Anaphor or Pronominal?*

Dong-In Cho

This paper examines the Korean caki and the Japanese zibun to determine whether they are anaphors or pronominals, applying the following three tests: (i) split antecedence; (ii) strict identity reading under VP ellipsis; (iii) disjoint reference effect. Interpretation of the plural markers, Korean tul and Japanese tati indicates that the split antecedence of caki-tul and zibun-tati cannot be attributed to pronominal properties of caki and zibun, but to the property of the plural morphologies tul and tati, respectively. Furthermore, the impossibility of a strict identity reading under VP ellipsis supports the analysis that they are not referential pronouns. It is also shown that their non-adherence to anti-locality condition excludes the possibility that they are bound pronouns or referential pronouns, supporting the claim that they are anaphors.

0. Introduction

There exists a controversy whether the Korean caki and the Japanese zibun are pronouns or anaphors. The claims that they are pronouns are mainly based on the following properties: (i) split antecedence (Fukui 1984 for zibun, Park 1988 for caki); (ii) strict identity reading under VP ellipsis (Ueda 1984 for zibun); (iii) disjoint reference effect in some sentences (Ueda 1984 for zibun).

* I am indebted to Joseph Aoun, Hajime Hoji, and Audrey Li for their valuable comments and suggestions on an earlier version of this paper. I thank Kaoru Horie, Masako Shimabukuro, and Ke Zou for their judgments on the Japanese and Chinese data. I am also grateful to two anonymous reviewers. The responsibility for any errors is, of course, my own.

1 The following abbreviations are used in this paper:

ACC : Accusative Case Marker COMP : Complementizer
DAT : Dative Case Marker DEC : Declarative Sentence Ending
GEN : Genitive Case Marker LOC : Locative
NOM : Nominative Case Marker PL : Plural
PROG : Progressive
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This paper attempts to examine some aspects of both caki and zibun and claims that even though they seem to share some properties with pronouns, their seemingly 'pronoun-like' properties do not derive from their being a pronoun, but from independent factors. We will be concerned mainly with the three properties mentioned above.

1. C-command Requirement

While kutul 'they' does not require c-command by a coreferential NP, the anaphor caki-tul 'selves' does, as illustrated in (1) and (2) below:

(1) a. [haksayng-tul-uyi, pwumonimtul]-i, caki-tul-ului kwachanhassta
   students-GEN parents-NOM selves-ACC overpraised
   'The students,' parents, overpraised themselves.'
   b. [haksayng-tul-uyi, pwumonimtul]-i, kutul-ului kwachanhassta
   students-GEN parents-NOM they-ACC overpraised
   'The students,' parents, overpraised them.'

In (1a), caki-tul can be co-referential with the c-commanding antecedent pwumonimtul 'parents'. However, haksayng-tul 'students', which does not c-command caki-tul, cannot be co-referential with it. If caki-tul in (1a) is replaced by kutul 'they', it can be co-referential with the non-c-commanding NP, haksayng-tul 'students', but not with the c-commanding NP, pwumonimtul 'parents', in the minimal S, observing Binding Principle B. As seen in (1a) and (1b), caki-tul 'selves' differs from kutul 'they' in that caki-tul must be c-commanded by its antecedent. However, the problem is not that simple, since caki-tul may have a non-c-commanding NP as an antecedent, as in (2):

(2) John-i, [s [s caki-tul-i+ki, ikiesssta]-ko] malhayssta
    John-NOM selves-NOM won-COMP said
    'John said selves have won'

In (2), caki-tul, which is a pluralized form of caki, does not agree with its overt antecedent in number. That is, it must refer not only to John, but also to other(s), which is not syntactically realized. Note that this other(s), which is not syntactically realized, does not c-command caki-tul.

Caki, which does not obey a strict locality requirement, also differs from
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English non-locally bound anaphors in Lebeaux's term (Lebeaux 1985, 346), which may not require c-command relationship with its antecedent, as in (3) (this example is due to Lebeaux 1985): ²

(3) John's, campaign required that pictures of himself, be placed all over town.

In (3), *himself* is not c-commanded by *John*, which is co-referential with it. The difference between (2) and (3) in terms of c-command requirement is that while in (2) *caki-tul 'selves' is c-commanded by a part of its antecedent, namely, *John*, in (3) *himself* is not c-commanded by its antecedent at all. This issue will be taken up in the next section.

