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O. Introduction

Linguists have been aware that the description of pronouns is one of the most intriguing problems in linguistic investigations. Recently, some Korean linguists, working within the framework of generative grammar, have shown their interests in Korean pronominal system (C. M. Lee 1974 and D. W. Yang 1975), but their investigations are mostly limited to the description of constraints on the occurrence of ku and caki. No attempt has been made to relate the occurrence of ku (i.e., Pronominalization) to that of caki (i.e., Reflexivization), and it has been suggested that the two pronominal expressions be brought about through independent syntactic processes.

The main concern of the present paper is to explain informally the relatedness of pronominal forms in sentences like (1).

(1) a. sensayngnim-i caki-uy calmos-ul molu-n-ta
   teacher SM self of mistake OM not know
   선생님이 자기의 잘못을 모른다.
   b. sensayngnim-i casin-uy calmos-ul molu-n-ta
   선생님이 자신의 잘못을 모른다.
   c. sensayngnim-i caki-casin-uy calmos-ul molu-n-ta
   선생님이 자기 자신의 잘못을 모른다.
   d. sensayngnim-i ku-uy calmos-ul molu-n-ta
      he of
      선생님이 그의 잘못을 모른다.
   e. sensayngnim-i ku-casin-uy calmos-ul molu-n-ta
      선생님이 그 자신의 잘못을 모른다.

   'The teacher does not know his own mistake.'

The most puzzling thing as regards to sentences like (1) is that they all mean the same thing. Thus, it is natural that the grammar of Korean must provide for them either a single underlying structure from which all the sentences in (1) are derivable or some

* This is a preliminary report of a more extensive study on Korean pronominal system which is currently under investigation.

1 Sentence (1d) is ambiguous: ku may refer to either the subject noun phrase sensayngnim or someone else. But the latter interpretation does not concern us here.
interpretive device which is capable of assigning an identical meaning to them. I do not exclude the possibility of adopting the interpretive position; but here I will simply take it for granted that all pronominal expressions in (1) are derived from fully specified noun phrases through transformations.

Consider further the sentences in (2).

(2) a. Chelswu-ka Yengho-lul ku-ka Pusan-ey issulttay manna-ess-ta
   SM OM he at be when meet Tns
   첼수가 영호를 그가 부산에 있을 때 만났다.

b. Chelswu-ka Yengho-lul ku-casin-i Pusan-ey issulttay manna-ess-ta
   첼수가 영호를 그 자신이 부산에 있을 때 만났다.

c. Chelswu-ka Yengho-lul casin-i Pusan-ey issulttay manna-ess-ta
   첼수가 영호를 자신이 부산에 있을 때 만났다.

d. Chelswu-ka Yengho-lul caki-casin-i Pusan-ey issulttay manna-ess-ta
   첼수가 영호를 자기 자신이 부산에 있을 때 만났다.

e. Chelswu-ka Yengho-lul caki-ka Pusan-ey issulttay manna-ess-ta
   첼수가 영호를 자기가 부산에 있을 때 만났다.

The kind of derivations which I believe is responsible for the synonymity of the sentences in (2) can be illustrated rather informally as in (3).

---

The antecedent of *ku* in sentence (2a) may be the subject, the object, or someone else.
1. Reflexivization and Pronominalization

In English, Reflexivization and Pronominalization are in complementary distribution; that is, they do not operate under the identical syntactic environment. Observe the following sentences:

(4) a. John recommended him.
   b. John recommended himself.

(5) a. John said that Bill would kill him.
   b. John said that Bill would kill himself.

In (4) and (5) the antecedent that the pronoun him refers to is different from the one that the reflexive himself refers to.

Yang (1975: 67) claims, 'As in English, Pronominalization and Reflexivization are mostly in complementary distribution.' Then, he goes on, '... if the antecedents of the pronouns were the matrix subjects, then Reflexivization, instead of Pronominalization, would apply... ' and (6b) and (7b) would be derived, instead of (8b) and (9b).

     SM OM house at meet Tns
     존이 톨을 자기의 집에서 만났다.
     'John met Tom at his own house.'

     came
     존이 톨을 자기가 시카고에 왔을 때 만났다.
     'John met Tom when he came to Chicago.'

