

# 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<sup>1</sup>

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.

<sup>1</sup> 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	

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. [haksayngtul-uy<sub>i</sub> pwumonimtul]-i<sub>j</sub> caki-tul-ul<sub>i/j</sub> kwachanhassta  
 students-GEN parents-NOM selves-ACC overpraised  
 ‘The students<sub>i</sub>’ parents<sub>j</sub> overpraised themselves<sub>i/j</sub>’  
 b. [haksayngtul-uy<sub>i</sub> pwumonimtul]-i<sub>j</sub> kutul-ul<sub>i/j</sub> kwachanhassta  
 students-GEN parents-NOM they-ACC overpraised  
 ‘The students<sub>i</sub>’ parents<sub>j</sub> overpraised them<sub>i/j</sub>’

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<sub>i</sub> [<sub>S</sub> [<sub>S</sub> caki-tul-i<sub>i+j</sub> ikiessta]-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

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):<sup>2</sup>

- (3) John's<sub>i</sub> campaign required that pictures of himself<sub>i</sub> 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.<sup>3</sup> 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-

<sup>2</sup> 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*.

<sup>3</sup> Lebeaux (1984, 1985:345) claims that in English, while locally-bound anaphors require a unique antecedent, non-locally bound anaphors allow a split antecedent.



Masako Shimabukuro (p.c) :

- (7) a. John-i        caki-ka        ikyessta-ko    malhayssta  
       John-NOM    self-NOM     won-COMP    said  
       'John<sub>i</sub> said that he<sub>i</sub> won'
- b. John-i        caki-tul-i        ikyessta-ko    malhayssta  
       John-NOM    self-PL-NOM    won-COMP    said  
       'John<sub>i</sub> said that they<sub>i+k</sub> won'
- (8) a. John-ga        zibun-ga        katta-to        itta  
       John-NOM    self-NOM     won-COMP    said  
       'John<sub>i</sub> said that he<sub>i</sub> won'
- b. John-ga        zibun-tati-ga    katta-to        itta  
       John-NOM    self-PL-NOM    won-COMP    said  
       'John<sub>i</sub> said that they<sub>i+k</sub> 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<sub>i+</sub>,        ikilkela-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)'.<sup>4</sup>

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.<sup>5</sup> Compare the usage of *tul* and *tati* 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-tati-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 *tati*: 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,

<sup>4</sup> 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-tati*, which is interpreted as 'John and other(s)'.

<sup>5</sup> Even though *general plurality* may not be a proper term, I will use it to distinguish one meaning of *tul* and *tati* (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<sub>i</sub> shuo *ziji*<sub>i/\*i+j</sub> ying-le  
 John said himself won  
 ‘John said that self won’
- c. John<sub>i</sub> gaoshu Bill<sub>j</sub> *ziji*<sub>i/\*i+j</sub> 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<sub>i</sub> Mary-eykey<sub>j</sub> caki-tul<sub>i,+j/+k</sub>-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 *ziji* cannot 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)'.<sup>6</sup>

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).<sup>6</sup> 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.

<sup>6</sup> 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.<sup>7</sup> Consider the following sentence from Ueda (1984 : 22):

- (15) John-ga [<sub>s</sub> zibun-ga kat-te-i-ru] inu-o nagu-ru to  
 NOM self -NOM keep-Prog-Pres dog-ACC hit-Pres when  
 Bill-mo soo si-ta  
 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

<sup>7</sup> 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*:<sup>8</sup>

- (19) a. John-<sub>i</sub> caki-lul<sub>i</sub> kwasin hayss-ko, Mary-to kule-hayssta.  
 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-<sub>i</sub> [<sub>NP</sub> caki-uy<sub>i</sub> ttal-ul] salang hayss-ko,  
 John-NOM self-GEN daughter-ACC loved-and  
 Bill-to kule-hayssta.  
 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-<sub>i</sub> [<sub>S</sub> caki-ka<sub>i</sub> ceyilila]-ko sayngkakhayss-ko,  
 John-NOM self-NOM best-COMP thought-and  
 Bill-to kule-hayssta.  
 Bill-also so-did  
 'John<sub>i</sub> thought that self<sub>i</sub> was best and Bill did, too'  
 (= Bill thought that Bill was the best, too)  
 (≠ Bill thought that John was the best, too)
- (20) John-<sub>i</sub> caki-tul-<sub>i,+j</sub> ikyessta-ko mitess-ko,  
 John-NOM self-PL-NOM won-COMP believed-COMP  
 Bill-to kule-hayssta  
 Bill-also so-did  
 'John<sub>i</sub> believed that they<sub>i,+k</sub> won, and so did Bill'

