

Korean Reflexive Pronoun *Caki* and Its Referent NP's Point of View

Sun Chang

Reflexivization in Korean by means of *caki* has been studied by a number of Korean linguists, the most representative ones among them being Chung-Min Lee (1973) and Wha-Chun Kim (1975). Regardless of whether any of their works could provide a satisfactory explanation about the phenomenon of Korean Reflexivization or not, one thing that has become increasingly clear is that, unlike English Reflexivization, Korean Reflexivization has no strict clause-bound constraint and its behavior and function when it occurs are extremely complicated. Due to the lack of the clause-bound constraint in Korean Reflexivization, it has been sometimes claimed that Reflexivization in Korean is almost equivalent to the combination of English Pronominalization and Reflexivization (cf. Chung-Min Lee 1973: 106).

The purpose of the present paper is to reexamine some sentences containing *caki* and to show that each occurrence of *caki* in those sentences can be best explained only if a certain kind of extra-linguistic factor, i.e., the point of view assumed by the speaker of a sentence, is taken into consideration. It will be also shown that the function of *caki* examined in the light of this new analysis is clearly distinguishable from that of a regular pronoun *ki* and that, consequently, any kind of attempt to treat Reflexivization and Pronominalization as optional variants in Korean is misleading.

In this paper, I will use Chung-Min Lee's dissertation *Abstract Syntax and Korean with Reference to English* (1973) as the main reference, partly because I have the dissertation in my possession here in Hawaii and mainly because I believe that his work on Korean Reflexivization is the most extensive and the most insightful one I have ever come across. I will assume throughout my paper that Lee's contention that in Korean an NP which triggers Reflexivization must be in both command and precedence relationship (in the underlying structure) with respect to the NP to be reflexivized is basically correct.

In Section 5.2 of Chapter II (Reflexivization) in his dissertation, Lee cites the following examples (the numbering of the examples is his):

- (81) b. *Sue_i -nin [caki_i -ka caki_i -lil tolpo -nin kəs] -ka swip -əss -ta*
Top SM OM take care Rel Comp Sm easy Past Dec

'As for Sue, it was easy for her to take care of herself.'

- (81) a. [caki_i -ka caki_i -lil tolpo -nin kəs] -ka Sue_i -eke swip -əss -ta
 SM ON take care Rel Comp SM to easy Past Dec
 'It was easy for Sue to take care of herself.'

In (81b), since the coreferential NP that triggers Reflexivization precedes and commands the two reflexivized NP's in the embedded sentence, the application of Reflexivization is perfectly acceptable. In (81a), however, the trigger NP neither precedes nor commands the two reflexivized NP's, but the sentence is still good. In order to explain the acceptability of (81a), Lee posits a single underlying structure for both (81a) and (81b), in which the Experiencer-Theme (i.e., Sue) is in the initial subject position. (81a) can be obtained by means of Flip, which moves the experiencer after the complement clause and assigns Dative marker *-eke*. Notice here that the main predicate of (81a) and (81b) is *swip-* ‘easy’, which Lee calls a ‘psychological predicate’, and Lee’s Flip rule applies only if the main predicate of a complex sentence is a psychological predicate. This point is further evidenced by unacceptability of the following sentences from Lee:

- (78) i. *[[caki_i -lil po] -n namca] -ka Sue_i -eke tol -lil tənci -əss -ta
 OM see Rel man SM to stone OM throw Past Dec
 'The man who saw *her_i* threw a stone to *Sue_i*.'

ii. *Sue_i -eke [[caki_i -lil po] -n namca] -ka tol -lil tənci -əss -ta
 to OM see Rel man SM stone OM throw Past Dec
 'To *Sue_i*, the man who saw *her_i* threw a stone.'

iii. *Sue_i -nin [[caki_i -lil po] -n namca] -ka tol -lil tənci -əss -ta
 Top OM see Rel man SM stone OM throw Past Dec
 'As for *Sue_i*, the man who saw *her_i* threw a stone.'