(8) a. John-i Tom-lul Tom-uy cip-eyse manna-ess-ta
     b. John-i Tom-ul ku-uy cip-eyse manna-ess-ta
     존이 톨을 그의 집에서 만났다.
     'John met Tom at his house.'

     b. John-i Tom-ul ku-ka Chicago-ey wassulttay manna-ess-ta
     존이 톨을 그가 시카고에 왔을 때 만났다.
     'John met Tom when he came to Chicago.'

As Lee (1974: 68) and Yang (1975: 32-33) claim, it is true that in sentences (6b) and (7b) caki can only be coreferential with the subject of the sentences. However, Yang is mistaken in thinking that in (8b) and (9b) the antecedent of the pronoun ku can only be the object of the sentences. All Koreans I have consulted with on the meanings of (8b) and (9b) unanimously said that they are ambiguous; one of their meanings is identical with that of (6b) and (7b), respectively. In other words, the pronoun ku may also refer to the subject in sentences like (8b) and (9b). This means that both Pronominalization and Reflexivization are applicable to structures like (6a) and (7a)-
We can conclude, therefore, that in Korean Pronominalization and Reflexivization are not in complementary distribution.

2. The Relationship between ku and caki

In the preceding section, we have seen that ku and caki are not always in complementary distribution. In this section I will try to show that Reflexivization (if we agree to call the substitution of an NP with caki Reflexivization) is a special type of Pronominalization. Consider the following sentences:

(10) a. sonye-tul-i Mary-ka [caki ku] -tul lul ssis-tolok takaw-ess-ta  
girl PI SM SM PI OM wash so that approach

소녀들이 메리가 [자기] 들을 청도록 다가왔다.
‘Girls approached so that Mary could wash them.’

teacher student PI to SM go will that tell Tns

선생님은 학생들에게 [자기] 가 가겠다고 말했다.
‘The teacher told the students that he would go.’

c. [caki ku] -ny ttal-lul kyothongsako-lo ilhepin ku-kyoswu-nun hollo salko-iss-ta  
of daughter car accident by lost the professor alone live

[자기] 의 딸을 교통사고로 잃어버린 그 교수는 홀로 살고 있다.
‘The professor who lost his daughter in a car accident lives alone.’

d. ku sinsa-nun [caki ku] -wa chwumchwu-n yeca-lul poaess-ta  
the man with dance woman saw

그 신사는 [자기] 와 춤추며 여자를 보았다.
‘The gentleman saw the woman who danced with him.’

e. Chelswu-nun [caki ku] -lul ttayli-n namca-lul manna-ess-ta  
OM beat man OM met

철수는 [자기] 를 때린 남자를 만났다.
‘Chelswu met the man who beat him.’

The primary investigation of the data seems to indicate that the pronoun ku can always substitute the reflexive caki without destroying the original meaning of the sentences (see (13) and (15) for exception). As we will see, however, it does not appear to be the case that the reflexive caki can always replace the pronoun ku. Observe the following sentences:

to SM mistake that said

존이 토에게 [자기] 가 잘못이라고 말했다.
‘John said to Tom that he was wrong.’
b. John-i Tom-eykey \{ku\} -ka ku-kes-ul hal-kes-ul myenglyengha-ess-ta
to
SM it OM do order
준이 품에게 \{자기\} 가 그것을 할것을 명령했다.
‘John ordered Tom that he should do it.’

The fact that the reflexive caki cannot occur in sentences such as (11) has been accounted for by Yang and Lee under the assumption that the antecedent of a reflexive pronoun must be the subject of the sentence (see Yang 1975: 32 and Lee 1974: 68). However, they have made no attempt to explain sentences like (10) in which ku and caki can substitute each other.

To account for this interesting syntactic phenomenon, we can think of two possible solutions;

(A) Pronominalization and Reflexivization independently derive ku and caki, respectively, from their underlying noun phrases.

(B) Reflexivization is a special type of Pronominalization: that is, an NP first becomes ku by pronominalization, and then this ku is transformed into caki under certain syntactic environments.

