

Local Obviation as a Relative Phenomenon*

Gun-Soo Lee

(Korea Maritime University)

Lee, Gun-Soo. (1999). Local obviation as a relative phenomenon. *English Language and Literature Teaching*, 5, 63~78.

In this paper, I explain why local obviation (Condition B of Chomsky's binding theory) should be viewed as a relative phenomenon, and establish a correlation between Local Obviation (henceforth LO) effects and the Referential Hierarchy of Korean anaphors proposed in Lee (1997): *ku* (he) > *caki* (self) > *casin* (self) > *cakicasin* (selfself) = *selo* (each other).¹⁾ I show that LO characterized as a relative phenomenon may enable us to view Conditions B and C of the binding theory simply as an instantiation of varying degrees of (long distance) disjoint reference effects on the same continuum.

I. Introduction

Let us first consider typical cases of Condition B violation. Pronominals in Korean and English clearly observe Condition B in the following data.

* This paper was originally presented at the 11th International Conference On Korean Linguistics that was held at University of Hawaii at Manoa in 1998.

1) Korean has one reciprocal expression *selo* and three anaphors *caki*, *casin*, and *cakicasin*. Bimorphemic *cakicasin* and the reciprocal *selo* are known to permit only local binding whereas monomorphemic *caki* and *casin* are regarded as long distance anaphors. In Lee (1997) I viewed long distance binding effects as a relative phenomenon that correlates with the referential hierarchy of different anaphors.

- (1) a. Tom_i-un [Youngsoo_j-ka ku_{i/sj/k}-lul jongyonghantako] sengakhanta
 Tom-Top Youngsoo-Nom he-Acc respect think
 Tom thinks that Youngsoo respects him.
 b. Tom_i thinks that Youngsoo_j respects him_{i/sj/k}

In (1), the pronominals of both languages must be disjoint in reference from the local subjects inside the embedded tensed clauses. However, the data in (2) shows some difference between the two languages in terms of LO effects of pronouns.

- (2) a. John_i asked Tom_j [PRO_j to call him_{i/sj/k}]
 b. John_i-un Tom_j-eke [PRO/pro_j ku _{i/sj/k}-eke jonhwahalako] hatta.
 John-Top Tom-Dat Pro he-Dat telephone asked

When an embedded clause is a non-finite clause as in (2), the Korean pronominal *ku*, unlike its English counterpart, seems to be disjoint in reference even from the matrix subject. This shows that the Korean pronominal shows longer disjoint reference effects than English *him*. Harbert (1995) also mentions that in Icelandic and Gothic pronouns may show similar long distance disjoint reference effects. What this implies is that the domain in which pronominals must be free (Condition B) may not be given an absolute value crosslinguistically, but only a relative value.²⁾ In this paper, I will not delve into the question of exactly what triggers the difference between the two languages in (2), but rather the focus will be upon answering the question why pronominals or other expressions must be free in some domain (LO).

2) At this point, it is not clear how the relative value may be defined. Furthermore, Harbert (1995 p.194) notes that languages with long distance binding do not necessarily show long distance disjoint reference effects of pronouns.

II. Phi-features and Local Obviation

A plausible answer may come from Burzio (1988). The following is Harberts (1995) summary of Burzio (1988): Some of these arguments would seem to apply as well to the more recent attempt by Burzio (1988) to derive disjoint reference effects from a principle of Morphological Economy (ME), requiring that a bound NP be maximally unspecified. Reflexives are claimed to be underlyingly featureless, and therefore less morphologically marked than pronouns. ME requires that they, rather than pronouns, be used where the relevant locality principle on reflexives allows. Burzio's proposal is intended in part to capture the observation (also remarked upon by Thrainsson (1976b)) that pronouns are subject to disjoint reference requirements just in case there exists a corresponding reflexive. Under this proposal, Principle B effects arise only when a less specified alternative than the pronoun (i.e. a reflexive) is available (Harbert, 1995, p. 216)

If a part of Burzio's ME is related to the specification of phi-features, then his account on ME would imply that pronouns may observe LO due to their full specification of phi-features whereas featureless anaphors may not show LO effects because of their lack of phi-features.³⁾ As shown in (1) and (2), pronominal *ku*, being fully specified in phi-features, clearly shows LO effects whereas Korean anaphors generally do not show LO when substituted for *ku* in the same data.