2. Split Antecedence

It is generally accepted that having split antecedents is one of the properties of pronouns and that it provides a test distinguishing pronouns from anaphors (see Giorgi 1984, Lebeaux 1984, 1985). While pronouns can have split antecedents, anaphors cannot.³ The following sentences are from Lebeaux (1984, 1985):

(4) a. *John told Mary about themselves.
   b. John told Mary that there were some pictures of themselves/them inside.

In (4a), the so-called local reflexive *themselves* cannot be co-referential both with *John* and *Mary*, while in (4b) the non-local reflexive *themselves* and the pronominal *them* can be construed to be both *John* and *Mary*, showing the split antecedence phenomenon. Lebeaux (1984, 1985) claims that the ability of the non-local reflexive *themselves* in (4b) to have a split antecedent can be ascribed to its property of being [+pronominal] and that of the local reflexive *themselves* in (4a) to its being [+anaphoric]. This line of argument may provide support for the claim that an NP can be a pronomi-

² Audrey Li pointed out to me (p.c) that the fact that *himself* is coreferential with the non-c-commanding NP *John* can be attributed to the 'inanimacy' of the c-commanding NP *campaign*. If *campaign* is replaced by *father*, the *father* is the only potential antecedent for *himself*.

³ Lebeaux (1984, 1985:345) claims that in English, while locally-bound anaphors require a unique antecedent, non-locally bound anaphors allow a split antecedent.
nal if it has split antecedents. Fukui (1984) indeed employed this test to support his claim that the Japanese *zibun* has a ‘pronoun-like’ property. The following sentence is due to Fukui (1984):

(5) John-ga Mary-ni [s Bill-ga zibun-tati+o waruku itteiru]-to sira
to badly is saying
taseta(koto)
reported
‘John, reported to Mary, that Bill was speaking ill of SELF+i+;’

The complex sentence in (5) shows the split antecedence phenomena, where the plural form of *zibun*, namely *zibun-tati* ‘selves’ has its antecedents both inside and outside of the minimal S containing it.

The same phenomenon appears with Korean *caki*. *Caki* in both simplex and complex sentences may also have split antecedents, as shown in the following examples:

(6) a. John-i; Mary-eykey; caki-tul+ i/i+k-eykwanhay iyakihayssta.
John-NOM Mary-to self-PL about told
‘John told Mary about themselves’

b. John-i; Mary-eykeyi [s PRO caki-tul-uYi+i/i+k kyelhon saynghwal-eykwanhay iyakiha-keyss-ta]-ko malhayssta.
John-NOM Mary-DAT PRO self-PL-GEN marriage life -about talk-will-DEC-COMP said
‘Johni told MarYi that [e]i will talk about selves’i+i/i+k married life’

Both in the simplex sentence (6a) and in the complex sentence (6b), *caki-tul* can have split antecedents as the index i+ j indicates. If Giorgi (1984) and Lebeaux (1984, 1985) are correct in that having split antecedents is a property of a pronoun, and that anaphors cannot have split antecedents, *caki-tul* must be classified as a pronoun inside and outside of the minimal S containing it; or at least it may be classified as having the property [+pronominal]. However, the split antecedents of *caki-tul* do not seem to be attributable to the pronominal property of *caki* but to the properties of the plural morpheme *tul*. Before we precede with this issue, we need to address some properties of the plural morphemes, both the Korean *tul* and the Japanese *tati*. Consider the following Korean and Japanese sentences which contain *caki-tul* and *zibun-tati*, respectively (the Japanese sentences are due to
Masako Shimabukuro (p.c)) : 

(7) a. John-i caki-ka ikyessta-ko malhayssta
   John-NOM self-NOM won-COMP said
   ‘John, said that he, won’

b. John-i caki-tul-i ikyessta-ko malhayssta
   John-NOM self-PL-NOM won-COMP said
   ‘John, said that they,+k won’

(8) a. John-ga zibun-ga katta-to itta
   John-NOM self-NOM won-COMP said
   ‘John, said that he, won’

b. John-ga zibun-tati-ga katta-to itta
   John-NOM self-PL-NOM won-COMP said
   ‘John, said that they,+k won’

As seen in (7) and (8), the number agreement between caki and zibun and their overt antecedents is not obligatory. When there is number agreement between the reflexives and their antecedents as in (7a) and (8a), caki and zibun are anaphoric only with a c-commanding NP. When there is no number agreement between them, especially when the antecedent is singular and the reflexive form is plural, the plural form of the singular reflexive can be interpreted as an embedded anaphor. In other words, in (7b) and (8b) caki-tul and zibun-tati may refer to ‘John and other(s)’, caki and tati referring back to John and tul and tati to ‘other(s)’. This will be clearer in the following sentences:

