Topic and Binding in Korean

Kook-Hee Gill
Department of Linguistics
University of Edinburgh
gil@ling.ed.ac.uk

1 Introduction

One of the long established characteristics of languages such as Chinese, Japanese, and Korean is their context dependence; or to put it in Li & Thompson (1976)'s terminology, their "topic-orientedness". Unlike other pro-drop languages (e.g., those in the Romance family) empty pronouns in East Asian languages are licensed not by strong agreement but their ability to be identified via strong contextual/discourse features. These languages also consistently exhibit long-distance anaphoric patterns (ziji in Chinese, zibun in Japanese, and caki in Korean). The relevance of contextual factors in accounting for long-distance anaphora has also been repeatedly stressed in the literature in various forms (Perspective (Iida 1996), Logophoricity (Sells 1987) or Point of view (Kuroda 1973; Banfield 1982; Zribi-Hertz 1989)). One the other hand, syntactic conditions such as the subjecthood condition which states that the Japanese Long-Distance Anaphor *zibun* allows a subject antecedent, but not a nonsubject one (Kuroda 1965; Kuno 1973) have also been put forward for the explanation of Long-Distance Anaphora. It is not, however, always clear whether these conditions are proposed in order to replace the contextual ones or to be taken in conjunction with them.

The aim of this paper is to reconsider a very widely discussed set of data in Korean, usually cited in favour of the contextual/discourse approach to Long-distance anaphora and to provide a rather simple syntactic account for the phenomena, independently of discourse conditions. I argue that *caki*-binding in the relevant data is very closely related to topicalised d constructions which, as I argue, are closely related to the null topic constructions and share the same underlying structure with the double nominative construction in Korean.

2 Relevant Data and Previous Accounts

What makes *caki*-binding distinctive from its counterpart reflexive in English is that *caki* may be indefinitely far from their antecedent. However, it is also a case of long-distance anaphora in the sense that it can be bound by *a Topic* in a non-argument position which, by Principle A of the Binding Theory, stays outside the binding domain . This is illustrated in the following:

(1) John$_i$-**un caki**$_i$-ka ka-ss-ta
John-**top self**-NOM go-PAST-DSE
'**As for John**$_i$, **self**$_i$-NOM went'

(2) **John**$_i$**-un caki**-uy ayin-i Seoul-e ga-pelyessta
John-TOP **self**-GEN lover-NOM Seoul-to go-PERF
'**As for John**$_i$ **self**$_i$'s lover has gone to Seoul'

(1) and (2) show the case where a topic-marked noun phrase antecedes *caki* The difference between the two is that in the former, *caki* occurs in the subject position and in the latter in the genitive case embedded within the subject NP. These examples are often considered as a case of discourse binding with an emphasis on the discourse functions of topic (See Huang (1984)) There is also a set of data which have been provided as the evidence of the discourse based account of long-distance anaphora. The following is one of those examples in Korean:

(3) A. Mary$_i$-ka ku pati-e kass-ni anim tarun salam-i taysin kass-ni?
Mary-NOM the party-to went-Q or other person-NOM instead go-Q
'Is it Mary$_i$ who went to the party or somebody else instead?'

B. Ani, **caki**$_i$-ka kasse
No, **self**$_i$-NOM went
'No, **self**$_i$ went'

(3) illustrates an exchange between two speakers A and B. In A's utterance, *Mary* is mentioned and remains a prominent topic throughout the exchange. In B's utterance, *caki* occurs without any overtly expressed antecedent in its own sentence. As the indexing indicates, *caki* is anteceded by *Mary*. This sort of example have been cited in most of the literature as a case of discourse-binding (Huang 1984; Ueda 1984). In fact, *caki* in (3) looks as if it was bound in discourse. In other words, with no possible antecedent available in its own sentence, it looks for its antecedent into the previous discourse. In this case, *caki* is bound by the prominent topic *Mary* in the discourse which is coindexed with the subject in the initial utterance (A).

