chinkwu-tul-ul cohahanta.
 NOM self-GEN friend-pl-ACC like
 (Tom likes casin's friends.)

Now let us consider (12):

- (12) a. Mary_i boasted that the chairman invited her_i friend and herself_i for a drink.
 b. *Mary_i boasted that the chairman invited herself_i for a drink.

In (12a), the English SELF anaphor *herself* is a logophoric reflexive because it does not serve as an argument of the embedded predicate invited. In (12a) the argument of the embedded predicate invited is her friend and herself, not herself. Thus, the SELF anaphor *herself* is allowed and it can be non-locally bound. In contrast, the SELF anaphor *herself* in (12b) functions as an argument of the embedded predicate invited. However, the SELF anaphor *herself* cannot refer to the chairman since the binding theory works for only two arguments of the predicate. More interestingly, the Korean SE anaphors *caki* 'self' and *casin* 'self' can be used as a logophor:

- (13) a. Tom_i-i caki_i-uy cha-lul poassta.
 NOM self-GEN car-ACC saw
 (Tom saw a car of caki.)
 a. Tom_i-i casin_i-uy cha-lul poassta.
 NOM self-GEN car-ACC saw
 (Tom saw a car of casin.)

The grammaticality of (13a) and (13b) demonstrates that the Korean SE anaphors *caki* 'self' and *casin* 'self' behave in the same way with respect to the logophoric use. This in turn suggests that the Korean SE anaphors *caki* 'self' and *casin* 'self' behave like SELF anaphors since they are used as a logophor. From this it is clear that (13a) and (13b) do not back up predicate-based binding theories. With respect to the logophoric use, however, there are cases where they behave differently:

- (14) a. Physicians like yourself are rare.
 b. Caki katun naykwauysatul-un tumwulta.
 Self like physicians-TOP rare
 (Physicians like caki is rare.)
 C. *Casin katun naykwauysatul-un tumwulta.
 Self like physicians-TOP rare
 (Physicians like casin is rare.)

The reason why the occurrence of *caki* 'self' is acceptable, whereas that of *casin* 'self' is not acceptable is that the Korean SE anaphor *caki* 'self' has its own reference, but the Korean SE anaphor *casin* 'self' does not. Thus, it is plausible to assume that the lack of reference in *casin* 'self' makes (14c) unacceptable. This in turn suggests that the Korean SE anaphor *caki* 'self' behaves like SELF anaphors, but the Korean SE anaphor *casin* 'self' does not. From all of this, it is clear that the Korean SE anaphors *caki* 'self' does not back up predicate-based binding theories.

2.4. Variable Binding

In what follows, we show that the Korean SE anaphors *caki* 'self' and *casin* 'self' behave differently with respect to a QP. *Casin* 'self' behaves like a SELF anaphor, whereas *caki* 'self' behaves like a SE anaphor or a SELF anaphor. Let us consider the following sentences:

- (15) a. Tom_i-i caki_i-lul kyeklyehayssta.
 NOM self-ACC encouraged
 (Tom encouraged caki.)
 b. Tom_i-i casin_i-ul kyeklyehayssta.
 NOM self-ACC encouraged
 (Tom encouraged casin.)

The occurrence of *caki* 'self' and *casin* 'self' in (15) is natural. However, when a QP appears as the antecedent, there is a difference in naturalness between *caki* 'self' and *casin* 'self':

- (16) a. ???Nwukwuna_i caki_i /hearer-lul kyeklyehayssta.
 Everyone self-ACC encouraged
 (Everyone encouraged caki.)
 b. Nwukwuna_i casin_i /hearer-ul kyeklyehayssta.
 Everyone self-ACC encouraged
 (Everyone encouraged casin.)

