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ABSTRACT

This thesis shows the different features of Korean reflexives compared to Japanese reflexives.

In Chapter 1, the differences between Japanese and Korean reflexives are discussed morphologically and syntactically. The general referential relationship of Japanese and Korean reflexives is discussed.

In Chapter 2, empathy expressions of the Japanese reflexive zibun 'self' and Korean reflexive caki 'self' is discussed.

In Chapter 3, the semantic interpretation of the plural form of Japanese and Korean reflexive, zibun-tatí 'selves' and caki-tul 'selves', is discussed.

In Chapter 4, a brief conclusion is presented. Further work on Korean reflexives is necessary to account for Korean anaphora.
INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this thesis is to discuss the several features which pertain to Korean reflexives compared to Japanese reflexives. The general referential relations, empathy expressions of Korean reflexives, and the semantic interpretation of Korean reflexives, caki 'self' and caki-tul 'selves', are examined and the analysis of Korean reflexives will be proposed based on the analysis of Japanese reflexives which many linguistics have talked about.

In Chapter 1, morphological and syntactic differences between Japanese reflexives and Korean reflexives are discussed. The Korean reflexive caki 'self' is bound by a 3rd person NP while another Korean reflexive casin 'self' and the Japanese reflexive zibun 'self' is not. The referential relation between casin 'self' and a 1st (or 2nd) person NP is possible if casin 'self' has a 1st (or 2nd) person NP as its referent inside its own clause and there is no blocking element between them. Korean caki-casin 'self-self' is a non-clause bound reflexive whereas Japanese zibun-zisin 'self-self' is a clause bound reflexive.

In Chapter 2, Empathy expressions of zibun 'self' and caki 'self' is discussed. In Japanese it is impossible for the speaker to describe an action or event which was not performed by himself not from his point of view but from a third person's point of view, while it is possible in Korean. A conflict may occur between boku 'I' (speaker), and zibun 'self' which has the matrix subject NP as its referent in Japanese. In Korean, however, the conflict seldom occurs. The empathy expression of Korean reflexives is not so strong as that of Japanese reflexives as Kuno analyzed.
In Chapter 3, the semantic interpretation of the singular form of Korean reflexive caki 'self' and the plural form caki-tul 'selves' is discussed based on the semantic interpretation of Japanese zibun 'self' and zibun-tati 'selves' analyzed by Akasu. Caki-tul 'selves' not only has a [+group] reading but also has a [-group] reading, whereas zibun-tati 'selves' has only a [+group] reading.
CHAPTER 1

JAPANESE AND KOREAN REFLEXIVES

1.1. Morphological difference

In Japanese and Korean, two kinds of reflexive exist such as Japanese zibun 'self' and zisin 'self', and Korean caki 'self' and casin 'self'. Japanese zisin cannot be used in replacement of zibun whereas Korean casin can be used in replacement of caki. The following table shows the morphological difference between zibun and zisin, and caki and casin.

Table 1. List of English, Japanese and Korean reflexives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th>Korean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>self</td>
<td>zisin</td>
<td>zibun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'self'</td>
<td>'self'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>myself</td>
<td>watasi-zisin</td>
<td>*watasi-zibun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yourself</td>
<td>anata-zisin</td>
<td>*anata-zibun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>himself</td>
<td>kare-zisin</td>
<td>*kare-zibun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>herself</td>
<td>kanozyo-zisin</td>
<td>*kanozyo-zibun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Johnself</td>
<td>John-zisin *</td>
<td>John-zibun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*childself</td>
<td>kodomo-zisin *</td>
<td>kodomo-zibun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*selfself</td>
<td>zibun-zisin *</td>
<td>zisin-zibun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>itself</td>
<td>*sore-zisin *sore-zibun</td>
<td>*sore-casin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*kukes-casin</td>
<td>*kukes-caki</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from the above table, Japanese zisin is similar to Korean casin in that personal pronouns and human nouns can be attached to those reflexives and become compound reflexives. The difference between zisin and casin is that zisin
cannot function as a reflexive pronoun by itself, whereas casin can. If a sentence has zisin or casin attached to a personal pronoun or a human noun, it might have emphatic function as shown in the following example.

JAPANESE

1. a. John ga ie o tateta. 
   house built

   b. John-zisin ga ie o tateta. 
      self

   c. Kare-zisin ga ieo tateta. 
      he self

KOREAN

2. a. John i cip ul ciessta. 
   house built

      self

   c. Ku-casin i cip ul ciessta. 
      he self

ENGLISH

3. a. John built a house.

   b. John himself built a house.

   c. He himself built a house.

The above examples show emphatic use of zisin and casin, as the corresponding English examples show in (3). On the other hand, Japanese zibun or Korean caki has common characteristics in that it can be used as a free morpheme and cannot make compound reflexives.

According to Park(1985), both casin and caki can stand as an independent unit, that is, both can be used as free morphemes, as in the following examples.
4. a. Mary nun casin ul salanhanta.
   self love
   'Mary loves self (herself).'

   b. Mary nun caki lul salanghanta.
   'Mary loves self (herself).'

There are no apparent functional differences in meaning between caki and casin in Korean, when these two reflexives are used as independent syntactic units.

Observe the following Japanese example.

5. a.* Mary wa zisin o aisuru
   love
   'Mary loves self (herself).'

   b. Mary wa kanozyo-zisin o aisuru.
   'Mary loves her own self.'

   c. Mary wa zibun o aisuru.
   'Mary loves self (herself).'

As seen in (5), zibun can be used as a free morpheme; however, zisin cannot be used as a free morpheme. Zisin can be used only as a bound morpheme, as zisin must be used as an element which composes compound reflexive pronouns.

1.2. Syntactic differences

Korean caki and casin can be used as independent reflexive pronouns by themselves like Japanese zibun, and those two Korean reflexives have a lot of syntactic properties in common though they are morphologically distinct. In this section, the general usage of Japanese and Korean reflexives' reference will be analyzed.
Observe the following examples.

**JAPANESE**

   'I blamed myself.'

   b. Anata wa anata-zisin / zibun-zisin / zibun / *zisin o hinansita.
   'You blamed yourself.'

   'John blamed himself.'

**KOREAN**

   'I blamed myself.'

   b. Ne nun ne-casin / ??caki-casin / casin / *caki ul pianhayessta.
   'You blamed yourself.'

   'John blamed himself.'

The above examples show that both zibun and casin are used for all persons while caki is used as a 3rd person-oriented reflexive. (7) shows a clear syntactic difference between caki and casin. The acceptability of caki-casin when na 'I' or ne 'you' is in the subject NP is quite marginal in a Korean simplex sentence. In (7a) and (7b), Korean caki-casin shows a tendency toward a 3rd person-oriented reflexive rather than toward a 1st or 2nd person-oriented reflexive.
The following analysis based on Hirakouji's (1973) is drawn from the above examples.

Analysis A (Simplex sentence)

JAPANESE  
In case the subject is 1st, 2nd, or 3rd person NP

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Sub} & \text{NP} & \text{Obj} \\
\text{NP}_1 & \text{NP-zisin}_1 \rightarrow & \text{NP}_2 \\
\text{} & & \text{NP-zisin}_2 \\
\text{} & & [+\text{pro}] \\
\text{} & \text{NP}_3 & \text{zibun-zisin}_3/\text{zibun}_3
\end{array}
\]

KOREAN  
I. In case the subject is a 1st or 2nd person NP

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{NP}_1 & \text{NP-casin}_1 \rightarrow & \text{NP}_2 \\
\text{} & & ??\text{caki-casin}_2/\text{casin}_2
\end{array}
\]

II. In case the subject is a 3rd person NP

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{NP}_1 & \text{NP-casin}_1 \rightarrow & \text{NP}_2 \\
\text{} & & \text{NP-casin}_2 \\
\text{} & & [+\text{pro}] \\
\text{} & \text{NP}_3 & \text{caki-casin}/\text{caki/casin}_3
\end{array}
\]

Observe the following examples.

JAPANESE

(8) a. John\text{\_} wa Mary\text{\_} to zibun\text{\_} no heya de atta.

'John met Mary in self’s (John’s) room.'

b. John\text{\_} wa Mary\text{\_} ni zibun\text{\_} no heya de benkyo-sase-ta.