III. Local Obviation as a Relative Phenomenon

However, it is not the case that all Korean anaphors do not show such

3) See section 6 for my account of *himself* type Korean anaphor *kucasin* in relation with local obviation effects.

effects. Frequently, *caki* seems to behave like pronouns with regard to condition B.

- (3) Chelsoo_i-nun [Younghee_j-ka caki_{i??j}-lul ttaryotako] malhatta.
 Chelsoo-Top Younghee-Nom self-Acc hit said
 Chelsoo said that Younghee hit self.

Lee (1988) also discusses a case where *caki* may not be bound by a local subject.

- (4) a. Joe_i-nun caki_i-lul kwasinha- yess- ta
 Joe-Top self-Acc have over-confidence past Dec
 Joe had over-confidence in himself.
 b. (?) Sue_i-nun caki_i-lul piphanha- yess- ta
 Sue-Top self-Acc criticized past Dec
 Sue criticized herself.
 c. ?? Sue_i-nun caki_i-lul kkocip -ess - ta
 Sue-Top self-Acc pinched past Dec
 Sue pinched herself.
 d. * Joe_i-nun caki_i-lul chi- ess - ta⁴⁾
 Joe-Top self-Acc hit past Dec
 Joe hit himself.

(Lee, 1988, p. 340)

Lee (1988) notes that in (4), except for cases where the embedded verbs involved are of a mental or abstract sense, *caki* does show LO (principle B effects). I along with other native speakers share his judgement that the data in (4) show gradational degradation in

4) Lees (1988) unacceptability judgement is somewhat less robust than my own judgement on the data in (4).

acceptability from (a) to (d), as the verbs involved switch from a mental or abstract sense to a physical sense in meaning. Lee further notes that in (4) when the sentences are embedded, there is an ambiguity between a matrix subject and the local subject for *caki* binding in (4a), but this type of ambiguity tends to be gradationally weakened from (a) to (d), and thus in (4c) and (4d), matrix subjects, but not the local subjects, may be the only antecedents for *caki* (obligatory long distance binding).

Lees (1988) account for (4) clearly shows that *caki* is in a way pronominal-like in terms of LO. *Caki*, in the embedding cases of (4), requires a sentence internal antecedent, but this antecedent should generally occur outside of the local domain. Therefore it seems that *caki* may be treated on a par with the pronominal anaphor Greek *idhio* and Danish *sig* [+L, +B_A, +ID] in the sense of Enc (1989).⁵⁾ If we substitute *casin* for *caki* in (4), all of the four simple sentences become perfectly acceptable (no LO effects), and even under embedding both local binding and long distance binding seems to be possible.⁶⁾ In view of *caki* in comparison with the anaphoric nominals Enc (1989) discusses, LO

5) Greek *idhio* and Danish *sig* may be classified as pronominal anaphor in that they have both pronominal and anaphoric properties. They are anaphoric because they must be bound sentence internally. They are pronominal in nature because they show local obviation effects. The term pronominal anaphor is fundamentally different from the same term reserved for PRO (Chomsky 1981, 1986).

6) Park (1988) briefly notes that there may be a difference in binding distance between two anaphors *caki* and *casin*. I share Parks judgement that in the following data the local binding reading is preferred for *casin* whereas the LDB reading is preferred for *caki*.

(i) John_i-un [Mary_j-ka (caki, casin)_j-lul cal al-n-ta-ko] mit-n-ta
 John-Top Mary-Nom self/self-Acc well knows believe
 John_i believes that Mary_j knows REFL_{i,j}.
 (Park, 1988, p. 603)

Park (1988) argues that *caki* is a bound pronoun whereas *casin* is a pure anaphor.

(condition B effects) may be regarded not only as an intercategory phenomenon but also as an intracategory one. In other words, it is frequently the case that some nominal types (Dogrib *ye*, Greek *idhio*, pronominals in general) always show LO whereas others (Korean *assin*, Japanese *zibun*, Turkish *kendisi*, reflexives in general) never show such effects. However, it may also be the case that one nominal type generally shows LO effects while local binding may still be possible for the same nominal in a limited way (e.g. Korean *caki*). This implies that LO effects may not be an absolute phenomenon governing the binding relation of one nominal expression, rather a relative phenomenon within that nominal expression, as indicated by the case of *caki* with its ambivalent status in terms of principle B. This in turn shows that different anaphoric pronouns within a given language (e.g. Korean) may also behave differently with regard to relative LO phenomenon.