When a reflexive appears with a QP, the only way for the reflexive to be bound by the QP is by variable binding. The marginality of (16a) suggests that *caki* 'self' is a SE anaphor, whereas the grammaticality of (16b) suggests that *casin* 'self' is a SELF anaphor. This in turn indicates that *caki* 'self' behaves like SE anaphors, whereas *casin* 'self' behaves like SELF anaphors. Note that SELF anaphors can occur freely in the object position, whereas SE anaphors may not. From this it is clear that the Korean monomorphemic anaphors *caki* 'self' and *casin* 'self' behave differently, which in turn indicates that predicate-based binding theories cannot account for this difference. We now intend to argue that unlike local *caki* 'self', non-local *caki* 'self' can be associated with a QP:

- (17) a. Nwukwuna_i caki_i-uy ai-lul kyeklyehayssta.
 Everyone self-GEN child-ACC encouraged
 (Everyone encouraged caki's child.)
 b. Nwukwuna_i casin_i-uy ai-lul kyeklyehayssta.

Everyone self-GEN child-ACC encouraged
(Everyone encouraged casin's child.)

In (17a) and (17b), *caki* 'self' and *casin* 'self' appear non-locally with respect to the QP and these sentences are perfect. This indicates that non-local *caki* 'self' and *casin* 'self' can be interpreted as a bound variable. To sum up, local *caki* 'self' functions as a SE anaphor, whereas non-local *caki* 'self' functions as a SELF anaphor. On the other hand, local and non-local *casin* 'self' functions as a SELF anaphor. We thus conclude that predicate-based binding theories have difficulties accounting for this difference.

2.5 TSC and SSC

In what follows, we show that the Korean SE anaphors *caki* 'self' and *casin* 'self' can be the subject of a tensed clause and that the intervention of an embedded subject in Korean does not block subject binding across it. Unlike the English SELF anaphor *himself*, the Korean SE anaphors *caki* 'self' and *casin* 'self' can appear in the embedded subject position:

- (18) a. *Tom_i thinks that himself_i is smart.
b. Tom_i-i caki_i-ka papola-ko sayngkakhanta.
NOM self-NOM fool-COMP think
(Tom thinks that caki is foolish.)
c. Tom_i-i casin_i-i papola-ko sayngkakhanta.
NOM self-NOM fool-COMP think
(Tom thinks that casin is foolish.)

What (18a), (18b), and (18c) suggest is that the Korean SE anaphors *caki* 'self' and *casin* 'self' cannot be treated on a par with the English SELF anaphor *himself*. In (18b) and (18c), *caki* 'self' and *casin* 'self' demonstrate the absence of TSC effect in Korean. This condition states that a reflexive cannot be the subject of a tensed clause. What (18b) and (18c) suggest is that condition A must function so that it may include the absence of the TSC. Yet, predicate-based binding theories have difficulties accounting for Korean anaphors which occur in the subject position since they mainly license SELF anaphors in the object position.

Likewise, unlike the English SELF anaphor *himself*, the Korean SE anaphors *caki* 'self' and *casin* 'self' portray the absence of the SSC effect:

- (19) a. *Tom_i thinks that Mary_j loves himself_i.
b. Tom_i-i Mary_j-ka caki_{i/j}-lul cohahanta-ko
NOM NOM self-ACC like-COMP
Sayngkakhanta.
Think
(Tom thinks that Mary likes caki.)
c. Tom_i-i Mary_j-ka casin_{i/j}-ul cohahanta-ko
NOM NOM self-ACC like-COMP
Sayngkakhanta.
Think
(Tom thinks that Mary likes casin.)

Interestingly, the Korean SE anaphors *caki* 'self' and *casin* 'self' can have either a local antecedent or a non-local antecedent, whereas the English SELF anaphor *himself* can only have a local antecedent. As alluded to in (19b) and (19c), the embedded subject *Mary* does not block subject binding. That is, (19b) and (19c) are grammatical despite the fact that *caki* 'self' and *casin* 'self' violate the Specified Subject Condition. We thus conclude that (19b) and (19c) do not

entertain predicate-based binding theories.

