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Introduction

• Anand (2006) proposes two different mechanisms for obligatory de se elements:
  • Semantic (context-overwriting): e.g. shifted indexicals.
  • Syntactic (binding by operator): e.g. Yoruba logophor own, Japanese long-distance reflexive zibun, etc.
• I show that Korean is a language where the two types of de se elements exist, i.e. shifted indexicals and the LD-reflexive caki.

Question: How would these two elements interact with each other? (Under Anand’s analysis, no interaction is predicted since the syntactic and semantic mechanisms for de se ascriptions are independent from each other.)

Indexical Shift in Korean

First, I show that the shifted interpretations of the person and adverbial indexicals in an indirect report are available in Korean (1)-(2).

(1) Mary-ka [mwo: na-hil cihansta]-ko malhayss-ni? Mary-Nom who 1-Acc like-C said-Q
  Who did Mary say likes {me, Mary}? (Pan 1997, Huang and Liu 2001, a.o.).

(2) Uterance in New York
  Who did Mary say in Amherst was born in New York, Amherst? (Pan 1997, Huang and Liu 2001, a.o.).

The shift-together constraint proposed by Anand and Nevins (2004) holds for both the person and adverbial indexicals in Korean.

Two Context-shift Operators

• Anand and Nevins (2004) and Anand (2006): Indexical shift is the result of a context-shift operator that overwrites the context parameter on the interpretation function with the index.

Proposal: To account for both Shift Together and Shift Independently, I argue that there are two separate operators, OP_PER and OP_ADV, for person and adverbial indexicals in Korean.

(4) Two context-shift operators
  a. [OP_PER [α] f<α, H, T, T, >i = [α] f<α, H, T, T, >i]
  b. [OP_ADV [α] f<α, H, T, T, >i = [α] f<α, H, T, T, >i]

(5) Sample illustration of Shift Independently
  a. John said [OP_PER I was born here].
  b. Truth-conditions: ( Q Q α ) = 1 iff
    ∃i ∈ Say(John,i) AUTH(i) was born in LOC( i ) in WORLD( i )

The Long-distance Reflexive caki

• Caki allows both local and long-distance binding.
    John, thinks that Tom, describes himself.

• The long-distance caki must be interpreted de se, as ziji in Chinese (Pan 1997, Huang and Liu 2001, a.o.).

• Multiple long-distance cakis in an embedded clause must find the same antecedent, as observed in Chinese.
    sayngkakanta)-ko malhayss. think-C
    a. *John, said that Bill, thought that his mother hates him, himself.
    b. *John, said that Bill, thought that his mother hates himself.

• I assume that caki is a de se element that is bound by a syntactic operator, OP-LOG, within the scope of attitude verbs (Anand 2006).

Puzzle: Between shifted indexicals and caki

(8) [OP-LOG [α] f<α, H, T, T, >i = [α'] f<α', H, T, T, >i] → AUTH(i)

IS (Indexical Shift)-Blocking Effect

• The interaction between the shifted indexicals and caki can be described as in (10).

(10) IS-Blocking Effect
  If caki and its antecedent are separated by more than one clause, a context-shift operator cannot intervene between them.

Key Question: How can we account for this one-way blocking effect between the shifted indexicals and caki?

Deriving the IS-Blocking Effect

• Basic assumptions (von Stechow 2003, Anand 2006, a.o.):
  • The de se elements like caki always bear the syntactic feature [+log].
  • The de se elements that bear [+log] must be bound by the closest operator that also takes the [+log] feature.

• New assumptions:
  • The syntactic operator can take either [+log] or [−log].
  • The context-shift operators always bear [+log].
  • When the OP-LOG and the context-shift operator occur in the same embedded clause, they must agree in the feature [+log].

• Deriving the IS-blocking effect:

(11) Deriving the IS-blocking effect:
  *John, said [λ x BILL, said [λ x caki-xil mother hates me] x]
  No blocking effect
  John, said [λ x OPP-l+x=+mother hates me] x

Further consequences

Our proposal also captures the interaction between multiple cakis.

(13) Deriving the restriction on multiple cakis
  a. John said [λ x BILL, said [λ x caki-xil mother hates caki-xil] x]
  b. *John said [λ x BILL, said [λ x caki-xil mother hates caki-xil] x]
  c. *John said [λ x OPP-l+x=+mother hates caki-xil] x
  d. John said [λ x OPP-l+x=+mother hates caki-xil] x
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