

Relevance of perspective in syntax: new evidence from Korean anaphors

1. Background and Goal - The notion of perspectivization is obviously crucial in language at the semantic and pragmatic levels: the source of a discourse determines its interpretation, as shown in detail by the *de re/de dicto* distinction for instance. The role perspective plays at the syntactic level is however less clear. This paper aims at tackling this broad issue by examining so-called exempt anaphors, specifically in Korean that sheds new light on the issue.

For more than forty years, it has been observed that in various languages, some anaphors seem to be exempt from the structural conditions imposed by Condition A (Chomsky 1986, a.o.). This property has been more or less precisely related to logophoricity, a term originating from specific pronouns found e.g. in West African languages that have to refer to centers of perspective (Clements 1975, a.o.): reflexives in languages like Icelandic (Maling 1984, a.o.), Mandarin (Huang & Liu 2001, a.o.) or Japanese (Kuno 1987, a.o.) have been assumed to be able to escape locality conditions when anteceded by “perspective centers”, “subjects of consciousness”, or more specifically by Source, Self, or Pivot (Sells 1987). It still remains controversial, however, how to pinpoint the exact perspectival properties of such exempt anaphors, and how to explain the link between locality and logophoricity.

The goal of this paper is to show that the Korean anaphor *caki-casin*, though usually considered a non-exempt anaphor, provides new insights on the former issue: the new tests and experimental studies described below reveal that a) perspective is in fact crucial to understand the distribution of this anaphor; b) at least two types of perspective (attitude and empathy) need to be distinguished for these syntactic reasons.

2. *Caki-casin* as an exempt, perspective-sensitive anaphor – *Caki-casin* is standardly assumed to be a strictly local anaphor (Cole *et al.*, a.o.). But recently, Kim & Yoon (2009) have argued based on the availability of strict readings that *caki-casin* can be exempt when it appears in logophoric environments using Sells’ categories Self, Source, and Pivot. Their study however suffers from some problems: (i) they presuppose that only exempt anaphors exhibit strict readings in ellipsis contexts without testing local anaphors, but Hestvik’s (1995) observation that strict readings can be obtained with locally bound *himself* in subordinate clauses questions the test; (ii) they do not independently determine the relevant domain for locality so there is no clear division between exempt anaphors and local anaphors. For these reasons, we propose new strategies to corroborate Kim & Yoon’s findings.

2.1. Study 1: Distribution of the inanimate anaphor *cachey* - First, we used the inanimacy strategy proposed in Charnavel & Sportiche (to appear) to independently define the locality domain of Korean anaphors: while there is no consensus on the exact definition of a perspective center, one thing that crucially holds is that, under any definition of logophoricity, inanimates cannot be logophoric centers since they lack a mental state; thus, inanimates are a precious tool for determining the scope of Condition A without the confound of logophoricity. Drawing on this idea, we examined the behavior of the understudied inanimate Korean anaphor *cachey* to use it as a baseline for plain anaphor-hood.

39 native Korean speakers were asked to complete a Grammaticality Judgment Task using a 6-point Likert scale, with 54 sentence items presented one by one in a randomized order. The sentences were divided into 3 groups: A- clausemate, c-commanding antecedent (1); B- clausemate, non c-commanding antecedent (2); C- non-local c-commanding antecedent, i.e. in different tensed clause (3).

- | | |
|--|-----------|
| (1) [i senpak] _i -un cachey _i -uy chwucinyek-ulo wumcikil swu iss-ta.
‘[This ship] _i can move using its _i momentum.’ | [Group A] |
| (2) *[i kwail] _i -uy caypayca-nun cachey _i -uy khentisyen-ul cacwu hwakinhanta.
‘[This fruit] _i ’s grower checks its _i condition often.’ | [Group B] |
| (3) *[i os] _i -un cwuin-i cachey _i -lul culkye ipnun-ta-nun kes-ul poyecwunta.
‘[This clothing] _i shows that the owner likes to wear it _i often.’ | [Group C] |

Group A was rated significantly higher than group B ($p < 0.0001$) and group C ($p < 0.0001$). This

means that a plain anaphor in Korean must have an antecedent that c-commands it within its smallest TP, which sets the baseline for Condition A in Korean.