'John let Mary study in self’s (John's / Mary's) room.'

(9) a. Boku\text{\_} wa Mary\text{\_} to zibun\text{\_} no heya de atta.

'I / You met Mary in self’s (my / your) room.'
b. Boku\_\_ wa Mary\_\_ ni zibun\_\_ no heya de benkyo-sase-ta.
   Anata\_\_ 'I / You let Mary study in self's (my-/-your/-Mary's) room.'

(10) a. John\_\_ waj boku\_\_ to zibun\_\_ no heya de atta.
   Anata\_\_ 'John met me/you in self's (John's) room.'

b. John\_\_ waj boku\_\_ ni zibun\_\_ no heya de benkyo-sase-ta.
   Anata\_\_ 'John let me/you study in self's (John's / my / your) room.'

KOREAN

(11) a. John\_\_ un Mary\_\_ wa caki\_/casin\_ iy pang ese mannassta.
   'John met Mary in self's (John's) room.'

b. John\_\_ un Mary\_\_ eke caki\_/casin\_ iy pang ese kongbuha-ke-hayessta.
   'John let Mary study in self's (John's / Mary's) room.'

(12) a. \{Na\}_\_ nun Mary\_\_ wa *caki\_/casin\_ iy pang ese mannassta.
   Ne\_\_ 'I met Mary in self's (my / your) room.'

b. \{Na\}_\_ nun Mary\_\_ eke caki\_/casin\_ iy pang ese kongbuha-ke-hayessta.
   Ne\_\_ 'I let Mary study in self's (Mary's) room.'

(13) a. John\_\_ un na\_\_ wa caki\_/casin\_ iy pang ese mannassta.
   Ne\_\_ 'John met me / you in self's (John's) room.'

b. John\_\_ un na\_\_ eke caki\_/casin\_ iy pang ese kongbuha-ke-hayessta.
   Ne\_\_ 'John let me / you study in self's (John's / your) room.'
The following analysis is drawn from the above examples.

Analysis B (simplex sentence)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JAPANESE</th>
<th>NP(1,2,3)</th>
<th>zibun²</th>
<th>NP_j</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KOREAN</td>
<td>I. NP(3)</td>
<td>caki / casin²</td>
<td>NP(3)_j</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II. NP(1,2)</td>
<td>caki / casin²</td>
<td>NP(3)_j</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III. NP(3)</td>
<td>caki / casin²</td>
<td>NP(1,2)_j</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The unacceptability of caki in (12a) arises as caki cannot take 1st or 2nd person in the subject NP as its referent. (13b) shows caki cannot refer to 1st or 2nd person in the object NP either, because caki has 3rd person oriented nature. On the other hand, compared to zibun in (9a) and (9b), casin in (12a) and (12b) can refer to neither na 'I' nor ne 'you', but can refer to only Mary in (12b), though it is not a 3rd person-oriented reflexive as we can see in (7a) and (7b). However, casin in (13b) refers to John or na/ne like zibun in (10b). The following generalization shows in what cases casin refers to na or ne.

Generalization 1

In a Korean simplex sentence a 1st or 2nd person NP can bind casin, only if the NP should be in the nearest place before casin, in other words, there should be no blocking element between the NP and casin.

The blocking element means an intervening NP which blocks the linking the NP to casin.

1. Each number in the parentheses indicates a personal (pro)noun. For example, (1,2) indicates a 1st or 2nd person NP and (3) indicates a 3rd person NP.

2. The subscript (j) means i must refer to zibun and j might refer to zibun in some context. The same reading applies to Korean examples.
From the above examples, we see that casin in (12a) and (12b) cannot refer to na ‘I/ne ‘you’ whereas zibun in the Japanese counterpart example (9a) and (9b) refers to boku ‘I/anata ‘you’, because Mary is the blocking element between na/ne and casin in (12). In the causative sentence (13b), casin can refer to either John, which is the subject of the simplex sentence and is a third person noun, or na/ne, which has no blocking element between na/ne and casin.

Observe the following examples

JAPANESE

(14) a. John, wa [Mary^ ga zibun^ o mini kuru] no o sitteiru.
    see come know

    ‘John knows Mary is coming to see self (John).’

    b. John^ wa [Mary^ ga zibun^ no heya de benkyosuru] no o sitteiru.
    room study know

    ‘John knows Mary studies in self’s (John’s / Mary’s) room.’

(15) a. {Boku^} wa [Mary, ga zibun^ o mini kuru] no o sitteiru.
    {Anata^}

    ‘I / You know Mary is coming to see self (me /you).’

    b. {Boku^} wa [Mary^ ga zibun^ no heya de benkyosuru] no o sitteiru.
    {Anata^}

    ‘I / You know Mary studies in self’s (my / your / Mary’s) room.’

(16) a. John^ wa [boku^ ga zibun^ o mini kuru] no o sitteiru.
    {anata^}

    ‘John knows I / you are coming to see self (John).’

    b. John^ wa [boku^ ga zibun^ no heya de benkyosuru] no o sitteiru.
    {anata^}

    ‘John knows I / you study in self’s (John’s / my / your) room.’

KOREAN
   see come know
   'John knows Mary is coming to see self (John).'

   b. John\_un [Mary\_ka caki\_/casin\_ iy pang ese kongpuhanun] kes ul
      room study
      know
   'John knows Mary studies in self's (John's / Mary's) room.'

(18) a. [Na\_nun [Mary\_ka *caki\_/casin\_ ul pore onun] kes ul alkoissta.
         [Ne\_]
   'I / You know Mary is coming to see self (me / you).'

   b. [Na\_nun [Mary\_ka caki\_/casin\_ iy pang ese kongpuhanun] kes ul
      [Ne\_]
      alkoissta.
   'I / You know Mary studies in self's (Mary's) room.'

      [ne\_]
   'John knows I / you are coming to see self (John).'

   b. John\_un [na\_ka caki\_/casin\_ iy pang ese kongpuhanun] kes ul
      [ne\_]
      alkoissta
   'John knows I / you study in self's (John's / (my / your)) room.'

As seen in (14), (15) and (16), there is no difference in zibun's reference regardless of the personal (pro)noun which zibun refers to. In case of Korean complex sentences, not only caki but also casin can have its referent outside its own clause as (17) shows. The referential relation of caki and casin, however, is more complicated in that the 1st person pronoun, na, and the 2nd person pronoun, ne, in the subject NP of the main clause cannot bind casin in the constituent clause as shown in (18a) and (18b). The unacceptability of the referential relation between John and na 'I'
(or ne 'you') in (19a), though both na/ne and casin are in the same clause, is a semantic problem. The constituent clause of (19a), in which casin refers to na or ne, means '*I come to see myself.' or '*You come to see yourself.' Hence, zibun in (16a) cannot refer to boku 'I' or anata 'you', but can refer only to John. If na and ne is in the subject NP of the constituent clause, they can bind casin in the same clause as shown in (19b). As caki is a 3rd person-oriented reflexive, it cannot be coreferential with na or ne in (18a), (18b), and (19b), whereas its Japanese counterpart zibun in (15a), (15b), and (16b) can. In a Korean complex sentence, casin in the constituent clause can't be bound by a 1st or 2nd person subject NP in the main clause. Casin is bound by a 1st or 2nd person NP in the same clause unless it has a blocking element between caki and the 1st or 2nd person NP.

Observe the following.

(20) a. John\textsubscript{\~} wa [boku\textsubscript{\~} ga Mary\textsubscript{\~} ni zibun\textsubscript{\~};\textsubscript{\~}/\textsubscript{\~} no heya de benkyo-sase-ta] no o sitteiru.

'John knows I let Mary study in self's (John's/my/Mary's) room.'

b. John\textsubscript{\~} un [na\textsubscript{\~} ka Mary\textsubscript{\~} k lul casin\textsubscript{\~};\textsubscript{\~}/\textsubscript{\~} iy pang ese kongpuha-ke-han] kes ul alkoista.

'John knows I let Mary study in self's (John's / Mary's) room.'

Compared to zibun's coreference with John, boku 'I', and Mary in (20a), caki cannot refer to \(\overset{\sim}{n}\) 'I', but can refer to John and Mary in (20b). Though both casin and the 1st person pronoun, na, are in the same clause, casin cannot be linked to na because Mary blocks the linking casin to na according to Generalization 1.