Solution (A), which I believe is supported by Yang, not only is intuitively unacceptable but also does not offer a way to deal with pairs of sentences in (10). However, let us suppose that the underlying structure of (10b) is represented as in (12).

\[
(12)
\]

Pronominalization applies to (12), converting the subject NP of the embedded sentence into ku; and whether Reflexivization is further applicable to (12) or not depends on the question of whether the antecedent of the pronoun ku is the subject of its dominating sentence. Since in (12) the antecedent is the subject of the matrix sentence, Reflexivization optionally replaces the pronoun ku with the reflexive caki. This seems to explain why two synonymous sentences in (10b) are derivable from a single underlying sentence like (12). However, caki cannot occur in sentences like (11), because the antecedent of the pronoun is not the subject of its dominating sentence.

\[\text{As to the constraints on the applicability of Reflexivization, see Lee (1974:68-128) and Yang (1975:31-66).}\]
There seem to be a few exceptions to the claim that the pronoun *ku* can always substitute the reflexive *caki* without destroying its original meaning. Examine the following sentences:

(13) a. Chelswu-nun *caki*-lul chwuchenha-ess-ta
   Chelswu SM OM recommend Tns
   ‘Chelswu recommended himself.’

b. *Chelswu-nun *ku*-lul chwuchenha-ess-ta
   ‘Chelswu recommended him (not Chelswu).’

The sentences in (13) indicate that *ku* cannot occur when the pronoun and its antecedent are clause-mates, that is, they are included in a simple sentence. I claim that even sentences like (13a) are derived from their underlying structures through the application of both Pronominalization and Reflexivization. In other words, Pronominalization first applies to the underlying structure of (13a), transforming it into (13b), and next we obligatorily applies Reflexivization to (13b) to derive (13a). This is to say that Reflexivization applies obligatorily when the pronoun and its antecedent are clause-mates. Note that the so-called subject-antecedent condition also holds in a simple sentence. In sentence (14) *caki* can refer to only the subject of the sentence.

(14) *ku* haksayng-i sensaygnim-ekey *caki*-lul calangha-ess-ta
   گر 학생이 선생님에게 자기를 자랑했다.
   ‘The student boasted about himself to the teacher.’

The obligatoriness of Reflexivization does not seem to be limited to a simple sentence. Consider the following sentences:

(15) a. *ku*-ka oltha-ko sayngkakha-nun salam-un motwu i-pang-ul naka-ess-ta
   گرا 올타고 생각하는 사람은 모두 이 방을 나갔다.
   ‘Men who think he is right all left this room.’

b. *caki*-ka oltha-ko sayngkakha-nun salam-un motwu i-pang-ul naka-ess-ta
   자기가 올타고 생각하는 사람은 모두 이 방을 나갔다.
   ‘Everyone who thinks he is right all left this room.’

In (15) the reference of the pronoun *ku* is obviously different from the one of the reflexive *caki*. In other words, *ku* must not refer to the head noun of the relative clause, *salam*, whereas *caki* must. The same phenomenon is also observed in sentences like (16).

(16) a. *ku*-ka totwuknom-i-la-ko mit-nun haksayng-un epsta
   گرا 도둑놈이라고 믿는 학생은 없다.
   ‘There are no students who believe that he is a thief.’

The example is due to Chung-min Lee.
b. \textit{caki-ka totwuknom-i-la-ko mit-nun haksayng-un epsta}

자기가 도둑놈이라고 믿는 학생은 없다.

‘No student believes that he\textit{(himself)} is a thief.’

Chung-min Lee (personal communication) pointed out to me that the difference in their references probably has to do with the predicates of dominating sentences. That is, if the predicate of the matrix sentence is a ‘psychological verb’ as in (15) and (16), only Reflexivization is possible. However, sentences like (17) and (18) cannot be handled by what Lee proposes.

(17) a. \textit{ku-ka olnha-ko malha-nun salam-un motwu i pang-eyse ccokyena-ess-ta right say man all room from be expelled}

그가 올다고 말하는 사람은 모두 이 방에서 쫓겨났다.

‘Men who said that he was right were all expelled from this room.’

b. \textit{caki-ka olnha-ko malha-nun salam-un motwu i pang-eyse ccokyena-ess-ta}

자기가 올다고 말하는 사람은 모두 이 방에서 쫓겨났다.

‘Everyone who said that he was right was all expelled from this room.’

(18) a. \textit{ku-ka totwuknom-i-la-ko cwucangha-nun haksayng-un epsta claim}

그가 도둑놈이라고 주장하는 학생은 없다.

‘There are no students who claim that he is a thief.’

b. \textit{caki-ka totwuknom-i-la-ko cwucangha-nun haksayng-un epsta}

자기가 도둑놈이라고 주장하는 학생은 없다.

‘No student claims that he \textit{(himself)} is a thief.’

In (17) and (18), the predicates of matrix sentences are not psychological verbs, but ‘verbs of saying’; still in the sentences of (17a) and (18a) the pronoun \textit{ku} cannot refer to the head noun.