The reason that discourse binding applies to these examples is that *topic* is viewed as a discourse function interpreted as what is being talked about or what is presupposed or understood by *the speaker*. This definition of topic is well suited for the notion of *Perspective* or *Point of view* used in the discourse based accounts of Long-distance anaphora. However, even if such discourse conditions explain the data given, it still remains in a rather abstract level unless there is a way to disambiguate the right antecedent among the possible candidates. A superior account would be one which would unambiguously predict the correct antecedent for every instance of *caki*-binding. Given this, the question I would like to raise in this paper is simple:

- **Is there a structural account for this binding pattern?**

The answer we suggest will involve the following:

- **There always exists a topic phrase either overt or covert that binds the long-distance reflexive** *caki*
- **This binding relation is licensed only in double nominative constructions**

Before directly moving on to the issue of *caki*-binding, we will explore the issue of Korean topicalisation. This will provide the first step leading to the elaboration of the argument of this paper regarding the nature of topic as an antecedent of *caki*

3 Two kinds of Topic Construction

In Korean, a topic is commonly realized as a phrase carrying the so-called topic maker *(n)un* in sentence initial position.[1] There are two kinds of topic constructions in Korean: Gapless and Gapped topic constructions. As the term indicates, the difference between the two kinds of topic construction is that in the former, the topic phrase is followed by a sentence which is fully saturated whereas in the latter, the topic precedes a sentence which has a null element coindexed with the topic phrase.

3.1 Gapless Topic Constructions

As shown in the following examples of Gapless topic constructions, there is no gap in the associated sentence (henceforth, the comment part) to the topic phrases.

(4) a. Ce-umsikcem-un [pica-ka masissta]
that-restaurant-TOP pizza-NOM delicious
'(As for) that restaurant, pizza is delicious'

b. I-chayk-un [Swuni-ka han-peyici-lu ilkessta]
this-book-TOP Swuni-NOM one-page-ACC read
'(As for) this book, Swuni read one page'

(Moon 1994)

In the above gapless topic constructions, the comment part should mention the entity in the the topic phrase, and a relation of 'aboutness' must be established between the topic and the comment. In terms of 'aboutness', the relation between the topic and the comment part in (4a) and (4b) can be said to represent a 'part/whole' relation as in the relation between *Ce-umsilcem (that restaurant)* and *pica (pizza)* in (4a) and between *I-chayk (this book)* and *han-peyici (one page)* in (4b). This 'aboutness' relation would be violated when a part/whole or other relevant relations cannot be established in the following examples:

(5) a. *I chayk-**un** Mary-ka **sinmun**-ul ilkessta
this book-TOP Mary-NOM newspaper-ACC read
'As for this book, Mary read **the newspaper**'

b. *Mary-**nun** John-i **i chayk**-ul ilkessta
Mary-TOP John-NOM this book-ACC read
'As for Mary, John read **this book**'

In the examples above, no possible 'aboutness' relation can be construed. For example, in (5a), the relation between the topic phrase *this book* and the comment part *Mary read the newspaper* is hard to be considered as 'part/whole' or 'type/token' relation. The same applies to the example (5b) which make the sentence ungrammatical.

[1] In Korean, focus is also marked with the same marker *(n)un*. In case where multiple *(n)un* marked phrases occur in sentence initial position, the first phrase is normally considered as a topic and the rest as focus (Chang 1995)

3.2 Gapped topic Constructions

In gapped topic constructions, the comment part should be a clause which contains an open syntactic position subcategorised for by a verb and the gap is obligatorily coindexed with the topic phrase. Consider the following examples:

(6) a. I chayk$_i$-un Mary-ka e$_i$ ilkessta
this book-TOP Mary-NOM read
'This book$_i$, Mary read (it$_i$)'

b. Mary$_i$-nun e$_i$ i chayk-ul ilkessta
Swuni-TOP this book-ACC read
'Mary$_i$, (she$_i$) read this book.'

(6a) is the case where the object position in the comment part is empty and coindexed with the topic *I chayk (this book)*. (6b), on the other hand, includes the gap in the subject position which is coindexed with the topic *Mary*.

3.2.1 Approaches to Topicalisation: Movement(Scrambling) vs. Base-generation

Two main types of approach for gapped topic constructions in Korean and also for similar structures in Japanese have been proposed in literature. The first one is a Movement account which argues that the gap in the comment part is a trace (of scrambling) (e.g., Hasegawa (1984); Imai (1983)). The second one assumes that the topic phrase is base-generated in its surface position (e.g. Saito (1985); Moon (1994)).