The following analysis is based on the above examples.
Analysis C  (Complex sentence)

Sub Sub

JAPANESE  NP\(x\) [ NP\(y\) zibun_{\alpha\gamma}\]

KOREAN  I. NP(3)\(x\) [ NP(3)_{j} caki_{\alpha\gamma}/ casin_{\alpha\gamma}\]

II. NP(1,2)\(x\) [ NP(3)_{j} caki_{\alpha\gamma}/ casin_{\alpha\gamma}\]

III. NP(3)\(x\) [ NP(1,2)_{j} caki_{\alpha\gamma}/ casin_{\alpha\gamma}\]

1.3. Zibun-zisin vs. Caki-casin

In this section, zibun-zisin and caki-casin's reference in a simplex sentence and complex sentence will be discussed.

1.3.1. Zibun-zisin and caki-casin in a simplex sentence

Observe the following examples.

JAPANESE

(21) a. John\(x\) wa Mary\(j\) ni zibun-zisin_{\alpha\gamma}/ no heya de benkyo-sase-ta.

'John let Mary study in self's (John's / Mary's) room.'

b. Boku\(x\) wa Mary\(j\) ni zibun-zisin_{\alpha\gamma}/ no heya de benkyo-sase-ta.

'I let Mary study in self's (my / Mary's) room.'

c. John\(x\) wa boku\(j\) ni zibun-zisin_{\alpha\gamma}/ no heya de benkyo-sase-ta.

'John let me study in self's (John's / my) room.'

KOREAN

(22) a. John\(x\) un Mary\(j\) eke caki-casin_{\alpha\gamma}/ iy pang ese kongpuha-ke-hayessta.

'John let Mary study in self's (John's / Mary's) room.'

b. Na\(x\) nun Mary\(j\) eke caki-casin_{\alpha\gamma}/ iy pang ese kongpuha-ke-hayessta.
'I let Mary study in self's (Mary's) room.'

c. John un na\_j eke caki-casin,\_jy pang ese kongpuha-ke-hayessta.

'John let me study in self's (John's / ??my) room.'

As can be seen from the above examples, there is no referential difference between (21a), (21b), (21c) and (8b), (9b), (10b), that is, zibun is freely replaceable by zibun-zisin in a Japanese simplex sentence, for it can't make any syntactic or semantic difference. In the case of Korean, however, though caki-casin has a tendency toward 3rd person-oriented reflexive rather than toward 1st or 2nd person-oriented reflexive as does caki in (7), it still a has 1st (or 2nd) person NP as its referent as long as there is no blocking element between them as we can see in (22c). The referential relation between na and caki-casin in (22c) is quite marginal because of the caki-casin's 3rd person-oriented reflexive tendency. In (22b) Mary is the blocking element, that is, Mary blocks the linking na to caki-casin. Hence, caki-casin cannot refer to na in (22b). As seen in (22) caki-casin can be replaced by caki without making any syntactic or semantic difference in a Korean simplex sentence as long as there is no blocking element between caki-casin and a 1st (or 2nd) person NP. The following example supports the above assumption.

KOREAN

(23) a. ??\{Na\_j\} nun caki-casin,\_ul salanghanta.

'I / You love myself / yourself.'

b. ??\{Na\_j\} nun caki-casin,\_iy pang ese kongpuhanta.

'I / You study in self's (my / your) room.'

c. *\{Na\_j\} nun Mary, lul caki-casin,\_iy pang ese ttalyessta.

hit
I / You hit Mary in self’s (my / your) room.’

The referential relation between na/ne and caki-casin in (23a) and (23b) is acceptable while the referential relation between na/ne and caki-casin is unacceptable in (23c), because Mary in (23c) is the element which blocks the linking na/ne to caki-casin. The following generalization is based on the above examples.

Generalization 2

In a Korean simplex sentence, a 1st or 2nd person NP can bind caki-casin as long as there is no blocking element between the NP and caki-casin, while a 3rd person NP can bind caki-casin regardless of whether there is any NP between them.

1.3.2. Zibun-zisin and caki-casin in a complex sentence

Observe the following examples.

JAPANESE


'John said Mary was blaming self ((John) / Mary).'


'I said Mary was blaming self ((me) / Mary).'


'John said I was blaming self ((John) / myself).'

KOREAN


malhayessta.  

said
'John said Mary was blaming self (John / Mary).'

b. Na\_ nun [Mary\_ ka caki\_/caki-casin\_/ ul pinanhako issta] ko
malhayessta.

'I said Mary was blaming self (Mary).'

c. John\_ un [na\_ ka caki\_/caki-casin\_/??\_ ul pinanhako issta] ko
malhayessta.

'John said I was blaming self (John / (??myself)).'

Zibun-zisin in (24a), (24b) and (24c) refers to only the subject NP in its own clause while zibun in (24a), (24b) and (24c) can refer to either the subject NP in the main clause or the subject NP in the constituent clause. Therefore, that zibun-zisin cannot be bound by any NP outside its own clause can be inferred from the above example. Zibun-zisin is restricted to clause bound reflexive use, whereas zibun is not. As seen in (25a), Korean caki-casin can refer to the subject NP, John, in the main clause or the subject NP, Mary, in the constituent clause, and it can be replaced by caki. In (25b) caki-casin which can be replaced by caki refers only to Mary, and caki-casin in (25c) refers to John or na while caki refers only to John. The referential relation between na and caki-casin in (25c) is quite marginal, because caki-casin has a 3rd person-oriented reflexive tendency though it still refers to a 1st or 2nd person NP as mentioned in the preceding section.

Look at the following examples.

\_ I
\_ Ne
\_ You

'I / You love myself / yourself.'
b. John un casin/caki-casin/caki lul salanghanta.

'John loves himself.'

Though caki-casin in (26a) is still grammatical, its acceptability is much lower than casin because of its 3rd person-oriented reflexive tendency. The referential relation between caki-casin and na in (26a) is still possible because the subject NP, na, and caki-casin are in the same clause. Nevertheless, its acceptability is much lower than the referential relation between caki-casin and John in (26b). In (25b) there is no referential relation between caki-casin and the matrix subject, na, because na is outside the clause which contains caki-casin.

Observe the following examples.

JAPANESE

(27) John\(\lambda\) wa [bokuj\(\lambda\) ga [Mary\(\kappa\) ga zibun-zisin\(\kappa\) o hinanse i ru] to itta] no on sitteiru.

'John knows that I said Mary was blaming self (Mary).'

KOREAN

(28) John\(\lambda\) un [na\(\lambda\) ka [Mary\(\kappa\) ka caki-casin\(\lambda/\kappa\) ul pinanhako issta] ko malhaye ssta] nun kes ul alkoissta.

'John knows that I said Mary was blaming self (John / Mary).'

JAPANESE

(29) John\(\lambda\) wa [bokuj\(\lambda\) ga Mary\(\kappa\) o zibun-zisin\(\lambda/\kappa\) no heya de benkyo saseta] no o sitteiru.

'John knows that I let Mary study in self's (my / Mary's) room.'

KOREAN

(30) John\(\lambda\) un [na\(\lambda\) ka Mary\(\kappa\) lul caki-casin\(\lambda/\kappa\) iy pang ese kongpuha kehan]
kes ul alkoissta.

'John knows that I let Mary study in self's (John’s / Mary’s) room.'

Since zibun-zisin is analyzed as a clause bound reflexive, its referent should be Mary in (27) and, boku or Mary in (29), respectively. In Korean, however, as caki-casin is not restricted to being a clause bound reflexive, and it can be bound by the matrix subject John or by the constituent clause subject, Mary, except that it cannot be bound by na which is outside of its own clause in (28). In (30), though na and caki-casin are in the same clause, na can bind caki-casin in the causative clause because Mary blocks the linking na to caki-casin. The following generalization of the referential relation between caki-casin and 1st or 2nd person NP is based on the above examples.

Generalization 3

In a Korean complex sentence, a 1st or 2nd person NP can bind caki-casin, only if it has caki-casin inside its own clause and has no blocking element between the NP and caki-casin. On the other hand, caki-casin can be bound by a 3rd person NP inside and outside its own clause.