2.2. Study 2: Logophoricity effects on the anaphor *caki-casin* – The goal of our second study (including 38 Korean speakers and 69 sentence items) was to look at the distribution of *caki-casin* in the same environments and to specifically focus on how *caki-casin* was licensed in Groups B and C (which did not license the inanimate anaphor *cachey*) depending on logophoricity. Specifically, we determined two types of logophoric centers, attitude holders and empathy loci, based on specific tests we defined: the epithet test and the sibling test.

2.2.1. Attitude and epithet test - We first hypothesized that one logophoric factor relevant for exempting *caki-casin* from Condition A is making the antecedent an attitude holder, which is an independently well-circumscribed notion (at least since Frege's (1892) observation that the substitution of coreferring terms in attitude contexts can change the truth conditions). We thus made the antecedents of *caki-casin* in group C subjects of intensional predicates like *think* as in (4). To test whether these antecedents are indeed attitude holders, we replaced *caki-casin* with an epithet like *ku papo* ('that idiot') in (4) and checked whether the sentence becomes unacceptable: this epithet test is based on Dubinsky & Hamilton's (1998) observation that an epithet cannot be anteceded by an individual from whose perspective its attributive content is evaluated.

- (4) **Cina_i**-nun kkwucwunhan wuntong-i {a.cakicasin_i/b.*ku papo_i}-l-ul pakkwuko issta-ko sayngkakhanta.
'CN_i thinks that regular exercise is changing {a.her_i/b. [*the idiot]_i }.' [Group C, attitude]

2.2.2. Empathy and sibling test – The second subtype of logophoric center hypothesized to license exempt *caki-casin* in non-attitude contexts is empathy loci, which are event participants with whom the speaker identifies (cf. Kuno 1987). We made the antecedents of *caki-casin* in group B empathy loci using a new test, which we dub the sibling test. Korean encodes empathy information lexically with the four terms it has for older siblings: specifically, the term used identifies the gender of the empathy locus (see table). If *caki-casin* is replaced with the term *nwuna* ('sister', empathy locus male), it can refer to the antecedent's sister only if it is an empathy locus; otherwise, it

gender of empathy locus	term for brother	term for sister
male	<i>hyeng</i>	<i>nwuna</i>
female	<i>oppa</i>	<i>enni</i>

has to refer to the sister or an older female friend of a male speaker. That the term *nwuna* requires the speaker be male in (6) but not in (5) shows that sentences like (5) involving the subject noun *thoughts* make the antecedent an empathy locus, which licenses *caki-casin*, while subject nouns like *bike* in (6) do not. Furthermore, the epithet test crucially fails in (5-6), i.e. *ku papo* can refer to the antecedent. This demonstrates that empathy loci and attitude holders are two different types of logophoric centers, each exempting the anaphor *caki-casin* from Condition A.

- (5) **Kangwu_i**-uy sayngkak-un {a. cakicasin_i-ul/b. *nwuna*-ul/c. [ku papo]_i} wihe-ey ppattulyessta.
'KW_i's thoughts put {a. him_i/b. KW/speaker's sister/c. [the idiot]_i} in danger.' [B, empathy]
(6) **Kangwu_i**-uy cacenke-nun {a. *cakicasin_i-ul/b. *nwuna*-ul/c. [ku papo]_i} wihe-ey ppattulyessta.
'KW_i's bike put {a.*him_i/b.*KW/speaker's sister/c.[the idiot]_i} in danger.' [B, not attitude/empathy]

2.2.3. Results – In attitude and empathy contexts, the ratings of *caki-casin* in Groups B and C were significantly higher ($p < 0.0001$) than those of *cachey*. Also, there was a significant difference between non-empathy contexts like (6) and empathy contexts like (5) within Group B: the minimal pair in (5) and (6) showed a sharp contrast, with (5) being rated 5.057, and (6) 3.105.

anaphor \ antecedent	A: clausemate c-commanding	B: clausemate non c-commanding	C: non clausemate
<i>cachey</i>	4.7	2.5	3.3
<i>caki-casin</i>	4.8	non-empathy: 2.7; empathy: 3.7	attitude: 4.7

3. Conclusion - In sum, our studies show using specific tests that at least two types of logophoricity are syntactically relevant to exempting Korean *caki-casin* from Condition A; Korean is specifically interesting in providing a new precise test for the notion of empathy.

Selected references: Charnavel & Sportiche (to appear). Anaphor Binding - What French Inanimate Anaphors Show. *Linguistic Inquiry*.
Kim & Yoon (2009). Long-distance bound local anaphors in Korean. *Lingua* 119.