Here, I present evidence that the gapped topic construction in Korean should be derived by movement rather than base-generation. Moon (1994) proposes that the gap in the examples (6a) and (6b) may be filled by resumptive pronouns coindexed with the topic phrases and that a null argument in the comment part may be in free variation with a resumptive pronoun as follows:

(7) a. I chayk-un Mary-ka **kukes-ul** ilkessta
this book-TOP Mary-NOM it-ACC read
'As for this book, Mary read it'

b. Mary-nun **Kunye-ka** i chayk-ul ilkessta
Mary-TOP she-NOM this book-ACC read
'As for Mary, she read this book'

(Moon 1994:p.442, ex.10)

However, Moon (1994)'s grammaticality judgements are questionable. It may be more plausible to assume that the topic phrase in the gapped topic constructions is moved to the sentence initial position from the gap position in the comment part. That is to say, the gap in the comment part is a trace of the moved topic phrase instead of a base-generated gap, namely pro. The same applies to the cases where the gap is embedded in the complement clause as below:

(8) a. John$_i$-**lul** Bill-i Mary-ka {*ku$_i$-lul/e$_i$} silhehanta ko mitko-issta
John-OBJ Bill-NOM Mary-NOM he-OBJ dislike COMPL believing-is
'John$_i$, Bill believes that Mary dislikes {*him$_i$/e$_i$}

b. John$_i$-**nun** Bill-i Mary-ka {*ku$_i$-lul/e$_i$} silhehanta ko mitko-issta
John-TOP Bill-NOM Mary-NOM he-OBJ dislike COMPL believing-is
'(Speaking of) John$_i$, Bill believes that Mary dislikes {*him$_i$/e$_i$}

(8a) is an example of pure scrambling where the embedded object is fronted. The replacement of the gap by a resumptive pronoun *ku$_i$-lul (him)* makes the sentence ungrammatical. The same grammaticality applies to (8b) where the embedded object is topicalised and this shows that the gapped construction is derived in the same way as the scrambling constructions are.

Moreover, Moon (1994) further provides more evidence in support of base-generation of the gapped topic constructions in terms of the *Wh-Island Constraint* (Ross 1976). If base-generation is the right derivation for the gapped topic constructions, then they should not be sensitive to Island Constraints whereas the scrambling constructions should be affected by Island Constraints. However, the data she intends to provide in favour of base-generation seems to be rather inappropriately put. (9a) shows the construction where the embedded object *Mary* is moved out of the relative clause, which violates Island Constraints and which makes the sentence correctly ruled out. However, the gapped topic construction where the embedded object *Mary* within the relative clause is topicalised as in (9b), shows no difference in grammaticality from that of scrambling construction as in (9a). This again confirms that the gapped topic constructions are derived by movement (scrambling) rather than by base-generation.

(9) a. *Mary$_j$-**lul** John-i [e$_i$ e$_j$ chacassten] salam$_i$-ul poassta
Mary-ACC John-NOM was-looking-for person-ACC saw
'*Mary$_j$, John saw a person who was looking for e$_j$'

b. *Mary$_j$-**nun** John-i [e$_i$ e$_j$ chacassten] salam$_i$-ul poassta
Mary-TOP John-NOM was-looking-for person-ACC saw
'*(Speaking of) Mary$_j$, John saw a person who was looking for e$_j$'

(Moon 1994:p.445, ex.18)

Even if we admit that (7b), 8b) and (9b) may exhibit a varying degree of grammaticality depending on dialectal factors, the following examples still contradict the base-generation hypothesis for the gapped topic construction.

(10) a. Nwu-ka [Mary-ka John-ul paypanhay-ss-ta-nun] somwun-ul mit-ess-ni?
who-NOM Mary-NOM John-ACC betray-PAST-DC-COMPL rumour-ACC believe-PAST-Q

'Who believed the rumour that Mary betrayed John?'

b. *Mary$_i$-nun Nwu-ka [e$_i$ John-ul paypanhay-ss-ta-nun] somwun-ul mit-ess-ni?
Mary-TOP who-NOM John-ACC betray-PAST-DC-COMPL rumour-ACC believe-PAST-Q

'As for Mary$_i$, who believes the rumour that e$_i$ betrayed John?'