Coming back to the original question of why pronouns and some anaphoric nominals must be free in the local domain while other anaphors never show such LO, I believe that Burzio's (1988) ME can be justified and thus LO is fundamentally related to the requirement that an NP that is bound in local domain should be maximally unspecified in lexical features (e.g. phi-features). Reinhart and Reulands' (1993) analysis also indicates that LO may be related to the specification of phi-features. They derive LO effects for pronouns independently from their A-chain condition requiring that only a head of a given A-chain must be fully specified in phi-features and Case-marked. According to their analysis, both pronouns and SE type anaphors (monomorphemic long distance anaphors to which *caki* would belong) in object positions would be banned from being bound by local subjects. However, they note (in fn. 44) that even though both pronouns and SE type anaphors (e.g. *caki*) show LO effects in the same position, the former may be worse (stronger LO effects) than the latter because locally bound pronouns (a tail of an

A-chain) may violate both the A-chain condition and their Condition B, whereas SE type anaphors (e.g. *caki*) violate only Condition B. Their Condition A requires that SELF anaphors (local anaphors to which *cakicasin* would belong) be obligatorily bound in the local domain (no LO effect).

Assuming the proposed correlation between LO and phi-features, it may be argued for Korean that pronominals (obligatory Condition B effects), being fully specified in phi-features, manifest a stronger degree of LO than all anaphors since *ku* or *kunyo* (she) would clearly show LO effects in all of the four sentences of (4).⁷⁾ *Caki* usually shows such effects except when the verbs are of abstract or mental sense, and would show a stronger degree of LO than *casin*, *cakicasin*, and *selo*, which would never show LO effects in (4). Therefore LO effects for pronominals would be stronger than for *caki*, which would be in turn stronger than the other Korean anaphors. Between *casin* and *cakicasin/selo*, it may be claimed that the former may be stronger in relative LO effects than the latter since the former has long distance binding possibilities while the latter are mandatorily locally bound as can be seen in (5) and (6). The LO degree index for the local anaphors *cakicasin* and *selo* may be zero due to the obligatory local binding.

- (5) Chelsoo_i-nun [Youngsoo_j-ka *caki_i*/*casin_i*/*cakicasin*_i*-lul nomuh mitnuntako]
 Chelsoo-Top [Youngsoo-Nom self/selfself-Acc too much trust]
 sengakhanta.
 think
 Chelsoo thinks that Youngsoo trust self/selfself too much.³⁸⁶
- (6) *geu tu sunsangnim-un* [*geu tu haksang_i-i selo*_i*-lul topnuntako] sengakhanta.
 the two teachers-Top [the two students-Nom each other-Acc help] think
 The two teachers think that the two students help each other.
 (Lee, 1997, p. 387)

7) See note 3 above.

Now the question is why there are differences among the anaphors in terms of the relative strength of LO effects. I will attempt to provide an answer to this question on the basis of the analysis of long distance binding proposed in Lee (1997). I will give a brief summary of Lee (1997) in next section and deal with the main issue in section 5.

IV. Lee (1997)

In Lee (1997), I proposed a referential hierarchy of anaphoric nominals in Korean and argued that the varying degrees of long distance binding effects different anaphoric expressions show correlate with the relative referential hierarchy established among them:

(7) *ku* > *caki* > *casin* > *cakicasin=selo*

(8) Long Distance Binding: The more referential an anaphoric expression is, the longer the possible distance between the anaphoric expression and its antecedent.

(Lee, 1997, p. 388)

Lee (1997) determined the hierarchy in (7) primarily by phi-features each anaphoric nominal carries and proposed (9).

(9) Between two anaphoric expressions A and B that belong to the same linguistic system L, A is regarded as more referential than B iff A has more lexical content (phi-features: person, gender, number) than B.

(Lee, 1997, p. 387)

The definition of referentiality in (9) predicted that *caki* (a third person anaphor), which has more phi-features (person and number features), is

more referential than the local anaphors *cakicasin* and *selo*, which lack phi-features as can be seen in the phi-feature specifications repeated as (14) below: *caki* > *cakicasin* = *selo*. That *caki* is a third person anaphor and is thus unspecified in gender feature only whereas the local anaphors *cakicasin* and *selo* have number feature only and are unspecified in terms of both person feature and gender feature was shown in data (10), (11), and (12), in which *caki* can have only a third person (male or female) antecedent while *cakicasin* and *selo* can take any person or any gender antecedent. Between *cakicasin* and *selo*, It was argued that the two are equally referential since both of them are specified in number feature only, that is, they have an equal amount of phi-features.