As examples of psychological predicates which can be subject to Flip, Lee lists the following sets of adjectives:

Adjectives of Emotion:

kkəlɪmcikha-	'uneasy'
komap-	'thankful'
ənccanh-	'unpleasant'
mianha-	'sorry'
aswip-	'desirous'
cilkəp-	'pleasant'

Adjectives of Factual Claim:

punmjəngha-	'certain'
hwaksilha-	'sure'
thillim-əps-	'doubtless'
ppənha-	'obvious'

Adjectives of Conception and Possessive Existence:

na-	'come out'
ttəoli-	'come to mind'

Adjectives of Potentiality:

swip-	'easy'
əliəp-	'difficult'

For the sake of clarifying Lee's argument for his Flip analysis, let us take more examples from Lee:

- (79) a. [Sue -ka *caki_i* -lil palapo -nin kəs] -ka *Joe_i* -eke cilkəp -əss -ta
 SM OM look at Rel Comp SM to pleasant Past Dec
 'Sue's looking at *him_i* was pleasing to *Joe_i*.'
- (79) b. *[Sue -ka *Joe_i* -lil palapo -nin kəs] -ka *caki_i* -eke cilkəp -əss- ta
 SM OM look at Rel Comp SM to pleasant Past Dec
 'Sue's looking at *Joe_i* was pleasing to *him_i*.'
- (79) c. *Joe_i* -nin [Sue -ka *caki_i* -lil palapo -nin kəs] -ka cilkəp -əss -ta
 Top SM OM look at Rel Comp SM pleasant Past Dec
 'As for *Joe_i*, *he_i* was pleasant about Sue's looking at *him_i*.'
- (79) d. *Joe_i* -ka [Sue -ka *caki_i* -lil palapo -nin kəs] -ka cilkəp -əss -ta
 SM SM OM look at Rel Comp SM pleasant Past Dec
 '*Joe_i* was pleasant about Sue's looking at *him_i*.'
- (80) a i. [Sue -ka *caki_i* -lil salangha -nin kəs] -ka *Joe_i* -eke punmjəngha
 SM OM love Rel Comp SM to certain
 -əss -ta
 Past Dec
 'That Sue loves *him_i* was certain for *Joe_i*.'
- (80)a ii. [*caki_i* -ka Sue -lil salangha -nin kəs] -ka *Joe_i*-eke punmjəngha -əss
 SM OM love Rel Comp SM to certain Past
 -ta
 Dec
 'That *he_i* loves Sue was certain for *Joe_i*.'
- (80) b i. *Joe_i* -nin [Sue-ka *caki_i* -lil salangha -nin kəs] -ka punmjəngha-əss
 Top SM OM love Rel Comp SM certain
 -ta
 Past Dec
 'As for *Joe_i*, *he_i* was certain that Sue loves *him_i*.'
- (80) b ii. *Joe_i* -nin [*caki_i* -ka Sue -lil salangha -nin kəs] -ka punmjəngha-əss
 Top SM OM love Rel Comp SM certain
 -ta
 Past Dec
 'As for *Joe_i*, *he_i* was certain that *he_i* loves Sue.'

It is clear that the above set of data used by Lee supports his Flip analysis hypothesis. However, there are two problems with his data: first, his judgment as to the

acceptability of some of his example sentences is a little bit questionable; second, he left out some important examples to complete his data set. In fact, these two problems are not separable from each other, for, by including some more examples in his data, the incorrectness of his acceptability judgment becomes more obvious. Take the following examples, which do not appear in Lee's data:

- (1) *Sue_i* -eke (-nin) [caki_i -ka caki_i -lil tolpo -nin kəs] -ka swip -əss
 to Top SM OM take care Rel Comp SM easy Past
 -ta
 Dec (cf. Lee's (81a) and (81b))
 ‘To *Sue_i*, *her_i* taking care of *herself_i* was easy.’
- (2) *Joe_i* -eke (nin) [Sue -ka caki_i -lil palapo -nin kəs] -ka cilkəp -əss
 to Top SM OM look at Rel Comp SM pleasant Past
 -ta
 Dec (cf. Lee's (79a,b,c and d))
 ‘To *Joe_i*, Sue's looking at *him_i* was pleasing.’
- (3) *Joe_i* -eke (-nin) [Sue -ka caki_i -lil salangha -nin kəs] -ka punmjəngha
 to Top SM OM love Rel Comp SM certain
 -əss -ta
 Past Dec (cf. Lee's (80a i and a ii))
 ‘As for *Joe_i*, it was clear to *him_i* that Sue loves *him_i*.’
- (4) *Joe_i* -eke (-nin) [caki_i -ka Sue -lil salangha -nin kəs] -ka punmjəngha
 to Top SM OM love Rel Comp SM certain
 -əss -ta
 Past Dec (cf. Lee's (80 a ii and b ii))
 ‘As for *Joe_i*, it was clear to *him_i* that *he_i* loves Sue.’