(10b) is derived from (10b) by topicalising *Mary* from the subject position within the appositive clause. This example turns out to be totally ungrammatical as expected under the movement approaches. Even if (7b), 8b) and (9b) were grammatical as suggested in terms of base-generation in Moon (1994), the base-generation hypothesis would not be able to account for the ungrammaticality of 10b) as a base-generated construction should not be sensitive to

Island Constraints. Movement, however, can well accommodate such sentences. (10b) not only violates the Wh-Island constraint, but also the Complex NP constraint (Ross 1976) as in the extraction of *Mary* out of the appositive clause. This multiple violation of the Island Constraints then explains the ungrammaticality of (10b), and provides further confirmation that the gapped topic construction is derived by movement rather than base-generation.

To sum up, there are two kinds of topicalisation in Korean: Gapless and Gapped topic constructions. The gapless topic constructions can be accounted for in terms of 'aboutness'. The gapless topic constructions are grammatical only if there is any plausible relation between topic and comment part. As for the gapped topic constructions, they are derived by movement and the gap in the comment part can not be filled by any lexical noun or pronominal (resumptive pronoun) noun phrases.

This exploration of the topic constructions in Korean is crucial in that in the subsequent sections we will relate the topic construction to long-distance anaphora. For example, in the example (1) repeated below as (11), we already saw that *caki* may well be bound by the topic phrase.

(11) John$_i$-**un caki**$_i$-ka ka-ss-ta
John-**top self**-NOM go-PAST-DSE
'**As for John**$_i$, **self**$_i$-NOM went'

This is a gapless construction as the comment part does not include any gap. In terms of 'aboutness', (11) does not seem to have any problem as long as *caki* is coindexed with the topic *John*. However, we face a problem in accounting for the example as follows:

(12) John$_i$-**un** Mary$_j$-ka {***caki**$_{i/j}$/**e**}-lul kacang silhehanta
John-**top** Mary-NOM {**self/e**}-ACC the most hate
'**As for John**$_i$ Mary$_j$ hates {***self**$_{i/j}$/**e**} the most'

In the same way (11) was explained above, (12) can be seen as a case of the gapless construction, as the comment part does not have any open argument position. *caki*, in this case, in the object position, is coindexed with the topic *John*. As indicated in the examples, however, (12) is ungrammatical. It cannot be viewed as an instance of the gapped topic constructions as they are not allowed any filler in the gap position. We will attempt to solve t this complex problem in the subsequent sections.

4 Topicalization & Caki-binding

In a highly discourse oriented languages like Korean, topic phrases are very often surpressed in sentences subseqent to the first ocurrence of the topic in the discourse. Consider the following examples:

(13) A. Yong-i nuwku-hako ssawa-ss-ta-ko?
Yong-NOM who-with fight-PST-DC-Q
'Who did you say Yong fought with?'

B. Heyn-hako-yo
Heyn-with-PO
'With Hyen'

(Chang 1995:p.200, ex.57(c-d))

Given the topic *Yong* in the initial dialogue A in (13), B's reply is elliptical: the topic elements are not repeated. And once the topic is introduced in an unstressed form, it is suppressed in the subseqent utterance or realised in a pronominal form. Otherwise, the same topic is repeated as shown below:

(14) Mia-nun ko-sam-i tway-yo. Nay-nyen-ey (kaya-nun/Mia-nun) tayhak-ey ka-yo.
Mia-TOP high-three become-sc se next-year-at she-TOP/Mia-TOP college-to go-SE
Kulayse (kyay-nun/Mia-nun) Yelsim-hi Kongpwuha-ko iss-e-yo
therefore she-TOP/Mia-TOP diligent-ly study-ing iss-PO-DC
'Mia becomes a high school 3rd grader. She goes to college next year. So she is studying hard'

(Chang 1995:p.200, ex.58)

In the above discourse setting, Mia is the topic in the first sentence. It continues to be the topic and it is realised by zero or the pronominal *kay-nun (child/she)*. The only case where the topic is obligatorily overt is when there exists some ambiguity of the topic or when the topic has been just changed from the previous one as we will see later in (26).

Now let us return back to the initial discussion where we have seen a set of data that have been treated in terms of the discourse condition. (3) is repeated here as in (15)

(15) A. Mary$_i$-ka ku pati-e kass-ni anim tarun salam-i taysin kass-ni?
Mary-NOM the party-to went-Q or other person-NOM instead go-Q
'Is it Mary$_i$ who went to the party or somebody else instead?'