- (10) *na_i/nuh_i/ku_i/kuny_o_i-nun cak_i etehaso amugotdo mollunta.⁸⁾
 I/You/He/She-Top self about anything not know
 I/You/He/She do(es) not know anything about self.
- (11) ^(?)na_i/nuh_i/ku_i/kuny_o_i-nun cakicasini etehaso amugotdo mollunta.
 I/You/He/She-Top selfself about anything not know
- (12) uri/nuhitul/tu namja_i/tu yoja_i-nun selo_i etehaso amugotdo mollunta.
 we/you two/two man/two woman-Top each other about anything not know

8) Park (1988) also provides the following data to show that *caki*, unlike *casin*, cannot be bound by first and second person antecedents.

sokayha zass tae _i -ka	caki _i -lul		
introduced I-Nom	REFL	Acc	
sokayha zass tae _i -ka	casin _i -lul		
introduced I-Nom	REFL	Acc	
I introduced myself.			
moli- (i) ta. * ne _i -nun	caki _i -lul	cal	
not know you-Top	Acc	well	
moli-n-tb. ne _i -nun	casin _i -lul	cal	
not know you-Top	-Acc	well	
You do not know yourself well.			

For some additional differences between *caki* and *casin*, see Park (1988).

We/You two/the two men/the two women do not know anything about each other.
(Lee, 1997, p. 387)⁹⁾

However, one apparent problem I had in Lee (1997) was that *casin* can take any person or any gender antecedent as can be seen in (13), which shows that *casin*, a long distance anaphor, has number feature only and patterns with the local anaphors *cakicasin* and *selo* in terms of phi-feature specification.⁹

- (13) *nai/nuhi/kui/kunyo-i-nun casin-i-lul kwasopyongahaessta.*
I/You/He/She-Top self-Acc underestimated
I/You/He/She underestimated self.
(Lee, 1997, p. 389)

- (14) *ku:* [p(3rd), g(male), n(sg)]
caki: [p(3rd), g(-), n(sg)]
casin: [p(-), g(-), n(sg)]
cakicasin: [p(-), g(-), n(sg)], *selo:* [p(-), g(-), n(pl)]
(Lee, 1997, p. 390)

Condition (8) proposed in Lee (1997) predicts that the long distance anaphors should be more referential than the local anaphors, but the local anaphors would be as referential as *casin* according to (9). In order to overcome this problem, I employed Lasniks (1991) universal condition that a less referential expression cannot bind a more referential one as a secondary test to determine referentiality, and proposed (15).

9) See note 1 in Lee (1997) for the reason why the meaning and binding behavior of *cakicasin* cannot be predicted from its two components, *caki* and *casin*. Also see section 6 of this paper.

- (15) Between two anaphoric expressions A and B that are equally specified in phi-features, A is regarded as more referential than B iff A can bind B but not vice versa.
(Lee, 1997, p. 391)

What condition (15) basically stated was that relative referentiality between two anaphors that cannot be determined by the condition in (9) can be determined by the condition in (15) as a residual case. Since *casin* and the local anaphors are equally specified in phi-features, the relative referentiality between them was determined by (15) as a default case. *Casin* was thus predicted to be more referential than *cakicasin/selo* since *casin* can bind both local anaphors whereas neither *cakicasin* nor *selo* may bind *casin*, as was shown in (16) and (17).

- (16) a. John_i-un [casin_i-i cakicasin_i-lul pulshinhakoissstako] malhatta.
John-Top self-Nom selfself-Acc not trust said
John said that self does not trust selfself.
- b. ? John_i-un [cakicasin_i-i casin_i-lul pulshinhakoissstako] malhatta.¹⁰
John-Top selfself-Nom self-Acc not trust said
- (17) a. geu tu sunsengnim_i-un [casin-tul_i-i selo_i-lul pybanghattako]
malhatta.
the two teachers-Top self-Plural-Nom each other-Acc criticized
said
The two teachers said that selves criticized each other.
- b. ?? geu tu sunsengnim_i-un [selo_i-ka casin-tul_i-lul pybanghattako]

10) I noted in Lee (1997) that even though quite a few native speakers found (16b) acceptable, they generally agreed that the optimal binding case is the one where the monomorphemic anaphor (e.g. *casin*) binds the heavy one (the bimorphemic *cakicasin*) as in (16a). It was also noted that the same pattern holds between Japanese *zibun* and *zibunzisin* and between Dutch *zich* and *zichzelf* according to my informants.

malhatta.

the two teachers-Top each other-Nom self-Plural criticized said
(Lee, 1997, p. 391)

The application of conditions (9) and (15) to all the anaphoric expressions yielded the referential hierarchy in (7), and Lee (1997) argued that this hierarchy correlates with relative long distance binding effects as stated in (8).