I do not understand why Lee failed to include the above examples in his discussion, for all these sentences are perfectly acceptable, and, in fact, sentences (3) and (4) are judged to be more acceptable than Lee's rather awkward (80 b i) and (80 b ii) respectively. Two Korean informants¹ that I consulted agreed that Lee's (80 b i) and (80 b ii) are intelligible but somehow sound less natural than (3) and (4). On the other hand, sentences (1) and (2) were judged as having equal acceptability as Lee's (81b) and (79c) respectively.

Now, what are the consequences of adding sentence (1), (2), (3) and (4) to Lee's data? First, though this is a minor point, it becomes obvious that his Flip analysis is not necessary. His Flip analysis hypothesis is based on his assumption that the Dative (or Experiencer) marker is not assigned until after the matrix subject or topic is moved after a complement clause. However, sentences (1), (2), (3) and (4) clearly show that this is not the case. If we want to keep his rule of Flip, then the subject/topic NP's in sentences (1), (2), (3) and (4) must be preposed again back to their original places

¹ I thank Professor Ho-Min Sohn from University of Hawaii and Professor Dae-Kyu Noh, a visiting scholar from Korea to this LSA Summer Institute, for having served as my informants.

after they have gone through *Flip*. Having this kind of double movement rules, which move an NP from one position to another and then move it back to its original place without any obvious reason, seems to be redundant, if not downright wrong.

According to my opinion, Lee's Flip analysis does not have to exist and, simply by keeping his underlying word order Experiencer-Theme — Complement Clause -- Main Predicate for all his examples and for sentences (1), (2), (3) and (4) as well and by explaining the occurrence of Experiencer/Theme after a complement clause as an instance of a regular optional Movement rule,² a better generalization can be obtained. This generalization can also handle the following examples, which do not appear in Lee's data:

Notice that in sentences (5) and (6) the experiencers Sue and Joe can be moved after the complement clauses even without *-eke*. This again shows that Lee's Flip analysis is not correct. Sentences (7) and (8), on the other hand, seem to be more acceptable when the Dative marker *-eke* is added to the experiencer Joe. This is consistent with my informants' judgment about the sentences (3) and (4) with *-eke*, which they regarded as more acceptable than Lee's (80b i) and (80b ii) respectively. For the sake of convenience, I will repeat these contrasting examples below (here, the acceptability judgment is mine and my informants'):

- (80) b i. ??*Joe_i* -nin [Sue-ka *caki_i* -lil salangha -nin kəs] -ka punmjøngha
 Top SM OM love Rel Comp SM certain
 -əss -ta
 Past Dec

² More specifically, something like Heavy NP Shift, which optionally moves a heavy constituent to the front of a sentence, will be sufficient.

‘*Joe_i* was certain that Sue loves *him_i*.’

- (80) b ii. ??*Joe_i* -nin [*caki_i* -ka Sue -lil salangha -nin kəs] -ka punmjəngha
 Top SM OM love Rel Comp SM certain
 -əss -ta
 Past Dec

‘*Joe_i* was certain that *he_i* loves Sue.’

- (3) *Joe_i* -eke (-nin) [Sue-ka *caki_i* -lil salangha -nin kəs] -ka punmjəngha
 to Top SM OM love Rel Comp SM certain
 -əss -ta
 Past Dec

‘To *Joe_i*, it was certain that Sue loves *him_i*.’

- (4) *Joe_i* -eke (-nin) [*caki_i*- ka Sue -lil salangha -nin kəs] -ka punmjəngha
 to Top SM OM love Rel Comp SM certain
 -əss -ta
 Past Dec

Now, what is responsible for the less acceptability of (80b i), (80b ii) and the simple topic markers in (7) and (8)? Interestingly, (80b i) and (80b ii) become perfectly acceptable if *caki* gets deleted from both:

- (80) b i'. *Joe* -nin [Sue-ka salangha -nin kəs] -ka punmjəngha -əss -ta
 Top SM love Rel Comp SM certain Past Dec

‘It was clear (to me) that, as for *Joe_i*, Sue loves *him_i*.’