The ‘psychological verb’ solution seems to fall down in sentences like (19), in which the higher predicates are psychological verbs and the pronoun \textit{ku} may also refer to the head noun of the relative clause.

(19) a. \textit{ku-mwuncey-ey tayhayse acikto ku-ka olh-ess-ta-ko sayngkakha-nun the problem about still right that think}

Chelswu-nun teisang malha-ki-lul kepuwha-ess-ta

more say Nom refuse

그 문제에 대해서 아직도 그가 였었 있다고 생각하는 철수는 더 이상 말하기를 거부했다.

‘Chelswu, who still thinks he was right on the problem, refused to say more.’

b. \textit{ku-muncey-ey tahhayse acikto caki-ka olha-ss-ess-ta-ko sayngkakha-nun Chelswu-nun teisang malha-ki-lul kepuwha-ess-ta}

그 문제에 대해서 아직도 자기가 였었다고 생각하는 철수는 더 이상 말하기를 거부했다.

Note that in (19a) the pronoun \textit{ku} may also refer to the head noun \textit{Chelswu} as in (19b).

I believe that the problem is closely related to the definiteness or specificity of the
head noun of the relative clause, rather than to the status of higher predicates. In (15-18) the head nouns are *indefinite*, while in (19) they are *definite*. Why this is so will be dealt with in the subsequent study on the problem; the problem, I believe, must be studied in conjunction with the problem of *referentiality* (cf. B. Hall Partee 1973).

Lee (1974: 119-24) points out that the subject which the reflexive *caki* refers to must be aware of what the *caki* clause represents. Thus, we find a semantic anomaly in (20a), whereas we do not in (20b).

(20) a. ?*honswusangthay-e ppaci-ess-nun Chelswu-nun Yenghi-ka caki-lul cikhie-coma po-nun kawuntey swumci-ess-ta watch while die Dec

*Chelswu, who fell in a coma, died while Younghi was watching him.*

b. wiphwung-tangtangha-n Chelswu-nun Yenghi-ka caki-lul cikhie-po-nun kaw-STAELY looking Top SM OM watch while

*Chelswu, who looks stately, entered the hall in a vigorous manner while Younghi was watching him.*

To handle sentences such as (20), Lee (1974:122) proposes,

The only possible way is to posit a higher abstract cognitive verb for any felicitous occurrence of a *caki* clause. If this abstract verb occurs, we know that the subject (or sometimes Topic) of its immediately higher sentence is able to cognize the action or state of the caki-inclusive (after Reflexivization) clause.

For example, the underlying structure of the relative clause of sentence (21) may be represented as in (22).

(21) ku miin-nun caki-lul cwusiha-ten namca-ka teylye-ka-ess-ta the beauty OM watch Rel man SM took away Dec

*The beauty, the man who was watching her took away.*

(22) [[ku miin -[namca kumiin cwusiha]s COGNIZE]s namca]NP

Then he goes on to say ‘On the other hand, if we have a pronoun *kunye [-Masc, +III] in place of caki in (99) (i.e., (21)), the beauty’s being conscious of such action is not relevant.’ It is not clear what he means by ‘not relevant.’ If he means that, when the pronoun *kunye* occurs in place of *caki* in (21), the beauty becomes *unconscious* of the man’s watching her, I think he is wrong, because in (23) the beauty may be also conscious of her being watched by the man as she may in (21).

(23) ku miin-nun kunye-lul cwusiha-ten namca-ka teylye-ka-ess-ta

*The beauty, the man who was watching her took away.*

It is possible to give another semantic interpretation to (23) in which the beauty may not
be conscious of the man's watching her. However, the abstract cognitive hypothesis does not degrade my hypothesis that Reflexivization is a subsystem of Pronominalization, at least in Korean. To counter this hypothesis, I believe we have to come up with instances in which the replacement of caki with a pronoun always signifies antecedent's unconsciousness of the action or state of the caki-clause.

In conclusion, what I have been trying to say in this section is not that meanings of the caki-containing sentences are identical to those of the ku-containing sentences, but that the former are included in the latter. In other words, a noun phrase is first pronominalized into a pronoun, and then this pronoun becomes a reflexive under some specifiable environments. The Reflexivization rule is an optional rule, but may become an obligatory rule under a certain circumstances, for example, when applied to a simple sentence. Note that such an apparent simple sentence as (1d) does not contradict the obligatoriness of reflexivization within a simple sentence, since we believe that it is derived from the structure underlying (24).