(9) a. nwukwuna-ka, caki-ka, ikilkela-ko mitnunta
   everybody-NOM self-NOM will win-COMP believe
   ‘Everybody believes that self will win’

b. nwukwuna-ka, caki-tul-i, iikilkela-ko mitnunta
   everybody-NOM self-PL-NOM will win-COMP believe
   ‘Everybody believes that selves will win’

The sentence in (9a), in which the singular reflexive form caki is used, is interpreted as ‘for every person x, x believes x will win’. On the other hand, the sentence in (9b), in which the plural reflexive form caki-tul is used, has the reading ‘for every x, x a person, x believes that x and other(s) will
win'. Here, *tul* is interpreted as 'and other(s)'.

So far we have seen one function of *tul*. We now look at another function of *tul*. This function of *tul* involves an interpretation of general plurality. Compare the usage of *tul* and *tat* in (7) and (8) with those in the following sentences (the Japanese sentence is due to Masako Shimabukuro (p.c)):

(10) a. ku haksayng-*tul*-i kyosil-lo tulekassta
    the student-PL-NOM classroom-to entered
    'The students entered the classroom'

b. sorera-no gaksayng-*tat*-ga kyooshitsu-ni hitta
    those-GEN student-PL-NOM classroom-to entered
    'The students entered the classroom'

In (10), the plural form of *haksayng*, namely *haksayng-*tul*, does not mean 'the student and other(s)', but 'the students'. If our analysis is correct, there might be at least two functions for *tul* and *tat*: one for 'x and other(s)', another for general plurality. Then, we can say that *caki* and *tul* in (10) share a division of labor. One may argue that our analysis of *tul* in *caki-*tul* as 'and other(s)' will encounter difficulty in accounting for the function of *tul* in (11b):

(11) a. John kwa Bill-i *caki-uy* pang-ulo tolakassta
    John and Bill-NOM self-Gen room-to returned
    'John and Bill returned to self's room'

b. John kwa Bill-i *caki-*tul-*uy* pang-ulo tolakassta
    John and Bill-NOM selves-Gen room-to returned
    'John and Bill returned to selves' room'

While (11a) has the reading that (i) John returned to John's room and Bill returned to Bill's room, (11b), in addition to the reading (i), has the reading that (ii) John and Bill returned to John and Bill's room. Therefore,

\[ \text{In order to have a clearer reading of 'and other(s)', *ney* can be used in the place of *tul* as pointed out by Paul Yul Kang (p.c). Hajime Hoji also pointed out to me (p.c) that the function of 'and other(s)' clearly shows up in *John-*tat*, which is interpreted as 'John and other(s)'.} \]

\[ \text{Even though *general plurality* may not be a proper term, I will use it to distinguish one meaning of *tul* and *tat* (i.e., the usual sense of plurality) from another meaning (i.e., 'and other(s)', as discussed above).} \]
tul in (11b) does not seem to be construed as 'and other(s)', contradicting our analysis about tul in caki-tul. We suggest that reading (ii) comes from the reading (iii) John returned to John and other's room and Bill returned to Bill and other's room. Namely, when the index of other(s) happens to include John or Bill, yielding John and Bill, we have the reading (ii). Hence, interpretation (iii) entails (ii).

This analysis shows that even though caki-tul and zibun-tati superficially show split antecedents, this property does not come from their pronominal property, but from the property of the plural forms tul and tati. Therefore, their having split antecedents does not constitute evidence that they are pronouns.

Our analysis can be indirectly supported by a morphologically singular reflexive in a language like Chinese as pointed out to me by Audrey Li (p. c). In Chinese, ziji, a morphologically singular reflexive, can refer back to a plural antecedent. However, it cannot refer back to split antecedents as shown in the following sentences (judgments are due to Ke Zou (p.c)):

(12) a. John he Mary shuo ziji hui-yang
John and Mary said self will win
'John and Mary said that self will win'
b. John, shuo ziji\textsubscript{other} ying-le
John said himself won
'John said that self won'
c. John\textsubscript{other} gaushu Bill, ziji\textsubscript{other} ying-le
John said Bill himself won
'John told Bill that self will win'

In (12a), ziji 'self' does not agree in number with its antecedent John he Mary. Then, a question arises: why cannot ziji in (12c) refer to John and Bill as in Korean sentences like (6a), repeated here as (13)?

