Logophoricity vs. Indexical shifting of person pronouns in Korean

Hyuna B. Kim(University of Southern California)

Korean is one of the languages that have peculiar long distance anaphors(LDAs), as in (1a), which is called a logophor(Sells 1987, Huang & Liu 2001): it has several types of logophor such as '*caki, casin, or caki-casin*' that are often considered to correspond to '*zibun or zibun-zisin*' in Japanese, or '*zuji or ta-zuji*' in Chinese. At the same time, Korean is one of the languages that exhibit indexical shifting, as in (2a-b), like Amharic(Schlenker 1999, 2003) or Zazaki/Slave(Anand & Nevins 2004). The study on the former issue about a Korean logophor '*caki*' has been occupied by the syntactic licensing condition of its distribution(Yoon 1989, Gill 1999, Kim&Yoon, 2006). The latter has been studied focusing the semantic mechanism of shifting for which there are suggested the lexical underspecification analysis(Schlenker 2003), the feature-based binding approach(Stechow 2002), and the context-shifting operator approach(Anand & Nevins 2004), even though indexical shifting in Korean never receives an attention in those studies. However, the syntactic/semantic relation between the two interesting phenomena, logophoricity and indexical shifting, has not been fully discussed. In the present paper, it is investigated how the two items, a logophor and a shifted person indexical, interact with each other, and it is proposed that a logophor '*caki*' remains unsaturated inside the frozen domain of CP created by the shifting operator introduced by a shifted indexical '*na*(=I),' producing a problem to interpretation.

Anand & Nevins(2004) proposes an analysis of logophors as denoting coordinates of index parameters, suggested as in $[[\text{Log-auth}]]^{c,i}=\text{AUTH}(i)$, where a logophor is treated in the same way with a shifted person indexical. However, it cannot account for the way logophors interact with shifted person indexicals. First, Anand & Nevins(2004) have to posit an *ad hoc* stipulation of the so-called 'Context blocking' such that *Do not use a logophor when an indexical could be used.* But, it does not hold in embedded imperative sentences in Korean, as shown in (4a) and (4b): a logophor can be used in the same context where a shifted person indexical appears. More interestingly, indexical shifting does not take place when a logophor is around, that is, whether embedded or embedding, as in (4c) and (4d). The semantic constraint of the blocking effect in multiple embedding, proposed by Anand & Nevins(2004) is not applicable to (4d): because '*caki*(=self)' is deeply embedded, lower than the 1st person pronoun '*na*(=I),' there is no intervening shiftable person indexical between '*na*(=I)' and the matrix subject 'Wang(=the king)', thereby nothing preventing '*na*(=I)' from being shifted. Nevertheless, it turns out that indexical shifting is not allowed in (4d) as well as (4c). Finally, if logophors and shifted indexicals are the same kind according to Anand & Nevins(2004), it is mysterious the fact that while the double occurrence of a shifted indexical or a logophor is allowed as in (4a)/(4b), the occurrence of a shifted indexical and a logophor together is banned, as in (4c)/(4d).

Adopting Anand & Nevins(2004)'s analysis, it is proposed that Korean has an optional context-shifting operator: Korean: $[[\text{OP}_{\forall}[\alpha]]]^{c,i} = [[\alpha]]^{i,i}$. The ambiguity of (2) is accounted for by the absence and presence of the shifting operator, yielding the non-shifted '**I**' in (2-Reading #A) and the shifted *I(=John)* in (2-Reading #B) respectively. Going further from Anand & Nevins(2004)'s '*shift-together constraint,*' we suggest that the context-shifting operator forms a frozen domain up to a CP boundary where all shiftable indexicals have to be shifted and only indexicals can be shifted; logophors cannot be shifted and they have to treated differently from shifted indexicals. It follows that logophors are not affected by the context shifting operator in determining their antecedent. However, what is meant by the frozen domain created by the context-shifting operator, is that the operator does not allow any non-shifting anaphors inside to build a dependency relation from outside its domain. Given this in one side, in the proposed analysis, we take the assumptions by Giorgi(2006) inspired by Higginbotham(1997) such that logophors are the spell out of an unsaturated theta-position that is to be saturated through the theta-identification with its possible antecedent. If they are not saturated to the end, a sentence turns out to be unacceptable. Combining the two above, a Korean logophor '*caki*' in (4c) and (4d) is within the frozen CP domain of the shifting operator and are not able to build an anaphoric relation outside the domain,

thereby remaining unsaturated, which makes (4c) as well as (4d) uninterpretable: though '***nay**(=I)*' in (4c) is deeply embedded, the domain of the shifting operator is the CP, the complement of saying verb, as well.

Examples:

(1) **Korean:** *a logophor 'caki'*
   a. John-un [Bill-i   ***caki*** tongsang-ul coaha-n-ta]-ko   malhay-ess-ta.
      John-Top Bill-Nom self sister-Acc   like-PRS-Dcl.-Comp say-PST-Dcl.
      'John said that Bill likes **self(=John/Bill)**'s sister.'
   b. John-un [nay-ka   ***caki*** tongsang-ul coaha-n-ta]-ko   malhay-ess-ta.
      John-Top I-Nom   self sister-Acc   like-PRS-Dcl.-Comp   say-PST-Dcl.
      'John said that I like **self(=John's/*my)** sister.'