Observe the following examples.

JAPANESE

(31) a. [Mary ga zibun-zisin o hinanasita] to iu zizitu ga John o zetuboo e oiyatta. 
blamed fact 
despair drove

'The fact that Mary blamed self (Mary) drove John to despair.'

b. [Mary ga zibun-zisin o hinansita] to iu zizitu ga boku o
zetuboo e oiyatta.

'The fact that Mary blamed self (Mary) drove me to despair.'

c. [Boku, ga zibun-zisin, o hinansita] to iu zizitu ga John, o zetuboo e oiyatta.

'The fact that I blamed self (myself) drove John to despair.'

KOREAN


blamed  fact
despair  drove

'The fact that Mary blamed self (Mary/John) drove John to despair.'

b. [Mary, ka caki-casin, ul pinanhayessta] nun sasil i na, lul celmang e molkokassta.

'The fact that Mary blamed self (Mary) drove me to despair.'

c. [Na, ka caki-casin, ul pinanhayessta] nun sasil i John, ul celmang e molkokassta.

'The fact that I blamed self (?myself/John) drove John to despair.'

(31) shows that zibun-zisin is a clause bound reflexive, whereas (32) shows that caki-casin is not restricted to being a clause bound reflexive. John as well as Mary can bind caki-casin in (32a). Caki-casin in (32b) cannot be bound by na outside its own clause. Na in (31c) can bind caki-casin because it has caki-casin in its clause.

1.4. Summary

In this chapter, it has been shown that Korean caki has 3rd person-oriented nature, whereas casin has all persons as its referent as does Japanese zibun. However, casin's referential relation with a 1st (or 2nd) person NP is very sensitive. The
referential relation between casin and a 1st (or 2nd) person NP is possible if casin has a 1st or 2nd person NP in its own clause and there is no intervening NP that blocks the liking the NP to casin between them.

The domain of the binding of zibun-zisin is restricted to its own clause, while caki-casin is not. Caki-casin has all persons as its referent, though it has a 3rd person-oriented reflexive tendency. Caki-casin can have a 1st (or 2nd) person NP as its referent inside its own clause as long as there is no intervening NP between caki-casin and the NP.
CHAPTER 2

EMPATHY EXPRESSION OF ZIBUN AND CAKI

2.1. Empathy Verbs

Kuno (1977) introduced the concept of "empathy" to describe an event in which the speaker can represent his attitude toward its participants in various ways as the following example shows.

[kuno's]

(1) a. John hit Mary.
   b. John hit his wife.
   c. Mary's husband hit her.

(2) a. Mary was hit by John.
   b. ??John's wife was hit by him. ??His wife was hit by John.
   c. Mary was hit by her husband.

Though all the above examples are identical in content, they are different from each other with respect to "camera angles", in other words, one event can be described in numerous ways from the speaker's view-point. According to Kuno (1986), there are special verbs such as giving and receiving verbs which express empathy, and those verbs make the speaker have specific camera angles in Japanese.

2.1.1. Giving verbs in Japanese

[kuno's]

(3) Taroo gives money to Hanako.
It is impossible to describe this event objectively in Japanese. It should be described either from John's camera angle or Hanako's by the speaker.

(4) a. Taroo ga Hanako ni okane o yaru. (Subject-Centered: from Taroo's money give camera angle)
   'Taroo gave money to Hanako.'

b. Taroo ga Hanako ni okane o kureru. (Dative-Centered: from Hanako's give camera angle)

Though both *yaru* and *kureru* have the meaning of 'give', yaru is used to express the subject's (Taroo's) view-point and kureru is used to express the dative object's (Hanako's) view-point.

Observe the following.

(5) a. yaru: Subject > Dative
   b. kureru: Dative > Subject

(6) a. Boku ga Hanako ni okane o yaru. (Subject-Centered)
   b. *Boku ga Hanako ni okane o kureru. (Dative-Centered)

(7) a. *Taroo ga boku ni okane o yaru. (Subject-Centered)
   b. Taroo ga boku ni okane o kureru. (Dative-Centered)

The empathy relationship in (6) and (7) is as follows:

Subject   Dative

(8) (6a): Speaker(I) > Hanako
   *(6b): Hanako    > Speaker(I)
   *(7a): Taroo    > Speaker(I)
   (7b): Speaker(I) > Taroo

From the above examples, Kuno proposed the following constraint.
(9) Speech-Act Empathy Hierarchy

It is not possible for the speaker to empathize more with someone else than with himself.

Kuno also proposed Descriptor Empathy Hierarchy, which dictates that given descriptor \( X \) (e.g., John) and another descriptor that is dependent upon \( X \), that is, \( f(X) \) (e.g., John’s brother), the relationship \( X > f(X) \) hold.

[Kuno’s]

(10) a. Taroo ga (Taroo no) imooto ni okane o yaru.
    little sister    money

    ‘Taroo gives money to his little sister.’

b.*Taroo ga (Taroo no) imooto ni okane o kureru.

(11) a.?Hanako no niisan ga Hanako ni okane o yaru.
    ‘s big brother

    ‘Hanako’s big brother gives money to Hanako.’

b. Hanako no niisan ga Hanako ni okane o kureru.

The unacceptability of (10b) arises because of the conflict between Dative (Taroo’s little sister) > Subject (Taroo) relationship according to the empathy requirement of kureru and \( X \) (Taroo) > \( f(X) \) (Taroo’s little sister) relationship according to the Descriptor Empathy Hierarchy. As the empathy requirement of \( yaru \) ‘give’ is weaker than that of \( kureru \) ‘give’, the acceptability of (11a) is marginal despite the conflict between subject (Hanako’s big brother) > Dative (Hanako) relationship according to the empathy requirement of yaru, and \( X \) (Hanako) > \( f(X) \) (Hanako’s big brother) relationship according to the Descriptor Empathy Hierarchy.

Kuno revised empathy relationship of \( yaru \) and \( kureru \) based on the above observation as follows:
(12) Empathy Condition on Giving Verbs in Japanese

a. yaru: Subject ≥ Dative

b. kureru: Subject < Dative

2.1.2. Receiving verb in Japanese

Besides these giving verbs, there is a receiving verb morau which performs a similar function according to the speaker's camera angle in describing an event.

[Kuno's]

(13) a. Taroo ga Hanako ni okane o moratta.
   from money received
   'Taroo received money from Hanako.'

b. Boku wa Hanako ni okane o morata.
   'I received money from Hanako.'

c. Hanako ga boku ni okane o moratta.
   'Hanako received money from me.'

From the above examples, Kuno proposed the following constraint.

(14) Empathy Condition on Receiving Verb in Japanese

morau: Subject > Ni-marked NP

Both giving and receiving verbs can form compound verbs as follows:

[Kuno's]

(15) a. Yamada-kun ga uta o utatta.
   song sang
'Yamada sang a song.'
b. Yamada-kun ga uta o utatte kureta.
    'Yamada gave me (the favor of) singing a song.'
c. Boku wa Yamada-kun ni uta o utatte moratta.
    'I received from Yamada (the favor of his) singing a song.'

(15a) is a neutral sentence. (15b) is a sentence from the speaker's camera angle. (15c) is also a sentence from the speaker's viewpoint.

The following shows the empathy constraints on the above compound verbs.

(16) a. -te yaru: Subject > Dative
b. -te kureru: Subject < Dative
c. -te morau: Subject > Ni-marked NP

2.1.3. Giving and receiving verb in Korean

The Korean giving verb cuta and receiving verb patta compared to the Japanese giving verbs yaru, kureru and the receiving verb morau, do not have empathy constraints. They are used as neutral verbs. Observe the following.

(17) a. John i Mary eke don ul cuta.
     to money give
     'John gives money to Mary.'
b. Na ka Mary eke don ul cuta.
     'I give money to Mary.'
c. John i na eke don ul cuta.
     'John gives money to me.'

As can be seen from the above Korean example, (17a) is described objectively by the speaker, that is, (17a) is neutral. One might say (17b) is subject-centered sen-
tence and (17c) is dative-centered sentence, as the empathy relationship in (17b) is Speaker (subjective) > Mary (dative) and (17c) is Speaker (dative) > John (subjective). Contradiction seems to occur in the empathy relationship in a sentence which contains the giving verb cuta. The only explanation of this phenomenon is that the Korean giving verb cuta is neither a subjective-centered verb nor a dative-centered verb, but a neutral verb.