- (80) b ii'. *Joe* -nin [Sue-lil salangha -nin kəs] -ka punmjəngha -əss -ta
 Top OM love Rel Comp SM certain Past Dec

‘As for *Joe_i*, it was clear (to me) that *he_i* loves Sue.’

Note that in either of these two sentences the meaning of the sentence becomes quite different from its original one: in (80b i) and (80b ii), however awkward they may sound, it is Joe himself that the fact of Sue’s loving Joe was clear to, in (80b i') and (80b ii'), however, the most plausible person to whom the fact of Sue’s loving Joe was clear is not Joe himself but somebody who said the sentence, i.e., the speaker of the sentence.

As for sentences (3) and (4), déletion of *caki* results in rather different interpretation:

- (3)' *Joe* -eke (-nin) [Sue-ka salangha-nin kəs] -ka punmjəngha -əss -ta
 to Top SM love Rel Comp SM certain Past Dec

‘It was clear to Joe that Sue is in love (with somebody).’

- (4)' **Joe* -eke (-nin) [Sue-lil salangha -nin kəs] -ka punmjəngha -əss -ta
 to Top OM love Rel Comp SM certain Past Dec

‘It was clear to Joe that (somebody) loves Sue’.

Here, as can be seen in the English glosses, the fact that Sue is in love with somebody or that somebody loves Sue was clear to Joe rather than anybody else, and this interpretation is obtained due to the presence of *-eke*. This shows that the function of *-eke* is to mark that the main predicate *punmjəngha* ‘clear’ is related to the point of view of

the subject/topic of the sentence with *-eke* attached to it.

If we delete *caki* from sentences which have some other types of psychological predicates as main verbs, such as *cilkəp-* ‘pleasant, happy’, *mianha-* ‘sorry’, *kippi-* ‘glad’, etc., would there be a similar kind of change of meaning? Observe the following sentences:

- (9) Joe-nin [Sue-ka salangha-nin kəs] -ka cilkəp -əss -ta
 Top SM love Rel Comp SM happy Past Dec
 ‘It was pleasing to *Joe_i* that Sue loves { *him_i* somebody } .’
- (10) Joe-nin [Sue-lil salangha-nin kəs] -ka cilkəp -əss -ta
 Top OM love Rel Comp SM happy Past Dec
 ‘It was pleasing to *Joe_i* that *he_i* loves Sue.’
- (9)' Joe-eke (nin) [Sue-ka salangha -nin kəs] -ka cilkəp -əss -ta
 to Top SM love Rel Comp SM happy Past Dec
 ‘It was pleasing to *Joe_i* that Sue loves { *him_i* somebody } .’
- (10)' Joe-eke (-nin) [Sue-lil salagha -nin kəs] -ka cilkəp -əss -ta
 to Top OM love Rel Comp SM happy Past Dec
 ‘It was pleasing to *Joe_i* that *he_i* loves Sue.’

The most crucial difference between the sentences with ‘Adjectives of Factual Claim’, e.g. *punmjəngha-* ‘certain, clear’, *hwaksilha-* ‘sure, clearly true’, etc., as main predicates and those with ‘Adjectives of Emotion’, e.g. *cilkəp-* ‘happy, pleasant’, *koməp-* ‘grateful, thankful’, *mianha-* ‘sorry’, etc., as main predicates is that, in the former case, deletion of *caki* changes the answer to ‘clear/true to whom?’, whereas in the latter case, deletion of *caki* does not change the answer to ‘who is happy/thankful/sorry?’ And somehow, this difference seems to be closely related to the difference in optionality of the choice of Dative marker *-eke*: with an adjective of factual claim such as *punmjəngha-* ‘certain, clear’, *-eke* is preferred to the simple topic marker; with an adjective of emotion such as *cilkəp-* ‘pleasant, happy’, choice of either *-eke* or simple *-nin* is optional, either choice being perfectly acceptable.