2.6. Two Occurrences of Anaphors

In the following, we consider two occurrences of the Korean SE anaphors *caki* 'self' and *casin* 'self'. Let us consider the following sentences:

- (20) a. *Tom_i-i caki_i-ka ku_i-lul piphanhayssta-ko
malhayssta.
NOM self-NOM he-ACC criticized-COMP said
(Tom said that caki criticized ku.)
b. *Tom_i-i casin_i-i ku_i-lul piphanhayssta-ko malhayssta.
NOM self-NOM he-ACC criticized-COMP said
(Tom said that casin criticized ku.)

As illustrated in (20), *caki* 'self' and *ku* 'he' cannot bear the same index. Likewise, *casin* 'self' and *ku* 'he' cannot have the same index. However, two occurrences of *caki* 'self' and *casin* 'self' can have the same index:

- (21) a. Tom_i-i caki_i-ka caki_i-lul piphanhayssta-ko
malhayssta.
NOM self-NOM self-ACC criticized-COMP said
(Tom said that caki criticized caki.)
a. Tom_i-i casin_i-i casin_i-ul piphanhayssta-ko malhayssta.
NOM self-NOM self-ACC criticized-COMP said
(Tom said that casin criticized casin.)

Interestingly, the Korean SE anaphor *casin* 'self' behaves like *caki* 'self'. As alluded to in (21), the reference of anaphors can be maximized only if anaphors are the same form. It should be pointed out that the English pronouns allow two occurrences in the sentence, but the English SELF anaphor *himself* does not exhibit this property. As indicated in (21), the Korean SE anaphors *caki* 'self' and *casin* 'self' can occur in the subject/object position. However, predicate-based binding theories are silent about this. That is to say, predicate-based binding theories cannot explain the fact that two occurrences of *caki* 'self' and *casin* 'self' in the subject/object position can bear the same index. In the predicate-based binding theories, an antecedent occurs in the subject position and its bindee appears in the object position. We thus conclude that predicate-based binding theories are silent about two occurrences of *caki* 'self' and *casin* 'self' in the subject/object position.

3. Conclusion

To sum up, we have argued that Korean binding does not entertain predicate-based binding theories. In section 2.1, we have argued that Korean anaphors cannot be divided into local anaphors and non-local anaphors. In section 2.2, we have further argued that the Korean anaphor *caki* 'self' is associated with its antecedent by the speaker's intention, whereas the Korean anaphor *casin* 'self' is associated with its antecedent by reference inheritance. In section 2.3, we have maintained that the Korean SE anaphors *caki* 'self' and *casin* 'self' behave like SELF anaphors since they are used as a logophor. In section 2.4, we have contended that local *caki* 'self' functions as a SE anaphor, whereas non-local *caki* 'self' functions as a SELF anaphor. We have contended, on the other hand, that local and non-local *casin* 'self' functions as a SELF anaphor. In section 2.5, we have argued that *caki* 'self' and *casin* 'self' indicate the absence of the TSC and

SSC effect in Korean. In section 2.6, we have further argued that predicate-based binding theories are silent about two occurrences of *caki* ‘self’ and *casin* ‘self’ in the subject/object position.

4. References

1. Charnavel I, Sportiche D. Anaphor Binding: What French Inanimate Anaphors Show? *Linguistic Inquiry*. 2016;47(1):35-87.
2. Chomsky N. *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht: Foris; c1981.
3. Chomsky N. *Barriers*. *Linguistic Inquiry Monograph* 13. Cambridge: MIT Press; c1986.
4. Pollard C, Sag I. Pollard C, Sag IA. *Anaphors in English and the scope of binding theory*. *Linguistic Inquiry*. 1992;23(2):261-303.
5. Reinhart T, Reuland E. *Reflexivity*. *Linguistic Inquiry*. 1993;24(4):657-720.
6. Reuland E. *An Overview of Binding Principles*. MS. Utrecht Institute of Linguistics OTS; c2005.
7. Reuland E. *Anaphora and Language Design*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press; c2011.