Observe the following examples.

(18) a. John iy yedongsang eke don ul cuta.
    John's little sister money give
    'John gives money to his little brother.'

    b. John iy yedongsang i John eke don ul cuta.
       John's little sister to money give
       'John's little sister gives money to John.'

As seen in (17) and (18), Kuno's Speech-Act Empathy Hierarchy or Descriptor Empathy Hierarchy does not apply to Korean.

Look at the following example.

(19) a. John i Mary eke don ul patassta.
    from money received
    'John received money from Mary.'

    b. Na nun Mary eke don ul patassta.
    'I received money from Mary.'

    c. Mary ka na eke don ul patassta.
    'Mary received money from me.'

As seen in (19), there is no empathy condition on the receiving verb in Korean. The receiving verb patta is also a neutral verb. In sum, a sentence which contains
the giving verb cuta or receiving patta is not restricted by any empathy constraint in
Korean.

2.2. Zibun, caki and empathy issues

Observe the following examples.

JAPANESE

[Kuno's]

(20) Taroo wa [Hanako ga zibun ni kasite-kureta/*yatta zitensya] o
    lend - gave bicycle
    syuuzensita.
    repaired

'Taroo repaired the bike that Hanako gave (him) the favor of lending
to self (Taroo).'

KOREAN

(21) Taroo nun [Hanako ka caki eke pilye-cun cacenke] lul surihayessta.
    lend-gave bicycle repaired

'Taroo repaired the bike that Hanako gave (him) the favor of lending
to self (Taroo).'

(20) is acceptable with kureta, while it is unacceptable with yatta. The
empathy relationship in the embedded clause of (20) is as follows:

(20) zibun: Taroo > Hanako
    kureta: Taroo(Dative) > Hanako(Subjective)
    *yatta: Hanako(Subjective) > Taroo(Dative)

The giving verb, yatta, in (20) raises a conflict in the speaker's empathy focus,
whereas Korean giving verb ,cun, in (21) cannot do so, since it functions as a neutral
verb.

JAPANESE
[Kuno's]
(22) a. *Taro wa [Hanako ga zibun ni okutta kozutumi] o okuri-kaesita.
   'Taroo sent back the parcel that Hanako sent to self (Taroo).'

b. Taro wa [Hanako ga zibun ni okutte-kita kozutumi] o okuri-kaesita.
   'Taroo sent back the parcel that Hanako sent to self (Taroo).'

The verb okuru of the embedded clause in (22a) is not dative-centered,
as shown in the following example.

(24) a. Boku wa Taro ni kozutumi o okutta.
   'I sent a parcel to Taroo.'

b. *Taro wa boku ni kozutumi o okutta.
   'Taroo sent a parcel to me.'

c. Taro wa boku ni kozutumi o okutte-kita / okutte-kureta.
   'Taroo sent a parcel to me.'
'Taroo sent a parcel to me.'

(24a) is a sentence from the speaker's point of view. In (24b) the recipient is the speaker, and it is impossible to describe the event neutrally in Japanese. Seen in (24c), the auxiliary verb kita 'came' and kureta 'gave' show the empathy relationship as: Recipient > Agent.

The empathy relationship of the embedded clause in (22a) is as follows:

(22a) zibun: Taroo > Hanako
okutta: Hanako (Agent) > Taroo (Recipient)

The above contradictory empathy relation shows the conflict in the speaker's empathy focus. The acceptability of (22b) is due to the fact that the auxiliary verb kita 'came' in the embedded clause has Recipient > Agent empathy relationship and no conflict occurs in the speaker's empathy focus. In the case of Korean, on the other hand, both (23a) and (23b) are totally acceptable as neutral sentences. The following is a counterpart example of Japanese (24a) and (24b).

KOREAN

       to parcel       sent

       'I sent a parcel to John.'

b. John un na eke sopo lul ponassta.

       'John sent a parcel to me.'

(25a) is a sentence from speaker's point-of-view. In (25b), though the speaker is the recipient, it is still possible to describe the event neutrally in Korean. The action of 'sending a parcel' belongs to John's territory, not the speaker's. Neverthe-
less, it is possible for the speaker to describe the action or event neutrally in Korean. The speaker can describe an action or event which is or was performed by a third person not from the speaker's view-point but from a third person's view-point in Korean. The following example supports the above assumption.

(26) JAPANESE [Kuno's]

a.*John ga boku ni denwa o kaketa.
phone placed

'John called me up.'

b.*John ga boku o tazuneta.
visited

'John called on me.'

KOREAN

a. John i na eke cenhwa lul kelessta.
to phone placed

'John called me up.'

b. John i na lul pangmunhayessta.
visited

'John called on me.'

Observe the following examples.

JAPANESE

[Kuno's]

(27) a.*Taroo that [boku ga zibun, ni kasita] okane o nakusita.
lent money lost

'Taroo lost the money that I lent to self (Taroo).'

b.?Taroo that [boku ga zibun, ni okane o kasita] koto o wasurete-
money lent has forgotten
simatta.
"Taroo has forgotten that I lent money to self (Taroo)."

KOREAN

   lent money lost

'Taroo lost the money that I lent to self (Taroo).'

b. Taroo, nun [na ka caki eke don ul kkuecun] kes ul ice-pelyessta.
   money lent has forgotten

'Taroo has forgotten that I lent money to self (Taroo).'

In (27a) the conflict between boku and zibun occurs since both are the markers of the speaker's viewpoint. *Zibun (Taroo) > boku 'I' (speaker) empathy relationship makes (27a) unacceptable. (27b) is quite marginal. According to Kuno, (27b) violates the speech-act empathy hierarchy as the relationship Taroo > boku shows. Kuno interpreted (27b) as a direct discourse sentence in a broad sense to resolve the conflict between boku and zibun. The direct discourse sentence derived from (27b) is as follows:

(29) Taroo: Boku wa kimi ga boku ni okane o kasita koto o wasurete-simatta.

'I have forgotten that you lent money to self.'

As a direct discourse sentence like (29) is not restricted by empathy constraint, its indirect discourse version (27b) is not ungrammatical though it is not totally acceptable. In case of Korean, both (28a) and (28b) are totally acceptable. There is no conflict between na and caki in (28) because Korean does have strict empathy constraint like Japanese.
Observe the following examples.

**JAPANESE**

[Kuno's]

(30) a. Yamada^\* wa kare^\* o nikunde iru onna to kekkonsite simatta.
   him hating is woman and marrying ended-up
   'Yamada ended up marrying a woman who hated him'

b. Yamada^\* wa zibun^\* o nikunde iru onna to kekkonsite simatta.
   'Yamada ended up marrying a woman who hated self (Yamada).'

**KOREAN**

(31) a. Yamada^\* nun ku^\* lul miwehako issnun yeca wa kyelhonha periyessta.
   him hating is woman and marrying ended-up
   'Yamada ended up marrying a woman who hated him.'

b. Yamada^\* nun caki^\* lul miwehako issnun yeca wa kyelhonha periyessta.
   'Yamada ended up marrying a woman who hated self (Yamada).'

According to Kuno, the speaker describes the event objectively placed at some distance from Yamada in (30a), and the speaker describes the event subjectively placed to Yamada and expresses Yamada's internal feeling in (30b). In (30b) Yamada knew the woman hated him at the time of marriage or he later came to know she hated him. On the other hand, there is no implication of Yamada's awareness of the fact that she hated him in (31a) and (31b). The only difference is ku 'him' in (31a) refers to Yamada or someone else, but caki in (31b) refers to only Yamada. Therefore, (31b) cannot represent the subject's internal feeling as does its Japanese counterpart example (30b).
Observe the following examples.

JAPANESE

[Kuroda’s]

(32) a. John wa zyuunen mae ni Mary ga zibun o tazunete kita ie de ima ten years ago visiting came house now wa kooohukuni kurasite iru. happily living is 'John now lives happily in the house where Mary came to visit self (John) ten years ago.'

b.*John wa zyuunen mae ni Mary ga zibun o tazunete itta ie de ima went wa kooohukuni kurasite iru. 'John now lives happily in the house where Mary went to visit self (John) ten years ago.'