My contention is that an adjective of factual claim and an adjective of emotion are semantically distinguishable and treating both types as psychological predicates is not correct. For me, *punmjəngha-* ‘certain, clear’ is a factual predicate rather than a real psychological one. This distinction between a factual and psychological predicate is rather delicate, and to put it very vaguely, a factual predicate involves external factors whereas a real psychological predicate directly represents internal feelings, knowledge, belief, etc. This semantic difference is responsible for determining from whose point of view a sentence containing one type of predicate rather than the other is uttered. To make it clearer, let us look at the following two sentences:

- (11) Joe -nin *punmjənghi* Sue-lil cuk -i -əss -ta
 Top certainly OM die Causative Past Dec

'It is certain (to me) that Joe killed Sue.'

- (12) Joe -nin *cilkɔi* Sue-lil cuk -i -əss -ta
Top gladly OM die Causative Past Déc

'Joe gladly killed Sue; it was to Joe's gladness that he killed Sue.'

In (11) *punmjənghī* 'clearly, certainly' does not have anything to do with Joe's internal feeling as to the certainty of his having killed Sue and the whole sentence represents the speaker's point of view rather than Joe's. On the other hand, in (12) *cilkɔi* 'gladly' represents Joe's internal feeling towards killing of Sue and the whole sentence is spoken from Joe's point of view.

At this point, I feel it necessary to mention that most of Korean declarative sentences with non-first person subjects/ topics and with psychological predicates (verbs or adjectives) are rather uncommon in actual conversations: occurrences of these sentences are mostly restricted to literary works. It is for this reason that Hong-Bae Lee, in his dissertation *A Study of Korean Syntax* (1970), regards the following sentences totally unacceptable:

- i) Joe-nin Sue-ka coh -ta
Top SM good Dec
'Joe is fond of Sue.'
- ii) Joe-nin paem -ka musəp -ta
Top snake SM afraid Dec
'Joe is afraid of snakes.'

while he accepts the following sentences:

- iii) na -nin Sue -ka coh -ta
I Top SM good Dec
'I am fond of Sue.'
- iv) Joe -nin [Sue -ka coh -ta ko] malha -əss -ta
Top SM good Dec Comp say Past Dec
(Quotative)
'Joe said that he is fond of Sue.'
- v) Joe -nin [paem -ka musəp -ta -ko] malha -əss -ta
Top snake SM afraid Dec Comp say Past Dec
(Quotative)
'Joe said that he is afraid of snakes.'

On the basis of his grammaticality judgment about the above examples, Hong-Bae Lee argues for the Performative analysis of all the sentences in Korean. According to him, any kind of predicate that represents non-first person subject's internal feeling, belief, knowledge, etc., cannot be used as a main predicate of a declarative sentence: this is due to the fact that a direct access to other people's internal feeling, belief, knowledge, etc. is practically impossible and that those can be revealed only indirectly, e.g. by guessing, hearing, etc.

I fully agree with Hong-Bae Lee on his point that sentences such as i) and ii) are not likely to occur in actual conversations; however, my intuition—and most of the other Koreans will agree with me—as a native speaker's of Korean tells me that these sentences are perfectly acceptable.³ Most Koreans would say ‘What's wrong with those sentences?’, although they might not be aware of the stylistic constraints necessary for their actual use. One of my main concerns in this paper is to explain why, even within the same stylistic domain, some sentences require *-eke* to be attached to their subject/topic NP's and others do not.

It is a well-known fact that, in a fictional literary work, the narrator often assumes the characters' points of view and that there exists identification, be it total or partial, between the narrator and the character(s). This is why a narrator can have a direct access to the internal feelings of a character and using a psychological predicate as a main verb of a declarative sentence with a third-person subject sounds perfectly natural. When the main predicate of a sentence is an adjective such as *cilkəp* ‘happy’, or *kippī* ‘glad’, which directly represents the subject/topic NP's internal feeling, the whole sentence can be regarded as being used from the subject/topic NP's point of view: in other words, there exists a total identification between the narrator of the sentence and the subject/topic NP. However, if the main predicate is a factual adjective such as *pumjəngħa* ‘clear’, or *hwaksilħa* ‘clearly true’, the most unmarked interpretation would be that the sentence is spoken from the narrator's point of view rather than that of the subject/topic NP's. (cf. examples (80b i' and 80b ii')) Here, in order to specify that the sentence represents the subject/topic NP's view point rather than the narrator's, Dative marker *-eke* is almost obligatory after the subject/topic NP.