(24) sensayngnim-i ku-ka cecilu-n calmos-ul molu-n-ta
    teacher SM he SM made mistake OM not know

선생님이 그가 저지른 잘못을 모른다.
'The teacher does not know the mistake he made.'

3. casin

In the preceding section, we have assumed that there is no intervening stage in deriving caki from the pronoun ku. But consider the following sentences:

    SM OM of house at met
    존이 톨을 그 자신의 집에서 만났다.
    'John met Tom at his own house.'

b. John-i Tom-ul ku-casin-i Chicago-ey w-assulttay manna-ess-ta
    SM OM SM to came when met
    존이 톨을 그 자신이 시카고에 왔을 때 만났다.
    'John met Tom, when he (John) came to Chicago.'

c. sensayngnim-un haksayng-tul-eykey ku casin-i ka-kess-ta-ko malha-ess-ta
    teacher student PI to SM go will that say
    선생님은 학생들에게 그 자신이 가겠다고 말했다.
    'The teacher said to the students that he would go.'

d. ku sinsa-nun ku-casin-kwa chwumchwu-n yeca -lul poa-ess-ta
    the gentleman with dance woman OM saw
    그 신사는 그 자신과 춤을 여자름 보았다.
    'The gentleman saw the woman who danced with him.'

e. Chelsuw-nun ku-casin-ul ttayli-n namca-lul manna-ess-ta
    Top OM beat man OM met
    철수는 그 자신을 매린 남자를 만났다.
    'Chelsuw met the man who beat him.'
The sentences in (25) show that ku-casin can always take the place of caki. Furthermore, compare the sentences in (11) and (20a) with those in (26).

    SM to SM mistake that said
    존이 톰에게 그 자신이 잘못이라고 말했다.
    ‘John said to Tom that he (Tom) was wrong.’

    b. John-i Tom-eykey ku-casin-i ku-kes-ul hal-kes-ul myenglyengha-ess-ta
    SM to SM it do ordered
    존이 톰에게 그 자신이 그것을 할 것을 명령했다.
    ‘John ordered Tom that he (Tom) should do it.’

    c. honswusangthay-e pacci-ess-nun Chelswu-nun Yenghi-ka ku-casin-lul cikh-
       cikhye-pocoma fall in Rel Top SM OM wat-
       ye-po nun kawunte swumci-ess-ta
       흔수상태에 떨어진 철수는 영화가 그 자신을 지켜보는 가운데 숨졌다.
       ‘Chelswu, who fell in a coma, died while Yenghi was watching him (Chel-
       swu).’

As shown in (26), ku-casin may also occur where the pronoun ku, but not caki, can occur. This means that the distribution of ku-casin covers both ku and caki.

4. Conclusion

On the basis of observations we have made, I propose that a noun phrase be first pronominalized into ku under appropriate conditions, and that to this pronoun the morpheme casin be added, converting it to ku-casin. I further claim that in Korean the insertion of casin after the pronoun ku should be regarded as Reflexivization; caki is regarded as an alternative form of ku-casin.

There is a certain advantage of regarding ku-casin as a third person reflexive pronoun. First, we can predict the forms of the first and second person reflexive pronouns.

(27) a. na-nun na-casin-ul nemwuna haktayhay-w-ass-ta
    1 Top myself OM too much ill-treat
    나는 나 자신을 너무나 화하게 했다.
    ‘I have ill-treated myself too much.’

    b. ne-nun ne-casin-ul al-ayaha-n-ta
    you yourself OM know must
    너는 너 자신을 알아야 한다.
    ‘You must know yourself.’

Second, you can give a natural explanation of various usages of casin. Consider the following sentences:

(28) a. Chelswu-nun casin-ul chwuchenha-ess-ta
    Top self OM recommend
    철수는 자신을 추천했다.
    ‘Chelswu recommended himself.’
b. na-nun casin-ul nemwuna haktayhay-w-ass-ta  
나는 자신을 너무나 학대해 왔다.  
'I have ill-treated myself too much.'

| c. ne-nun casin-ul al-ayaha-n-ta  
너는 자신을 알아야 한다.  
'You must know yourself.' |

In (28), casin is used as first, second, or third reflexive pronouns. As I have indicated in (3), casin is derived from pronoun + casin by Pronoun Deletion Transformation.
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