<sup>8</sup> 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-<sub>i</sub> caki-lul kwasin hayssko, John-uy emma-to kule-hayssta.  
 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 only 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:

- (21) John-i        caki-uy kay-lul chass-ko, Bill-to kulekey-hayssta.  
 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 *kulehkey-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- $i_i$  [<sub>S</sub> Bill- $i_j$     caki- $i_j$ /ku- $i_i$ /? $i_j$ ]-lul kwachanhayssta]-ko  
 John-NOM Bill-NOM self/he-ACC        overpraised-COMP  
 malhayssta  
 said  
 'John $i_i$  said that Bill $j$  overpraised himself $i_j$ /him $i_i$ /? $i_j$ '.



- (24) a. *nwukwuna-ka caki-lul sinloyhanta*  
 everyone -NOM self/he-ACC trust  
 'Everyone trusts himself'
- b. *nwukwunka-ka caki-lul sinloyhanta*  
 somebody-NOM self/he-ACC trust  
 'Somebody trusts himself'

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)).<sup>11</sup> 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.

<sup>11</sup> They agree that *cakicasin* 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.

## References

- Aoun, J. and N. Hornstein (1986) 'Bound and Referential Pronouns,' ms.
- Bourchard, D. (1985) 'PRO, Pronominal or Anaphor,' *Squibs and discussions* : *LI* 16.3, 471-477.
- Cho, D.-I. (1989) 'A Preliminary Remark on Korean Reflexives,' ms., USC, L.A.
- Chomsky, N. (1981) *Lectures on Government and Binding*, Foris, Dordrecht.
- Fukui, N. (1984) 'Studies in Japanese Anaphora,' ms., MIT Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Giorgi, A. (1984) 'Long-Distance Anaphora' in *The Linguistic Review* 4, 307-361.
- Hong, S. (1985) 'A and A' Binding in Korean and English : Government-Binding Parameters,' Diss., University of Connecticut.
- Huang, J. and C.C. Jane Tang (1989) 'On the Local Nature of the Long-Distance Reflexive in Chinese,' ms.
- Im, H. (1987) *kwuke-uy caykwysayenkwu* (A Study of Korean Reflexives), Sinkwumwunhwsa, Seoul, Korea.
- Katada, F. (1988) 'LF-Binding of Anaphors' in *Proceeding of WCCFL*.
- Kurata, K. (1986) 'Asymmetries in Japanese,' ms., University of Massachusetts.
- Lebeaux, D. (1983) 'A Distributional Difference between Reciprocals and Reflexives' in *LI* 14.4.
- Lebeaux, D. (1984, 85) 'Locality and Anaphoric Binding' in *The Linguistic Review* 4 : 343-363.
- Lee, H. S. (1987) 'Pronominal Anaphors and Binding Domain : with Reference to a Quasi Reflexive *caki* in Korean,' ms.
- Park, K. (1988) 'Reflexive Anaphora in Korean', paper presented at the 6th International Conference on Korean Linguistics, ms.
- Partee, Barbara H. (1978) 'Bound Variables and Other Anaphors' in

- Proceedings of TINCAP-2*, ed., David Waltz, Univ. of Illinois (79-85).
- Reinhart, T. (1983) *Anaphora and Semantic Interpretation*, The University of Chicago Press.
- Safir, K. (1989) 'Implied Non-conference and the Pattern of Anaphor,' ms.
- Sag, I. (1976) 'Deletion and Logical Form,' Diss., MIT.
- Saito, M. and Hoji, H. (1983) 'Weak Crossover and Move  $\alpha$  in Japanese' in *NLLT* 1 : 245-259.
- Sprotiche, D. (1986) 'Zibun' in *LI* 17, 369-374.
- Ueda, M. (1984) 'On Japanese Reflexive Zibun,' ms., University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

서울특별시 성북구 안암동 5가  
고려대학교 영어영문학과  
136-701