KOREAN

(33) a. John un sipnyen cen e Mary ka caki lul pangmunha on cip ese cikum ten years ago visiting came house now un hangbokhake salko issta. happily living is 'John now lives happily in the house where Mary came to visit self (John) ten years ago.'

b.*John un sipnyen cen e Mary ka caki lul pangmunha kan cip ese cikum went un hangbokhake salko issta. 'John now lives happily in the house where Mary went to visit self (John) ten years ago.'
The empathy relationship in (32a) and (32b) is as follows:

(32a) Embedded clause:  
- zibun: John > Mary  
- kita: John > Mary  
Main clause: speaker > John  
Empathy relation speaker > John > Mary

(32b) Embedded clause:  
- zibun: John > Mary  
- itta: Mary > John  
Main clause: speaker > John  
Empathy relation *speaker > John > Mary > John

Korean counterpart examples (33a) and (33b) have the same empathy relationship as (32a) and (32b) have. As seen in the above examples, the Korean verb ota 'come' represents the speaker's view-point (speaker's empathy) and the verb kata 'go' represents the agent's view-point (agent's empathy). Hence, caki can be used with the verb ota 'come', as its referent is the speaker's empathy focus.

2.3. Summary

In this chapter, it has been shown that it is possible for the speaker to describe an action or event which is or was performed by the speaker neutrally in Korean, whereas it is impossible in Japanese. A conflict hardly occurs between na 'I' (speaker), and caki because there is few predicates that have the empathy locus compared that Japanese predicates have one empathy locus according to Kuno. The speaker's point of view (or empathy) and the awareness constraint does not play an important role in Korean.
CHAPTER 3
ZIBUN, ZIBUN-TATI VS. CAKI, CAKI-TUL

This section is concerned with investigating sentences which contain zibun 'self', zibun-tatı 'selves' and caki 'self', caki-tul 'selves', and analyzing their semantic interpretation. Tatı is the Japanese and tul is the Korean plural ending morpheme, respectively. The outline of this section is as follows: Korean caki cannot have a [+group] reading, whereas caki-tul can have a [-group] reading as well as a [+group] reading, contrasting with Japanese zibun which cannot have a [+group] reading, whereas zibun-tatı has only a [+group] reading according to Akasu(1982).³

3.1. Semantic Interpretation of the singular reflexive zibun and caki

Observe the following examples.

JAPANESE

(1) a. John ga zibun o hinansita.
   'John blamed self.'

b. John, to Mary wa zibun_j o hinansita.⁴
   'John and Mary blamed self.'

c. *John, to Mary_j wa zibun_k+i o hinansita.⁵

d. Sono futari wa zibun o hinansita.
   The two persons

3. [+group] reading means a Japanese or Korean reflexive refers to more than two individuals as its antecedent, and [-group] reading means it refers to a respective individual as its antecedent.

4. The subscript i/j in this chapter means i and j as a respective individual.

5. The subscript i+j means i and j as one group.
'The two blamed self.'

KOREAN

(2) a. John i caki lul pinanhayessta.
   blamed

b. John\textsubscript{i} kwa Mary\textsubscript{j} nun caki\textsubscript{i,j} lul pinanhayessta.
   and

c. *John\textsubscript{i} kwa Mary\textsubscript{j} nun caki\textsubscript{i,j} lul pinanhayessta.

d. Ku tu salam un caki lul pinanhayessta.
   The two persons

As the above examples show, though singular Japanese and Korean reflexive zibun and caki can have a plural antecedent as well as a singular antecedent, they do not have plural meaning in any case, in other words, neither zibun nor caki can have a [+group] reading. The syntactic difference between (1b) and (1c) or (2b) and (2c) occurs as to 'and' in (1b) and kwa 'and' in (2b) are S-conjunctive particles and to in (1c) and kwa in (2c) are P-conjunctive particles.  

6. According to Kuno (1973a, 1973b), 'NP to NP' in Japanese has the same ambiguity as 'NP and NP' in English.

Observe the following.

JAPANESE
  John to Mary wa gekkonsita.
  John and Mary got married.

KOREAN
  John kwa Mary nun kyelhonhayessta.
  John and Mary got married.

ENGLISH
  John and Mary got married.
  i) "John and Mary got married and became man and wife." (P-conjunctive)
  ii) "John got married and Mary got married, respectively." (S-conjunctive)

If the Japanese particle to (or Korean particle kwa) is interpreted as NP and NP as a group, it is P-conjunctive (for Phrasal conjunctive), otherwise it is S-conjunctive (for Sentential conjunctive).
The semantic interpretation of (1b) and (2b) is "John blamed himself and Mary blamed herself." and the same reading is applicable to (1d) and (2d) as "The one blamed himself and the other blamed himself." The term "distributive" will be used hereafter to represent the above reading. The ungrammaticality of (1c) and (2c) shows that \textit{zibun} and \textit{caki} cannot have a plural reading, that is, both \textit{zibun} and \textit{caki} have only [-group] readings.

3.2. Semantic interpretation of the plural reflexive \textit{zibun-tati} and \textit{caki-tul}

Observe the following examples.

\textbf{JAPANESE}

(3) a. John ga zibun-tati o hinansita.
'John blamed selves (themselves).'
"John blamed himself and other individual(s)."

b. John \textsubscript{x} to Mary \textsubscript{j} wa zibun-tati\textsubscript{x/j} o hinansita. (S-conjunctive)
'John and Mary blamed selves (themselves).'
"John blamed himself and other individual(s) and Mary blamed herself and other individual(s)."

c. John \textsubscript{x} to Mary \textsubscript{j} wa zibun-tati\textsubscript{x+j} o hinansita. (P-conjunctive)
'John and Mary blamed selves (themselves).'
"John and Mary blamed themselves."

d. Sono futari wa zibun-tati o hinansita.
'The two blamed selves (themselves).'

7. See Akasu (1982) for this term.
(i) "The one blamed himself and other individual(s) and the other blamed himself and other individual(s)."

(ii) "The two blamed themselves."

KOREAN

(4) a. John i caki-tul ul pinanhayessta.

"John blamed themselves."

b. John kwa Mary nun caki-tul ul pinanhayessta. (S-conjunctive)

(i) "John blamed himself and Mary blamed herself."

(ii) "John blamed himself and other individual(s) and Mary blamed herself and other individual(s)."

c. John kwa Mary nun caki-tul ul pinanhayessta. (P-conjunctive)

"John and Mary blamed themselves."

d. Ku tu salam un caki-tul ul pinanhayessta.

(i) "The one blamed himself and the other blamed himself."

(ii) "The one blamed himself and other individual(s) and the other blamed himself and other individual(s)."

(iii) "The two blamed themselves."

As can be seen from the above examples, the plural form of Japanese reflexive, zibun-tatij or Korean caki-tul, can appear regardless of whether its antecedent is singular or plural. Zibun-tatij in (3a) or caki-tul in (4a) means 'John and another individual as a group' or 'John and other individuals as a group. The same reading is applicable to other examples. According to Akasu, Japanese zibun-tatij has only a [+group] reading as seen in (3), while zibun has only a [-group] reading (or singular reading). In Korean, however, caki-tul can have a [-group] reading as well as a
[+group] reading as (4b) and (4d) show whereas caki has a [-group] reading only. Caki-tul in (4b) is ambiguous in two ways, as it has not only a [-group] reading like (2b) but also has a [+group] reading like (3d). Ambiguity occurs in (3d) as zibun-tati's antecedent 'sono futari' (the two persons) is interpreted as either two individuals as a group like P-conjunctive phrase or respective individuals like S-conjunctive phrase, that is, (3d) has a [+distributive] reading and a [-distributive] reading.

Observe the following examples.

(5) a. John\(\lambda\) wa Mary\(j\), to zibun-tati\(\lambda+j\) o hin\(\lambda\)nsita.
   'John blamed selves (themselves) with Mary.'

   b.*John\(\lambda\) wa Mary\(j\), to zibun-tati\(\lambda+j\) o hin\(\lambda\)nsita.