Now, let us turn to the discussion of the main point that I'd like to make in this paper. Why, in all of the example sentences that are supposed to represent the points of view of the subject/topic NP's, are *caki*'s rather than *ki*'s used? Would it make any difference if we replace *caki*'s with *ki*'s in those sentences? Observe the following sentences:

- (13) *Joe_i* -nin [$\left\{ \begin{matrix} caki_i \\ ??ki_i \end{matrix} \right\}$] -ka Sue -lil salangha-nin kəs] -ka cilkəp -əss -ta
 Top SM OM love Rel Comp happy Past Dec
 ‘As for *Joe_i*, *he_i* was happy about *his_{i,j}* loving Sue.’
- (14) *Joe_i* -nin [Sue -ka $\left\{ \begin{matrix} caki_i \\ ??ki_i \end{matrix} \right\}$] -lil salangha-nin kəs] -ka cilkəp -əss -ta
 Top SM OM love Rel Comp SM happy Past Dec
 ‘As for *Joe_i*, *he_i* was happy about Sue's loving *him_{i,j}*.’

³ Incidentally, Chung-Min Lee, who would accept this type of sentences without any questioning, majored in literature before he got into linguistics and Hong-Bae Lee is from a military background. I believe that this difference in their background is responsible for the difference in their flexibility in grammaticality/acceptability judgment.

- (15) *Joe_i* -eke (-nin) [$\left\{ \begin{matrix} caki_i \\ ??ki_i \\ ki_j \end{matrix} \right\}$ -ka Sue-lil salangha-nin kəs] -ka punmjəngha
to Top SM OM love Rel Comp SM clear

-əss -ta
Past Dec

'It was clear to *Joe_i* that *he_{i,j}* loves Sue.'

- (16) *Joe_i* -eke (-nin) [Sue -ka $\left\{ \begin{matrix} caki_i \\ ??ki_i \\ ki_j \end{matrix} \right\}$ -lil salangha-nin kəs] -ka punmjəngha
to Top SM OM love Rel Comp SM clear

-əss -ta
Past Dec

'It was clear to *Joe_i* that Sue loves *him_{i,j}*.'

All of the above sentences can be perfectly acceptable. However, notice that they are perfectly acceptable only when Joe and *ki* 'he' are not coreferential when *ki* refers to some other person than Joe, while *caki* unambiguously refers to the subject/topic NP of each sentence. In other words, *ki* in each of the above examples cannot easily refer to the subject/topic NP of the sentence, and *caki* must obligatorily refer to the subject/topic NP of the sentence. Then, why?

I think one of the major functions of *caki* in Korean is to mark that a sentence containing *caki* represents the point of view of the NP which *caki* refers to. Thus, when the subject/topic NP and the main predicate of a sentence clearly show that the sentence represents the subject/topic NP's point of view, the choice of *caki* rather than *ki* to refer to the subject/topic NP is almost obligatory, in order not to introduce any kind of conflicting element in the sentence. This is why the presence of *caki* in sentences (80b i) and (80b ii), though rather awkward, helps us to interpret the sentences as unambiguously representing Joe's point of view rather than the speaker's.

As another piece of evidence supporting my point, observe the following examples:

- (17) *Joe_i* -e kwanha-ə malha-ca-mjən, [$\left\{ \begin{matrix} ??caki_i \\ ki_i \\ if \end{matrix} \right\}$ -ka Sue -lil salangha -nin kəs] -ka punmjəngha -əss -ta
to concerning say if SM OM love Rel Comp SM clear Past Dec

'Talking about *Joe_i*, it was clear that *he_i* loves Sue.'

- (18) *Joe_i* -e kwanha-ə malha-ca-mjən, [Sue -ka $\left\{ \begin{matrix} ??caki_i \\ ki_i \\ if \end{matrix} \right\}$ -lil salangha -nin kəs] -ka punmjəngha -əss -ta
to concerning say if SM OM love Rel Comp SM clear Past Dec

'Talking about *Joe_i*, it was clear that Sue loves *him_i*'

In the above two examples, by adding *Joe-e kwanha-ə malha-ca-mjən* 'if I talk about Joe/talking about Joe,' it becomes obvious that the point of view represented in the sentences is the speaker's, not Joe's: the speaker is intentionally avoiding the identification of himself with Joe. This lack of identification between the speaker and the subject/

topic of the above sentences makes *ki* far more acceptable than *caki*.