(13) John-i, Mary-eykey, caki-tul\textsubscript{other}, eykwanhay iyakihayssta.
John-NOM Mary-to self-PL about told
'John told Mary about themselves'

In (13), the construal of caki-tul with John and Mary is possible. This is predicted in our account: the lack of plural morphology for ziji in Chinese, meaning 'and other', prevents its coreferentiality with the non-subject NP
Bill in (12c). Our claim is supported in (12b), in which zijicannot be interpreted as John and other(s), while such an interpretation can be obtained in the Korean and Japanese counterparts. Note that Korean and Japanese singular reflexive forms can have plural morphology attached meaning ‘and other(s)’.

So far we have seen that the plural morpheme tul and tati, not caki and zibun, are responsible for split antecedence. The next section will examine the nature of caki in terms of strict and sloppy identity readings.

3. Strict and Sloppy Identity Readings

VP ellipsis provides another test for the investigation of the properties of a pronoun. This section will examine whether caki and zibun can be tested under VP ellipsis and whether they provide two readings, that is, strict and sloppy identity.

VP-deletion has provided a test for distinguishing anaphors from pronouns in the literature (see Ross 1967, Lebeaux 1984, 1985, Bourchard 1985). While pronouns and non-locally bound anaphors (see Lebeaux, 1984, 1985 for English) allow two readings under VP ellipsis, namely, strict and sloppy identity, locally bound anaphors allow only the sloppy identity reading. The following sentences are from Lebeaux (1984, 1985: 346) and Safir (1989:18, 19)

(14) a. John hates his mother and Bill does too (Safir)
   (= Bill hates Bill’s mother, or
   = Bill hates John’s mother)

b. John hit himself and Bill did too (Lebeaux)
   (= Bill hit Bill
   ≠ Bill hit John)

While (14a), which contains the pronoun he, can have both strict and sloppy identity readings, (14b), which contains an anaphor himself, has only the sloppy identity reading.

Sag (1976:101) notes that some English speakers find anaphors under VP ellipsis in some sentences to be ambiguous between strict and sloppy identity readings. Since the strict identity reading of an English anaphor is not accepted in most literature, I will assume that the strict identity interpretation of an anaphor under VP ellipsis is impossible.
Ueda (1984: 22) claimed that *zibun* may have two readings: both sloppy and strict identity under VP ellipsis. If he is correct, *zibun* has the property of both a referential pronoun and a bound anaphor like the English pronoun *he*. Aoun and Hornstein (1986) claims that referential pronouns and bound pronouns are two distinctive categories and *he* is a form which happens to be the realization of both the referential pronoun and the bound pronoun (for more details, see Aoun and Hornstein (1986)). The same can be said of *zibun*, if it has two readings, sloppy and strict identity under VP ellipsis. Namely, *caki* and *zibun* are both referential pronouns and bound pronouns.  

Consider the following sentence from Ueda (1984: 22):

(15) John-ga [*z zibun-ga kat-te-i-ru] inu-o nagu-ru to Bill-mo soo si-ta
    NOM self -NOM keep-Prog-Pres dog-ACC hit-Pres also so did

‘When John hit the dog self kept, Bill did so, too’

Ueda (1984) claims that the second conjunct of the sentence (15), in which *soo si-ta* substitute for the VP in the first conjunct, may have the two readings, namely (i) Bill hit Bill’s dog (sloppy identity reading) and (ii) Bill hit John’s dog (strict identity reading).

However, as pointed out to me by Hajime Hoji (p.c), it is not clear whether the so-called Japanese *soo-su* is a real counterpart of English *do so* construction. He points out that *soo si-ta* in the second conjunct of (15) is not a substitute of the VP in the first conjunct, but it simply implies ‘did in that way’. This becomes clear in the sentence with a non-action predicate. Consider the following Japanese sentence with the deleted VP. The judgment is due to Kaoru Horie (p.c.):

(16) *John-ga kwurwuma-o motte-imasi-ta. Bill-mo soo si-ta
      John-NOM car-ACC owned Bill-also so did

‘John owned a car. So does Bill.’

As seen in (16), *soo si-ta* cannot be used for the deleted non-action predicate. This suggests not only that *si-ta* is not the same auxiliary verb as English *did*, but also that *soo si-ta* is not a counterpart of English *so did*. If this

---

7 We are not concerned with locality or anti-locality condition of *caki* and *zibun* here. This will be discussed in the next section.
is so, Ueda’s test of VP-deletion to examine the property of *zibun cannot be justified.