(6) a. John\(\lambda\) un Mary\(j\), wa caki-tul\(\lambda+j\) ul pinanhayessta.
   'John blamed selves (themselves) with Mary.'

   b.*John\(\lambda\) un Mary\(j\), wa caki-tul\(\lambda+j\) ul pinanhayessta.

Both the particles, to 'and' in (5) and wa 'and', in (6) function as P-conjunctive, that is, (5) and (6) should not be S-conjunctive. Therefore, (5a) and (6a) have the same semantic interpretation that (3c) and (4c) have. (5a) and (6a) are paraphrased from (3c) and (4c), respectively. The ungrammaticality of (5b) is due to the fact that a sentence in which zibun-tati has a P-conjunctive antecedent cannot have a distributive reading, hence the ungrammaticality of (6b).

3.3. Collective nouns as antecedents of zibun-tati and caki-tul

The following examples show the different semantic interpretation of zibun-tati and caki-tul when each reflexive has a singular antecedent or a plural antecedent which has plural meaning as a collective noun in any case.
Look at the following examples.

**JAPANESE**

(7) a. *Sono team wa zibun no syoori o yorokonda.*
   victory rejoiced
   'The team rejoiced at self’s victory.'

b. *Sono ni team wa zibun no syoori o yorokonda.*
   two
   'The two teams rejoiced at self’s victory.'

c. *Sono team wa zibun-tati no syoori o yorokonda.*
   'The team rejoiced at selves’ victory.'

d. *Sono ni team wa zibun-tati no locker room o soojisita.*
   cleaned
   'The two teams cleaned selves’ locker room.'

**KOREAN**

(8) a. *Ku team un caki iy sungri lul kippehayessta.*
   victory rejoiced
   'The team rejoiced at self’s victory.'

b. *Ku tu team un caki iy sungri lul kippehayessta.*
   two
   'The two teams rejoiced at self’s victory.'

c. *Ku team un caki-tul iy sungri lul kippehayessta.*
   'The team rejoiced at selves’ victory.'

d. *Ku tu team un caki-tul iy locker room ul sojehayessta.*
   cleaned
   'The two teams cleaned selves’ locker room.'

From (7a), (7b) and (8a), (8b), zibun or caki cannot have a collective noun which has plural meaning such as a team, group, family and organization as its antecedent
though the subject NP has a singular form in (7a) and (8a), whereas zibun-tati or caki-tul can have such as antecedent as shown in (7c), (7d) and (8c), (8d).

From the above examples, it can be inferred that zibun-tati or caki-tul has only a [+group] reading if its antecedent is a collective noun regardless of whether it has a singular or plural form. (7d) and (8d) are ambiguous in two ways as both have a [+group] reading with a [+distributive] reading and a [-distributive] reading as: i) The two teams cleaned their locker rooms (together) ii) The one team cleaned its locker room and the other team cleaned its locker room.

The following table based on Akasu's analysis shows the different semantic interpretation between Japanese and Korean reflexive.
Table 2. Reading table of Japanese and Korean reflexives

**JAPANESE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule</th>
<th>Antecedent</th>
<th>Reflexive</th>
<th>Reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>singular</td>
<td>zibun</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>S-conjunctive NP</td>
<td>zibun</td>
<td>+distributive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>P-conjunction NP</td>
<td>zibun</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>plural</td>
<td>zibun</td>
<td>+distributive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>singular</td>
<td>zibun-tati</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>S-conjunctive NP</td>
<td>zibun-tati</td>
<td>+distributive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>P-conjunctive NP</td>
<td>zibun-tati</td>
<td>-distributive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>plural</td>
<td>zibun-tati</td>
<td>+distributive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collective noun</td>
<td>singular</td>
<td>zibun-tati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>plural</td>
<td>zibun-tati</td>
<td>+distributive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KOREAN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule</th>
<th>Antecedent</th>
<th>Reflexive</th>
<th>Reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1’</td>
<td>singular</td>
<td>caki</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2’</td>
<td>S-conjunctive NP</td>
<td>caki</td>
<td>+distributive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3’</td>
<td>P-conjunctive NP</td>
<td>caki</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4’</td>
<td>plural</td>
<td>caki</td>
<td>+distributive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5’</td>
<td>singular</td>
<td>caki-tul</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6’</td>
<td>S-conjunctive NP</td>
<td>caki-tul</td>
<td>+distributive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7’</td>
<td>P-conjunctive NP</td>
<td>caki-tul</td>
<td>-distributive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8’</td>
<td>plural</td>
<td>caki-tul</td>
<td>+distributive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collective Noun</td>
<td>singular</td>
<td>caki-tul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9’</td>
<td>plural</td>
<td>caki-tul</td>
<td>+distributive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The readings include both the distributive and non-distributive forms.*
As can be seen from the above table, the only difference between the two reflexives is \textit{caki-tul} can have a [-group] reading only if a sentence has a distributive reading, except in case \textit{caki-tul}'s antecedent is a collective noun. On the other hand, \textit{zibun-tati} has only a group reading regardless of whether a sentence has a distributive or non-distributive reading. Strictly speaking, Japanese rule 6 has ambiguous meaning, that is, (3b) is ambiguous in two ways: (i) John blamed himself and other individual(s) and Mary blamed herself and other individual(s), (ii) John blamed himself and Mary and Mary blamed herself and John. The same interpretation occurs in case of Korean \textit{caki-tul} in (4d).

Observe the following Abe's (1977) examples.\(^8\)

\textbf{JAPANESE}

(9) a. Dark Ducks wa \textcolor{red}{*zibun/zibun-tati no manager o kiratte iru.}  \\
\textcolor{blue}{'\text{hating} \text{is} \text{}} \text{The members of} \text{Dark Ducks hate selves' (their) manager.'}  \\
b. Taroo to hanako wa \textcolor{red}{*zibun/zibun-tati no kalsya no mae de wakareta.}  \\
\textcolor{blue}{'\text{company front parted} \text{Taroo and Hanako parted in front of selves' (their) company building.'}}  \\
c. Usagi to kame wa issyoni \textcolor{red}{*zibun no ie ni kaetta.}  \\
\textcolor{blue}{'\text{rabbit tortoise} \text{The rabbit and the tortoise went back to selves' home, together.'}}  \\
c'. Usagi to kame wa issyoni \textcolor{red}{zibun-tati no ie ni kaetta.}  \\
\textcolor{blue}{'\text{The rabbit and the tortoise went back to selves' (their) home, together.'}}

---

8. The Abe's examples are cited from Akasu's (1982) 'Semantic Interpretation of Japanese Reflexives', Lexicon II.
(10) a. Dark ducks nun *caki/caki-tul iyu manager lul miwehako issta.  
   hating is
   'The members of) Dark Ducks hate selves’ (their) manager.'

b. Taroo wa Hanako nun *cak/caki-tul iy hosa ap ese heyejyessta.  
   company front parted 
   'Taroo and Hanako parted in front of selves’(their) company building.'

c. Tokki wa kebuk un hamkke caki iy cip uro tolakassta.  
   rabbit tortoise together house went back
   'The rabbit and tortoise went back to self’s home, together.'

c'. Tokki wa kebuk un hamkke cakitul iy cip uro tolakassta.  
   'The rabbit and tortoise went back to selves’ (their) home,  
   together.'

Zibun in the above example and caki in (10a), (10b) are unacceptable while caki in (10c) is acceptable. The ungrammaticality of zibun in (9a) and caki in (10a) arises since it violates the Rule 9 and Rule 9' respectively. The subject NP Dark ducks should be treated as a collective noun such as a club or team. The following example supports the above assumption.

(11) Yankees wa *zibun/zibun-tati no manager o sonkeisite iru.  
   respect
   '(The players of) the Yankees respect selves’ (their) manager.'

The ungrammaticality of zibun in (9b) and caki in (10b) is not a syntactic problem but a pragmatic problem. The particle to 'and' in (9b) and wa 'and' in (10b) cannot function as a sentence-conjunctive particle but as a phrase-conjunctive particle. In Japanese and Korean, such verbs as wakareru 'part' and au 'meet' are P-conjunctive. They need object-like NP after subject NP and particle to (in case of
Korean, particle wa) which follows object-like NP.