Compare sentences (17) and (18) with (19) and (20) below:

- (19) *Joe_i-iy kwancəm -esə po -ca-mjən, [{??ki_i} {caki_i}] -ka Sue-lil salangha-nin*
 Poss viewpoint from look at if SM OM love Rel

kes] -ka punmjəngha -əss -ta
 Comp SM clear Past Dec

'From *Joe_i*'s point of view, it was clear that *he_i* loves *Sue_i*.'

- (20) *Joe_i -iy kwancəm -esə po -ca-mjən, [Sue -ka {??ki_i} {caki_i}] -lil salangha*
 Poss viewpoint from look at if SM OM love

-nin kəs] -ka punmjəngha -əss -ta
 Rel Comp SM clear Past Dec

'From *Joe_i*'s point of view, it was clear that *Sue_i* loves *him_i*.'

In sentences (19) and (20), by adding *Joe-iy kwancəm-esə po-ca-mjən* 'if I look at it from *Joe_i*'s point of view,' the speaker is speaking from the point of view of *Joe_i* rather than his own, and, consequently, *caki* is far more acceptable than *ki*. (However, if *ki* in (19) and (20) refers to some other person than *Joe_i*, *ki* is acceptable.)

That the occurrence of *caki* rather than *ki* in a sentence implies a close identification between the speaker and the subject/topic NP of the sentence can be more easily seen in the following sentences:

- (21) *Joe_i -nin [{caki_i} {??ki_i}] -ka Sue -lil salangha-n-ta ko]*
 Top SM OM love Dec Comp (Quotative) malha
-əss -ta
 Past Dec

'*Joe_i* said that *he_i* loves *Sue_i*.'

- (22) *Joe_i -nin [Sue -ka {caki_i} {??ki_i}] -lil salangha-n-ta ko]*
 Top SM OM love Dec Comp (Quotative) malha
-əss -ta
 Past Dec

'*Joe_i* said that *Sue_i* loves *him_i*.'

- (23) *Joe_i -nin [{caki_i} {??ki_i}] -ka Sue-lil salangha-n-ta ko]*
 Top SM OM love Dec Comp {nikki-
-ta saengkakha-} -əss
 Dec {mit-}
{feel}
{think}
{believe}

'*Joe_i* {felt
thought} that *he_i* loves *Sue_i*.'

- (24) *Joe_i nin [Sue -ka {caki_i} {??ki_i}] -lil salangha-n-ta ko]*
 Top SM OM love Dec Comp {nikki-
-ta saengkakha-} -əss
 Dec {mit-}
{feel}
{think}
{believe}

‘*Joe_i* { felt
thought
believed } that Sue loves *him_i*.’

Verbs of ‘saying’ or psychological verbs, when they occur as main verbs, necessarily have to represent the subject/topic NP’s point of view, and using *ki* instead of *caki* in these cases to refer to the subject/topic NP results in reducing acceptability of the sentences.

I firmly believe that the syntactic rule of Reflexivization by *caki* has a functional motivation discussed in this paper and that Lee’s Reflexivization rule:

Caki is coreferential with the Subject or Topic NP of any dominating sentence.

In other words, when the Subject or Topic NP of a sentence is in command with *caki*, the latter is coreferential with the former (Lee 1973: 68).

can be seen as a natural consequence of the fact that normally a subject or topic tends to be the representing the point of view of the sentence. My guess it that another constraint in Korean Reflexivization, i.e., the referent NP of *caki* is usually [+Human], as indicated by Lee, is also natural in the light of the fact that it is most natural and easy to assume human beings’ point of view rather than any other beings’ or objects’.

The subject/topic constraint with respect to the point of view analysis seems to be the crucial factor in determining the degrees of acceptability of the following sentences:

- (25) i. ??*Joe_i* -nin *caki_i* -ka salangha-nin jøca -ka manna -əss -ta
Top SM love Rel woman SM meet Past Dec

‘As for *Joe_i*, the woman *he_i* loves met.’

- ii. *Joe_i* -nin *caki_i* -ka salangha-nin jøca -lil manna -əss -ta
Top SM love Rel woman OM meet Past Dec

‘As for *Joe_i*, *he_i* met the woman *he_i* loves.’