Korean seems to be more complicated than Japanese for the counterpart of English *do so construction. Korean may seemingly have two different forms for the so-called English *do so constructions: one similar to Japanese *soo si-ta for action predicates, and another for non-action predicates. If non-action predicates in the first conjunct can be substituted by some form in the subsequent conjunct which excludes the interpretation of ‘do in that way’, the test of VP deletion may be achieved in Korean. Consider the following sentences:

(17) a. John-i cha-lul soyuhayss-ko,
John-NOM car-ACC owned-and
Bill-to kule-hayessta/*kulekey-hayessta
Bill-also so did
‘John owned a car and Bill did, too’
b. John-i kay-lul coahayss-ko,
John-NOM dog-ACC liked-and
Bill-to kule-hayessta/*kulekey-hayessta
Bill-also so did
‘John liked a dog Bill did, too’

(18) a. John-i cha-lul chass-ko,
John-NOM car-ACC kicked-and
Bill-to *kule-hayessta/kulekey-hayessta
Bill-also so did
‘John kicked the car and Bill did, too’
b. John-i ppang-ul mekess-ko,
John-NOM bread-ACC ate-and
Bill-to *kule-hayessta/kulekey-hayessta
Bill-also so did
‘John ate the bread and Bill did, too’

As seen in (17) and (18), while *kulekey-hayessta in the second conjunct can substitute for the action predicates in the first conjunct, *kule-hayessta can be used only for the deleted non-action predicates. Even though the *kule-hayessta construction is not a perfect counterpart of the English *do so construction in that the *kule-hayessta construction can only substitute for
the non-action predicates, we can at least test the strict and sloppy identity readings under VP ellipsis. Let us now consider the following Korean sentences with *caki*: 8

   John-NOM self-ACC overtrusted-and Mary-also did so
   'John overtrusted himself, and Mary did, too'
   (= Mary overtrusted herself)
   (= Mary overtrusted John)

   b. John-i; [NP caki-uyi; ttal-ul] salanghyeys-ko,
   John-NOM self-GEN daughter-ACC loved-and
   Bill-to kule-hayessta.
   Bill-also so-did
   'John loved self's daughter and Bill did, too'
   (= Bill loved Bill's daughter, too)
   (= Bill loved John's daughter, too)

   c. John-i; [s caki-ka; ceyilila]-ko sayngkahayys-ko,
   John-NOM self-NOM best-COMP thought-and
   Bill-to kule-hayessta.
   Bill-also so-did
   'John; thought that self; was best and Bill did, too'
   (= Bill thought that Bill was the best, too)
   (= Bill thought that John was the best, too)

(20) John-i; caki-tul-i+; ikyessta-ko mitess-ko,
    John-NOM self-PL-NOM won-COMP believed-COMP
    Bill-to kule-hayessta
    Bill-also so-did
    'John, believed that they;+; won, and so did Bill'

8 In case of sloppy identity readings, pragmatics seems to play a role in some sentences. If *Mary* in (19a) is replaced by *John-uy emma 'John's mother', very few Korean native speakers marginally have a strict identity interpretation of *caki* as shown in the following sentence:
   John overtrusted himself, and John's mother did so, too.
   (=John's mother overtrusted herself)
   (=??/John's mother overtrusted John)
In (19a), *caki*, which has its antecedent *John* in the same clause, can be interpreted as *Bill* in the second conjunct (sloppy identity reading). In (19b) and (19c), *caki*, which has its antecedent outside of the minimal NP or S containing *caki*, also yields sloppy identity reading only. *Caki-tul* in (20) does not have strict identity reading, either. The second conjunct of (20) has only one reading 'Bill believed that Bill and other(s) will win'. These constitute evidence against the claim that *caki* is referential.

However, the following sentence gives both the sloppy and strict identity readings to some native speakers of Korean, just as does the Japanese counterpart in (15) does:

    John-NOM self-GEN dog-ACC kicked-and Bill-also so-did
    'Lit. John kicked self's dog, and Bill did so, too'
    (= Bill kicked Bill's dog, too)
    (= Bill kicked John's dog, too)

Since this is the counterpart of the Japanese *soo-sita*, the same explanation for the sentence in (15) can be applied to this sentence.

Thus far we have seen that *caki* gives only a sloppy identity reading under VP ellipsis, and that the strict reading of the deleted *caki* in *kulekey-hayssta* and the *zibun* in the *soo sita* in Japanese, respectively, can be attributed to incorrect selection of a counterpart form of the English *do so* construction, and not to a pronominal property of *caki* and *zibun*.