The following shows the usage of P-conjunctive particle to with the verb wakareru.

JAPANESE

(12) a. *John wa wakareta.
   'John parted.'
   b. John to Mary wa wakareta.
   'John and Mary parted.'
   c. John wa Mary to wakareta.
   'John parted from Mary.'

Observe the following paraphrased example from (9b).

(13) a. Taroo wa Hanako to *zibun, no kaisya no mae de wakareta.
   'Taroo parted from Hanako in front of self's company building.'
   b. Taroo wa Hanako to zibun-tati, no kaisya no maede wakareta.
   'Taroo parted from Hanako in front of selves'(their) company building.'

As the particle to is P-conjunctive in the above example, zibun is not acceptable in (13a) according to Rule 3.

Observe the following examples.

JAPANESE

(14) a. Taroo to Hanako wa tomodati to zibun no kaisya no mae de friends
   wakareta.
   'Taroo parted from friends in front of his company building and
Hanako parted from friends in front of her company building.

b. Taroo to Hanako wa tomodati to zibun-tati no kaisya no mae de wakareta.

i) "Taroo parted from friends in front of their company building and Hanako parted from friends in front of their company building."

ii) "Taroo parted from friends in front of his company building and Hanako parted from friends in front of her company building."

(15) a. Taroo to Hanako wa zibun no kaisya no mae no restaurant de steak o tabeta.

"Taroo and Hanako ate steak at the restaurant in front of self's (his / her) company building, (respectively)."

b. Taroo to Hanako wa zibun-tati no kaisya no mae no restaurant de steak o tabeta.

"Taroo and Hanako ate steak at the restaurant in front of selves' (their) company building, (together)."

In (14a), and (14b) the first particle to can be either P-conjunctive or S-conjunctive, but the second one should be only P-conjunctive as shown in (13). The Rule 2 is applicable to (14a) and Rule 6 & 7 are applicable to (14b). As the particle to 'and' in (15) can be either S-conjunctive or P-conjunctive, both zibun and zibun-tati are acceptable.

As Akasu indicates that issyoni 'together' does not take S-conjunctive NP but does take P-conjunctive NP in Japanese, (9c) is ungramatical, but (9c') with zibun-tati is gramatical according to Rule 3 and Rule 7, respectively. However, in case of Korean (10c), hamkke 'together' can take either P-conjunctive NP or S-conjunctive NP. So Rule 2' and 3' apply to (10c), and Rule 6' and 7' apply to (10c'). (10c'),
therefore, has i) a [+distributive] and [-group] reading, ii) a [+distributive] and [+group] reading, and iii) a [-distributive] and [+group] reading as follows: i) The rabbit returned to self's home and the tortoise returned to self's home, together. (same reading as 10c) ii) The rabbit returned to selves' home and the tortoise returned to selves' home, together. iii) The rabbit and the tortoise returned to selves' home, together.

Observe the following examples.

JAPANESE

(16) a. Usagi to kame wa sorezore zibun no ie ni kaetta.
   rabbit tortoise respectively
   b. Usagi to kame wa sorezore zibun-tati no ie ni kaetta.
      'The rabbit and the tortoise returned self's/selves' home,
      respectively.'

KOREAN

(17) a. Tokki wa kebuk un kakkak caki iy cip uro tolakassta.
   rabbit tortoise respectively
   b. Tokki wa kebuk un kakkak caki-tul iy cip uro tolakassta
      'The rabbit and the tortoise returned self's/selves' home,
      respectively.'

As sorezore 'respectively' in (16) and kakkak 'respectively' in (17) cannot take P-conjunctive NP's but take S-conjunctive NP's, (16a) and (17a) have a [+distributive] and [-group] reading and (16b) and (17b) have a [+distributive] and [+group] reading according to Rule 2 & 2' and Rule 6 & 6', respectively.

The following example is from Akasu.

JAPANESE
(18) a. Taroo wa Tokyo ni, Ziroo wa Oosaka ni sorezore rippa na ikken no respectively splendid a house

ie o motte ita. Nimokakawarazu, Taroo to Ziroo wa sorezore zibun have nevertheless

no ie ni hi o tuketesimatta. fire set ( fire )

b. *Taroo wa Tokyo ni, Ziroo wa Oosaka ni sorezore rippa na ikken no

ie o motte ita. Nimokakawarazu, Taroo to Ziroo wa sorezore

zibun-tati no ie ni hi o tuketesimatta.

'Taroo had a splendid house in Tokyo and Jiroo in Osaka. Nevertheless, Taroo and Jiroo set fire to self's (his) / selves' (their) house(s), respectively.'

KOREAN

(19) a. Taroo nun Tokyo e, Ziroo nun Oosaka e hakkak hulryunghan hance iy respectively splended a house

cip ul kaciko issta. Kulemetopulkuhako, Taroo wa Ziroo nun have nevertheless

kakkak caki iy cip e pul ul cilleperiessta. respectively fire set ( fire )

b. Taroo nun tokyo e, Ziroo nun Oosaka e hakkak hulryunghan hance iy

cip ul kaciko issta. kulemetopulkuhako, Taroo wa Ziroo nun

kakkak caki-tul iy cip e pul ul cilleperiessta.

'Taroo had a splendid house in Tokyo and Jiroo in Osaka. Nevertheless, Taroo and Jiroo set fire to self’s (his) / selves' (their) house(s), respectively.'

The exact meaning of (18a) is 'Taroo and Jiroo set fire to his own house, respectively.' according to Rule 2 which has a [+distributive] and [-group] reading. Rule
6 is not applicable to (18b), since the sentence has only a [-group] reading. If Taro and Jiro have more than two houses, respectively, zibun-tati in (18b) is acceptable since it has a [+group] reading. In case of Korean, caki and caki-tul in (19) are both acceptable. Caki in (19a) is acceptable as the same way that zibun is acceptable in (18a). Rule 6' can explain why caki-tul is acceptable in (19b). According to Rule 6', a sentence in which caki-tul has a S-conjunctive antecedent can have either a [+group] reading or a [-group] reading. As Taro and Jiro have only one house, respectively, a [+group] reading cannot occur in (19). Only a [-group] reading in Rule 6' is applicable to (19). In other words, there is no semantic difference between caki and caki-tul in (19).

3.4. Summary

In this chapter, I have discussed how Korean reflexive caki and caki-tul can be interpreted compared to Japanese reflexive zibun and zibun-tati. First, as I have discussed, they have common characteristics in that zibun and caki have only [+distributive] readings regardless of whether the antecedent is plural or singular; and zibun-tati and caki-tul can have [-distributive] readings except that the plural form of subject NP is distributed to the respective antecedents of zibun-tati or caki-tul. Second, as I have discussed, caki and zibun have only [-group] readings, and caki-tul has a [+group] reading as well as a [-group] reading, whereas zibun-tati has only a [+group] reading, as Akasu has analyzed.
CHAPTER 4

CONCLUSION

In this thesis, I have examined and analyzed the general referential relation between Korean reflexives and personal NP's as their referents. In Korean caki requires only a 3rd person NP as its referent, and casin takes a 1st, 2nd, or 3rd person NP as its referent, though the reference of casin is restricted by a 1st or 2nd person NP. On the other hand, the reference of zibun is not restricted by any personal NP in Japanese. The Korean reflexive caki-casin is bound by a 1st or 2nd person NP inside its own clause and is bound by a 3rd person NP inside or outside its own clause, contrasting with the Japanese reflexive zibun-zisin is bound by any personal NP inside its own clause.

In regard to empathy expressions, the fact that caki can hardly be the empathy locus and a conflict between caki in an embedded clause and the speaker, 'I', seldom occurs shows that the empathy constraint of caki is much weaker in Korean than that of zibun in Japanese.

The plural form of Korean reflexive caki-tul not only has a [+]group reading but also has a [−group] reading if its antecedent is distributed to respective individual, while Japanese zibun-tati has only a [+]group reading.

This thesis is mostly based on the books and papers in which many linguists have discussed the Japanese reflexive zibun. More sophisticated work on Korean reflexives is necessary to account for Korean anaphora. I hope this thesis will be helpful to those who want to discuss and analyze Korean reflexives as well as Japanese reflexives more specifically in the future.
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