Example (25 i) is extremely awkward, though intelligible, and the reason for this awkwardness to be that, while *Joe* with the topic marker *nin* and *caki* both confirm Joe’s point of view, the subject of the sentence and the main verb favor the point of view of *jøca* ‘woman’: this conflict between two points of view within a single sentence makes the sentence (25 i) sound very strange, if not totally unacceptable. On the other hand, there is no such conflict in (25 ii), hence its perfect acceptability. (The same kind of principle can explain why Lee’s examples (78 i, ii, and iii) on pages 2-3 in this paper are all bad.)

I hope that in this paper I convincingly showed the importance of treating *caki* from a functional point of view. I have no doubt that there are other functions of *caki*, such as emphasis,⁴ disambiguation, etc., but it seems to me that the function of *caki* as

⁴ I suspect that the reason why *caki* normally seems to have some kind of emphatic function is that the use of *caki* establishes a strong identification between the referent NP and *caki*; this emphatic function seems to be lacking in *ki*.

representing its referent NP's point of view is the most crucial and interesting one among all. In this paper I dealt with only a limited set of data consisting of a particular type of sentences; I believe, however, that further research along the lines of functional analysis of *caki* will reveal a more extensive and general applicability of the functional principles played by *caki* than has been discussed in the present paper.

Before ending this paper, I would like to suggest that the use of *caki*, which has been studied only within the context of single, separate sentences, be studied in a broader context such as discourse, texts, etc. To show the necessity of broadening the scope of Reflexivization by *caki* beyond a sentence level, I will quote a passage from a Korean novel, where occurrences of *caki* are often not sentence-bound. This passage is a particularly nice instance in which the effect of total identification of the narrator with the main character in the passage can be clearly felt by the readers: the readers will be able to have a direct access to the internal world of the character.

tancang -lil machi -n *səlwha* -kongcu; -nin kewul -lil hjangha -ə *caki*; -iy əlkul -lil make-up OM finish Rel Sulwha princess Top mirror OM towards Poss face OM
 pichu -ə po-n-ta. pun -lil pali -ko salccek -lil tasili -ko ipsul -lil pulk-e reflect see Dec face powder OM apply and hair OM arrange and lips OM red(Adv)
 muncili-ko pichwi-ok kwikəli-lil kəl -ko nani *caki*; casin-lil *caki*; -ka palapo -ə-to rub and jade earring OM hang and then self OM SM look at even if
 eeppi -ta ko ani malha -l su əp -əss -ta. kiləna *səlwha* -kongcu -iy pretty Dec Comp not say possibility not exist Past Dec but Sulwha princess Poss
 maim -nin tasi ətup-əss -ta. *caki*; -nin nuku -lil wiha -əsə ha-nin tancang -i -n-ka mind Top again dark Past Dec Top who OM for do Rel make-up Cop Question
 ha ko saengkakha -ə po -n -ta. *caki*; -ka maim sok -ilo himmoha -ko akki -ko Comp think try Dec SM mind inside with admire and cherish and
 salangha -tə -n salam -nin imi *caki*; -iy kəs -ka ani -əss -ta. love Past Rel(Retrospective) person Top already Poss thing SM not Past Del
 ingljən -nin ice -nin *caki*; -iy aein -ka ani -la enni -iy namphjen -i -əss Eunglyum Top now Poss lover SM not instead sister Poss husband Cop Past
 -ta.
 Dec (from Chong-wha Park's *Sam Kuk Phung Lyu*, 1959, p. 48)

Translation:

Princess *Sulwha*, who finished make-up, faces the mirror and looks at the reflection of her face. After applying face powder, arranging the hair, putting on lipstick, and putting on jade earings, she couldn't help saying that she was pretty, even though it was she herself that was looking at herself. But Princess Sulwha's mind was dark again. She try to think for whom the make-up she did is. The person whom she used to admire, cherish and love inside her heart was not hers already. Now, Eunglyum is not her lover, but her sister's husband.

REFERENCES

- Lee, Chung-Min. 1973. Abstract Syntax and Korean with Reference to English. Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University.

Lee, Hong-Bae. 1970. A Study of Korean Syntax. Doctoral dissertation, Brown University.

Box E. Linguistics

Brown University

Providence, R.I. 02912

U.S.A.

(Received 25 August 1977)