B. Ani, $[\mathbf{e}_i]_{top}$ **caki**$_i$-ka kasse
No, **self**$_i$-NOM went
'No, $[\mathbf{e}_i]_{top}$ **self**$_i$ went'

It was mentioned above that this kind of *caki*-binding is considered to be bound by a topic, in this case, *Mary* in the previous discourse as a case of discourse binding. However, as we have seen in (13) and (14), we may well suppose that there exists a null topic phrase (as indicated in (15) as a non-repeated topic as suggested in Chang (1995)). At this point, what we can propose against discourse-based account is that *caki* is *structurally* bound by such a null topic phrase (a case of a topic binding) rather than any entity in a discourse level.

Furthermore, the following examples illustrates the instances where caki-binding is not licensed because of the lack of explicit topic phrases where they are needed. In the examples below, *Mary* and *John* are discourse-given as possible entities for *caki*-binder. Since both entities are equally prominent, *caki* in B's replies should need an overt topic as its binder. Without this overt topic phrase, *caki*-binding cannot be licensed.

(16) A. Mary-ka pati-ey ka-ss-ni? anim John-i ka-ss-ni?
Mary-NOM party-to go-PAST-Q or John-NOM go-PAST-Q
'Did Mary go to the party or is it John who went to the party?'

B. ***Caki**-ka ka-ss-e
self-NOM go-PAST-DC
'**Self** went'

(17) A. Mary-ka pati-ey ka-ss-ta-myense? John-ekey kiss-hay-ss-ni?
Mary-**NOM** party-to go-**PAST-DC**-(I) hear John-**DAT** kiss-do-**PAST-Q**
'I hear that Mary went to the party. Did she Kiss John?'

B. ***Caki**-ka hay-ss-e
self-NOM do-**PAST-DC**
'**Self** did'

Another piece of the supporting evidences is that *caki* in (15) cannot be topic-marked itself as shown below:

(18) B'. *Ani, caki$_i$-**nun** kasse
no, self-**TOP** went

What this tells us is that *caki* being a topic itself, cannot be entitled to have another topic phrase available by the condition that Korean allows only one topic per sentence (Moon 1994; Chang 1995). Thus, there is no possible antecedent (no possible topic phrase) to bind *caki*. Its ungrammaticality also shows that *caki* in (18) cannot look for its possible antecedent beyond the sentential level, that is, it cannot take any discourse antecedent.

Given this hypothesis, let us go back to the problem we had in (11) and (12) repeated again as (19) and (20) below:

(19) John$_i$-**un caki**$_i$-ka ka-ss-ta
John-**top self**-NOM go-**PAST-DSE**
'**As for John**$_i$, **self**$_i$-NOM went'

(20) John$_i$-**un** Mary$_j$-ka {***caki**$_{i/j}$/**e**}-lul kacang silhehanta
John-**top** Mary-**NOM** {**self/e**}-**ACC** the most hate
'**As for John**$_i$ Mary$_j$ hates {***self**$_{i/j}$/**e**} the most'

We have seen from these two examples earlier that the gapless topic constructions cannot explain the examples above due to the inconsistent grammaticality. On the other hand, given that we have postulated that there may well exist an overt/covert topic phrase, the examples above may be seen as a case where the topic phrase is overtly spelled out. Considering these two issues together, a consistent explanation for (19) and (20) in one can be drawn from the following simple syntactic construction allowed in Korean as well as Japanese.

- The Binding relation between a non argument topic and *caki* is licensed only in the double nominative construction

Korean and Japanese among many other allow the double nominative constructions. What the speculation on the double nominative constructions provides us with is that nothing prevents the first nominative from being topicalised. For example, (19) can be derived from what is initially the double nominative construction as below:

(21) John$_i$-**i** **caki**$_i$-ka ka-ss-ta
John-**nom self**-NOM go-**PAST-DSE**
'**John**$_i$, **self**$_i$-NOM went'

This binding relation between the first nominative *John* and the second *caki* is licensed by the 'subject-orientedness' property of *caki*. Doron & Heycock (1998) make a similar observation in accounting for Japanese double nominative construction as below:

(22) a. Sono hito$_i$-ga **zibun**$_i$-ga kodomo-yori atama-ga ii (koto)
that person$_i$-NOM **self**-NOM child-than head-NOM good (fact)
'That person$_i$ [is such that] **self**$_i$ is more intelligent than his/her child'

b. Sono hito$_i$-**wa** **zibun**$_i$-ga kodomo-yori atama-ga ii (koto)
that person$_i$-TOP **self**-NOM child-than head-NOM good (fact)
'As for that person$_i$ **self**$_i$ is more intelligent than his/her child'

(Modified from Doron & Heycock (1998)

Some may argue that such double nominative constructions with *caki* or *zibun* being the second nominative element may not be a pure instance of the double nominative constructions, but just an instance of *caki* being used emphatically as noted (as *himself*) in the English translation in (23) below.

(23) Ku cangkwun$_i$-**un** **caki**$_i$-ka momso cakcen-ul cihwihayssta
The general-TOP **self**-NOM personally operation-ACC commanded
'As for the general$_i$, **self**$_i$ commanded the operation in person'
(or, 'The general himself commanded the operation in person')

However, as the example 24 shows, it is not the case that what we are dealing with here is an instance of added emphasis.

(24) **John**$_i$**-un caki**-uy ayin-i Seoul-e ga-pelyessta
John-TOP **self**-GEN lover-NOM Seoul-to go-PERF
'**As for John**$_i$ **self**$_i$'s lover has gone to Seoul'

(24) is a double nominative construction where *caki* is embedded as a genitive within the second nominative NP. And *caki* in this case cannot be used as an emphatic pronoun in (23). Therefore, what we can conclude at this point is that the binding relation between the topic and the nominative *caki* is a case of the gapless topic construction and such binding relation can be licensed only by the double nominative construction. Then how do we resolve the problem for the examples such as (20) above? The answer is now simple. The binding relation between the topic and the accusative *Mary* in (20) is not derived in a double nominative construction.

5 Conclusion and Problems to solve

In this paper, we have reconsidered the data that have been discussed as discourse-oriented *caki*-binding. My goal here was to show that one can do without reference to *contextual* antecedents whose binding domains are, almost by definition, rather obscure and unconstrained, and that *caki*-binding can be structurally accounted for by construing a topic phrase (either over or covert) as a potential antecedent. This binding pattern between the topic phrase as an antecedent and *caki* is derived from double nominative constructions. To back up these proposals, we have also looked at how the topic phrases in both gapped and gapless topic constructions in Korean are licensed. These proposals however cannot stand on their own when it comes to the data where some pragmatic and semantic factors seems to be inevitably (or intuitively) involved. Consider the following:

(25) Sono hito$_i$-**wa** **kodomo**$_i$-ga kodomo zibun-yori atama-ga ii (koto)
that person$_i$-**TOP** child-**NOM** it self$_i$-than head-**NOM** good (fact)
'As for that person$_i$ (his/her) child is more intelligent than self$_i$'

(Doron & Heycock 1998)

Example (25) above is the one of the examples cited in Doron & Heycock (1998) and the counterpart in Korean is also grammatical. These examples present a problem for the proposal concerning the double nominative constructions. Even though the topic *sono hito* and *zibun* are not in nominative positions, the binding between them is grammatically licensed. Furthermore, consider the following Korean examples:

(26) A. Ne Nay-ka kaciko-iss-te-n chayk-ul po-ass-ni?
You I-**NOM** had-**PAST-RETRO-REL** book-**ACC** see-**PAST-Q**
Modun-salam-i talla-ko hako iss-e
every-person-**NOM** ask for-to do **PROG-DSE**
'Did you see the book that I had?
Everybody is asking for it'

B. **John$_i$-un** nay-ka **caki**$_i$-ekey cwu-ess-e
John-TOP I-**NOM** self-**DAT** give-**PAST-DSE**
'**As for John**$_i$, I gave (it) to **self**$_i$'