4. Antilocality Condition

One of the major differences between anaphors and pronouns is that while pronouns show a disjoint reference effect, anaphors do not. In Korean, while the pronoun *ku* obeys a disjoint reference condition, *caki* does not (see Hong 1985). This is borne out by the following example:

(22) John-i, [s Bill-i, caki_n/ku/m-lul kwachanhayssta]-ko
    John-NOM Bill-NOM self/he-ACC overpraised-COMP said
    'John said that Bill overpraised himself’. 
In (22), while caki can be bound by Bill in the minimal S containing it, ku 'he' shows the disjoint reference with Bill, which is in the minimal S containing ku.

Ueda (1984) suggests that the Japanese zibun also obeys the disjoint reference requirement, regarding its binding in the minimal S or NP as marked case. However, it seems to be the other way around. Namely, obeying the disjoint reference is the marked case. Disjoint reference of zibun does not seem to come from its pronominal property, but from some other factors. Observe the following sentences from Oshima (cited from Ueda 1984:38, his (55)):\(^9\)

(23) a. *Hiroshi-wa zibun-o korosi-ta
    \[ \text{killed-PAST} \]
    'Hiroshi killed (lit.) self'

b. *John-wa zibun-o ket-ta
    \[ \text{kick-PAST} \]
    'John kicked (lit.) self.'

Notice that the so-called Japanese short-distance reflexive zibun\(_zisin\) cannot be used in the slot of zibun in both examples. This means that the ungrammaticality of these sentences cannot be attributed to the disjoint reference effect of zibun, but to some other factor. These examples indirectly contradict Ueda's suggestion that the short-distance binding of zibun is a marked property of anaphor. Since Korean counterparts of the Japanese sentences in (23) show the same acceptability, the same argument can be applied to caki.

The bound variable interpretation of caki which is bound by a quantifier also provides the counter-analysis to Fukui's argument. While the bound variable interpretation of ku 'he' is totally impossible in the minimal S, caki can have a bound variable reading in the same domain. In (24), caki is bound by the quantifier nwukwuna 'everyone' in the minimal S:\(^10\)

\(^9\) When sentence (23) is interpreted as an idiomatic expression, namely, 'Hiroshi suppressed himself', it is acceptable, as H. Hoji pointed out to me (p.c). This is also the case for Korean as pointed out in H. Im (1987).

\(^10\) Sportiche (1985) provides a similar argument concerning the bound variable reading of the Japanese zibun in the minimal S containing zibun and a quantifier binding it.
These examples provide a counter-analysis to any argument for the disjoint reference of caki. According to Aoun and Hornstein (1986), a bound pronoun which is bound by a quantifier has to be free in some local environment across languages, i.e., free from the first A-bar binder. If this is so, a bound pronoun observes the disjoint reference requirement, predicting caki, which does not obey such requirement, not to be a bound pronoun. The same argument can be applied to the Japanese zibun. If zibun were a bound pronoun, it would have to obey the disjoint reference requirement. However, since zibun and caki do not show disjoint reference effect in unmarked case, we can say that they are indeed anaphors.

Sportiche (1985) argued that zibun is both a bound pronoun and an anaphor, covering two lexical categories. He claimed that if zibun were only a pronoun, Japanese would not have a lexically realized equivalent of the English reflexive. However, this is not the case, since the Japanese short-distance reflexive zibunzisin fills the missing category (see Kurata (1986) and Katada (1988) on the short-distance reflexive zibunzisin). Korean is also claimed to have a short-distance reflexive which obeys a stricter locality condition than caki (see H.S. Lee (1987) and D.I. Cho (1989)). Then, the claim that zibun and caki are needed to fill the missing category loses its conceptual motivation. Rather, arguments in the current and preceding sections indirectly and directly support the claim caki and zibun are anaphors.

5. Summary

Interpretation of tul and tati shows that the split antecedence of caki–tul and zibun–tati cannot be attributed to pronominal properties of caki and zibun, but to the property of the plural morphemes tul and tati, respectively.

11 They agree that cacicasin is a short-distance reflexive, but do not agree about its binding domain. They also do not agree about the binding domain of casin.
Furthermore, the impossibility of a strict identity reading under VP ellipsis supports the analysis that they are not referential pronouns. It is also shown that their non-adherence to anti-locality condition excludes the possibility that they are bound pronouns or referential pronouns, supporting the claim that they are anaphors.
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