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- Experimental study of Korean anaphors cachey and caki-casin
- Inanimacy Strategy with cachey to establish baseline of core binding
- Testing the effect of logophoricity on exempt binding with caki-casin

Background on Condition A
- Chomsky 1986: An anaphor must be bound within the smallest XP containing a subject distinct from the anaphor.

\[ \text{[YP} \ldots \text{XP Subject} \ldots \text{Anaphor} \ldots \ldots] \]


An anaphor must be bound by its coargument.

Exemptions:
1. Bill said that the rain has damaged pictures of himself. [PS’92] How to identify exempt anaphors?
2. [PS’92, RR’93]: Anaphor is exempt if it lacks a coargument.
3. BUT same criterion to define both Condition A and exemption!

Logophoricity:
- Charnavel \& Sportiche 2016: Exempt anaphors are logophoric, i.e. they need to be anteceded by perspective holders.

Caki-casin can be long-distance (LD) bound [Kim \& Yoon 2009]
- Against coargumenthood theory (exempt in coargument position)
- Assumption:
  - TSC (Tensed-S Condition) violation allowed for core anaphors
  - SSC (Specified Subject Condition) violation not allowed
  - TSC-violating caki-casin also seems exempt.

Research Goals:
1. Define the domain of locality for Korean (TSC vs. SSC)
2. Test for effect of logophoricity on licensing exempt anaphors

Study 1: Inanimate anaphor cachey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inanimacy Test</th>
<th>[CS’16]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inanimates cannot be logophoric/have perspective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Condition A without the confound of logophoricity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Local, c-commanding antecedent

2. [i senpak]-un cachey,-uy chwucinylek-ulo wumciki-n-ta. [This ship], moves using its, momentum.'

B. Local, non-c-commanding

3. *[i kwail]-uy caypaya-nun cachey,-uy khentisyen-ey papoapun-%un
   [This fruit], grows checks its, condition often.'

C. Non-local, c-commanding (includes TSC)

4. *[i os]-un cuwin-i cachey,-lul cikye ipun-ta-nun kes-ul poycwunta.
   [This clothing], shows that the owner likes to wear it, often.'

5. *[i sosel]-un cachey,-uy cece-ka apu-ta-nun kes-ul poycwunta.
   [This novel], shows that its, owner is sick.'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>TSC-violating cachey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rating out of 6</td>
<td>4.675</td>
<td>2.452</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.303</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Local, c-commanding condition rated significantly higher than in non-c-commanding or non-local condition.
- If antecedent appears outside smallest TP, rating significantly lower
  - Including TSC-violating conditions
  - Domain of Condition A is no larger than smallest tensed TP

Study 2: Animate anaphor caki-casin
- Same structural variation, with an additional variable: logophoricity

C. Non-local, c-commanding

- Attitude Holder (AH)

The antecedent is the intellectual perspective holder. [Charnavel 2014]

- Epiphith Test: An epithet in AH context cannot refer to the AH. [C’14]

   ‘CN, thinks that regular exercise is changing {a. her, / b. *[the idiot]},’
   [Group C, +A]

B. Local, non-c-commanding

- Empathy Locus (EL)

The sentence takes the “mental perspective of” the antecedent.

(Sibling contexts are different from attitude contexts)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anaphor/antecedent</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cachey</td>
<td>4.675</td>
<td>2.452</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average rating of non-c-commanding antecedent sentences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-empathy</th>
<th>Empathy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cachey</td>
<td>2.452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caki-casin</td>
<td>2.724</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusions:
- Korean anaphors must have a c-commanding antecedent in the smallest TP containing them (TSC Violation not allowed).
- Logophoricity is a crucial factor in licensing exempt anaphors.
- Supporting the CS’16 version of the Chomskyan Condition A with a logophoricity-based theory of exemption.
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