In the exchange between A and B as above, because an ambiguous topic is provided in the dialogue initial utterance with *Modun salam (everybody)*, B, in his reply, is compelled to include an overt topic phrase to provide a legitimate antecedent of *caki*. However, the problem lies in where the binding is licensed between the topic *John* and *caki* which are not in the double nominative positions. Even though this obviously contradicts our proposal, this should not undermine the postulation of the double nominative hypothesis. The binding relations in (25) and (26) are possible only with the participants' enforced interpretation in discourse. For example, in (25), *kodomo (child)* cannot be compared with *zibun (himself/herself)*. Then a participant in the discourse tries to improve the interpretation by forcing the only possible antecedent, the topic phrase, in this case, to bind *zibun*. Without this co-operative interpretation or the semantic relation in the sentence being impossible, the example should be ungrammatical. The same applies to (26). Given that *caki* should be bound by a third person singular antecedent, it cannot take any first or second person antecedent (Cole *et al.* 1990; Kang 1988). In (26), *caki* as a subject-oriented anaphor, may well take the subject as its antecedent, which in this case is not possible as the subject is a first person nominal. At this point, the participant in the discourse again forces the only remaining nominal to antecede *caki* to improve the interpretation. If the subject were in the third person as shown below, the sentence should be in no doubt ungrammatical as the binding between *Bill* and *caki* violates the 'aboutness' relation.

(27) B'. **?*John$_i$-un** Bill$_j$-i **caki**$_{i/j}$-ekey cwu-ess-e
John-TOP Bill-**NOM** self-**DAT** give-**PAST-DSE**
'**As for John**$_i$, Bill$_j$ gave (it) to **self**$_{i/j}$'

The solution to these problems should be more concretely spelled out. However, it should not undermine any formal and syntactic account in terms of the overt/covert topic phrase and the double nominative construction.

References

BANFIELD, ANN. 1982. *Unspeakable Sentence*. Boston, RKP.

CHANG, SUK-JIN. 1995. *Korean*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

COLE, PETER, GABRIELA HERMON, & LI-MAY SUNG. 1990. Principles and Parameters of Long-Distance Reflexives. *Linguistic Inquiry* 21.1–22.

DORON, E., & C. HEYCOCK. 1998. Filling and Licensing Multiple Specifiers. In *Specifiers: Minimalist Approaches*, ed. by D. Adger, S. Pintzuk, B. Plunkett, & G. Tsoulas. OUP.

HASEGAWA, N., 1984. A Lexical Interpretive Theory with Emphasis on the Role of Subject. ms. University of Massachusettes, Amherst.

HUANG, C.-T. JAMES. 1984. On the Distribution and Reference of Empty Pronouns. *Linguistic Inquiry* 15.531–574.

IIDA, MASAYO. 1996. *Context and Binding in Japanese*. CSLI:Stanford.

IMAI, T. 1983. On the significance of 'Move-alph' and Empty Categories in Non-Configurational Languages. In *???*, ed. by Y. Otsu. ???

KANG, BEOM-MO. 1988. Unbounded Reflexives. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 11.415–456.

KUNO, SUSUMO. 1973. *The Structure of the Japanese Lanuage.*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.

KURODA, SIGE-YUKI, 1965. *Generative Grammatical Studies in the Japanese Language*. MIT, Cambridge, Massachusetts dissertation.

——. 1973. Where Epistemology, Style and Grammar Meet: A Case Study from Japanese. In *A Festschrift for Morris Halle*, ed. by S. Anderson & P. Kiparsky, 377–391. New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

LI, CHARLES N., & SANDRA A. THOMPSON. 1976. Subject and Topic: A New Typology of Languages. In *Subject and Topic*, ed. by C. N. Li. New York: Academic Press.

MOON, GUI-SUN. 1994. Topic Constructions in Korean. In *Explorations in Generative Grammar: A Festschrift for Dong Whee Yang*, ed. by Young-Sun Kim, Byung-Choon Lee, Kyoung-Jae Lee, yun Kwon Yang, & Jong-Yurl Yoon. Seoul:Hankuk Publishers.

ROSS, J. R. 1976. *Constrains Variables in Syntax*. Cambridge, Massachusettes: MIT Press.

SAITO, MAMORU, 1985. *Some Asymmetries in Japanese and Their Theortical Implications*. MIT. dissertation.

SELLS, PETER. 1987. Aspects of Logophoricity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 18.445–81.

UEDA, MASANOBU, 1984. On Japanese Reflexive *zibun.* Ms. University of Massachusetts at Anherst.

ZRIBI-HERTZ, ANNE. 1989. Ananphor Binding and Narrative Point of View; english reflexive pronouns in sentence and discourse. *Language* 65.695–727.