(2) **Korean:** *shifting of person indexicals*
   John-un [***Nay***-ka yeongwong-i-∅-ra(=ta)]-ko   malhay-ess-ta.
   John-Top   I-Nom hearo-Copular-PRS-Dcl.-Comp say-PST-Dcl.
      (i) Reading A: 'John said that **I** am a hero.'
      (ii) Reading B: 'John said that ***I(=John)*** am a hero.'

(3) **Korean:** *No blocking effect by person indexicals, 'na(=I)' or 'ne(=you)'*
   John-un [***Nay***-ka ***caki***-lul pinanha-koiss-∅-ta]-ko   malhay-ess-ta.
   John-Top   I-Nom self-Acc criticize-PROG-PRS-Dcl.-Comp say-PST-Dcl.
      (i) Reading A: 'John said that **I** was criticizing ***self***(=John).'
      (ii) ~~Reading B~~: 'John said that **I** was criticizing ***myself***.'

(4) **Korean:** *a logophor 'caki' & a shifted 1ˢᵗ person indexical 'na'*

a. Wang-un cumcangi-eykey [[***caki***-ka kku-n]   kkum-ul ***caki***-eykey malha-ra]-ko   malhay-ess-ta.
   King-Top fortune teller-to self-Nom dream-PST dream-Acc self-to say-Imp-Comp say-PST-Dcl.
   (i) Reading A: 'The king ordered(said) a fortune teller to tell **self(=the King)** what dream **self(=K)** dreamed.'
   (ii) Reading B: 'The king ordered(said) a fortune teller to tell **self(=the Fortune Teller)** what dream **self(=?FT)**
             dreamed.'

b. Wang-un cumcangi-eykey [[***nay***-ka kku-n]   kkum-ul ***nay***-key malha-ra]-ko   malhay-ess-ta.
   King-Top fortune teller-to I-Nom dream-PST dream-Acc I-to   say-Imp-Comp say-PST-Dcl.
   (i) Reading A: 'The king ordered(said) a fortune teller to tell ***me(=K)*** what dream ***I(=K)*** dreamed.'
   (ii) Reading B: 'The king ordered(said) a fortune teller to tell ***me(=SU)*** what dream **I(=SU)** dreamed.'
                                       *<SU=the speaker of the utterance>
   (iii) ~~Reading C~~: 'The king ordered(said) a fortune teller to tell ***me(=K)*** what dream **I(=SU)** dreamed.'
   (iii) ~~Reading D~~: 'The king ordered(said) a fortune teller to tell **me(=SU)** what dream ***I(=K)*** dreamed.'

c. Wang-un cumcangi-eykey [[***caki***-ka kku-n]   kkum-ul   ***na***-eykey malha-ra]-ko malhay-ess-ta.
   King-Top fortune teller-to self-Nom dream-PST dream-Acc self-to say-Imp-Comp say-PST-Dcl.
   (i) Reading A & B: 'The king ordered(said) a fortune teller to tell **self(=K/FT)** what dream **I(=SU)** dreamed.'
   (ii) ~~Reading C & D~~: 'The king ordered(said) a fortune teller to tell **self(=K /FT)** what dream ***I(=K)*** dreamed.'

d. Wang-un cumcangi-eykey [[***nay***-ka kku-n]   kkum-ul   ***caki***-eykey malha-ra]-ko malhay-ess-ta.
   King-Top fortune teller-to self-Nom dream-PST dream-Acc self-to   say-Imp-Comp say-PST-Dcl.
   (i) Reading A & B: 'The king ordered(said) a fortune teller to tell **self(=K/FT)** what dream **I(=SU)** dreamed.'
   (ii) ~~Reading C & D~~: 'The king ordered(said) a fortune teller to tell **self(=K/FT)** what dream ***I(=K)*** dreamed.'

Selected References:

Anand, P. & Nevins, A. (2004), Shifty operators in changing context. *Proceedings of SALT XIV*.

Giorgi, A. (2006). From temporal anchoring to long distance anaphors, *Nat Lang Linguist Theory 24.*

Giorgi. A., & Pianise, F. (1997). *Tense and Aspect*: From semantics to morphosyntax, New York: Oxford
          University Press.

Higginbotham, J. (1997). A plea for implicit anaphora, *Atomism and binding(eds)*, Dordrecht.

Huang, J., & Liu, L. (2001). Logophoricity, attitudes, and *ziji* at the interface, *Long-distance reflexives*,
          New York. Academic Press.

Schlenker, P. (2003). A Plea for Monsters (2003), *Linguistics & Philosophy* 26: 29-120.

Kim, J.H., & Yoon, J. (2006). The exempt binding of local anaphors, presented at JK conference 2006.