V. Referential Hierarchy and Local Obviation

Assuming that the referential hierarchy proposed in Lee (1997) is tenable, we may claim that it correlates not only with long distance binding but also with the relative LO effects described in section 3 above:

- (18) Local Obviation: The more referential an anaphoric expression is, the stronger the local obviation effects.

We see that as we move up on the referential hierarchy in (7) from *akicasin* and *selo*, the lowest elements, up to *ku*, the highest element, relative referentiality as determined by (9) and (15) increases, and so does the degree of LO effects involved. As we move down on the hierarchy, the tendency for local binding increases while the relative degree of LO effects gradually decreases. This account may be a reasonable one since I am treating both LO and long distance binding as relative phenomena rather than absolute ones.

The proposed account may also shed light on the nature of the Principle C of binding theory. According to Lasnik (1991) (and condition (15)), names like *John* are more referential than the pronominals (e.g. *he*). Then the proposed account predicts that the former should manifest a

stronger degree of local obviation than the latter. Since the domain in which the former should be free (matrix clause) is substantially larger than that in which the latter should remain free, it may be claimed that names manifest the strongest degree of local obviation (long(er) distance disjoint reference effects). Viewed in this way, principle C may be simply reduced down to a non-substantive descriptive term without any theoretical contents, representing an instantiation of long(est) distance disjoint reference effects (strongest local obviation effects).

VI. Apparent Problematics: *Himself*-type Anaphors

In (19), *kucasin* (himself) is obligatorily bound by the local antecedents.

- (19) a. John_i-un kucasin_i-lul bipanhatta.
 John-Top himself-Acc criticized
 John criticized himself.
- b. Yengswu_i-nun Chelswu_j-ka kucasin*_i-ul cal tobol-kessirako sengkakhanta.
 Yengswu-Top Chelswu-Nom himself-Acc well take care of-will think
 Yengswu thinks that Chelswu will take good care of himself.

Assuming that my account in section 2 that local obviation effects are fundamentally related to the phi-feature specification of a bound anaphoric pronoun is valid, the question is why in (19a) and (b), *kucasin*, which is fully specified in phi-features, does not show local obviation effects.

The answer may be provided in the following way. *kucasin* will have the structure (NP or DP) where *ku* and *casin* are in a spec-head relation. If it is the head rather than its spec that determines the phi-feature specification of the maximal projection, then *kucasin* may be deficient in phi-features since the head *casin* does not have phi-features, hence no local obviation effects for featureless *kucasin*. Likewise, if the two

components of the English local anaphor *himself* are in a spec-head relation, then *himself* could be taken to be featureless, with the assumption that the X^0 head of *himself*, that is, featureless *-self*, rather than its spec (*him*), determines the phi-feature specification of the maximal projection (NP or DP). Such being the case, the conditions in (9) and (18) would predict that the featureless English local anaphor *himself* is substantially less referential than *him*, and would thus show the weakest degree of LO, obligatory local binding. This account may explain why *cakicasin* is featureless, even though the third person anaphor *caki* carries some specification of phi-features. Featureless *casin*, the head, but not *caki* (the spec), will determine the phi-feature specification of *cakicasin*. Therefore, the maximal projection *cakicasin* would be featureless in the same manner.

An alternative way to account for the view that *kucasin*, *himself*, and *cakicasin* may be maximally unspecified in phi-features can be found in Reinhart and Reuland (1993). The data in (19) would be exactly the case referred to as a reflexive-marked predicate by their binding condition A, which guarantees obligatory local binding of SELF anaphors (e.g. *kucasin*, *himself*, *cakicasin*, etc.). Reinhart and Reuland (1993) argues that SELF anaphors including the English local anaphor *himself*, when locally bound, forms an A-chain with their antecedents, and the chain obeys the A-chain condition requiring that only a head but not a tail of an A-chain must be fully specified in phi-features and Case-marked. This is so because a SELF anaphor (e.g. *himself*) would not be Case-marked in the tail position of a given A-chain. Then, that the local anaphors *kucasin*, *himself*, and *cakicasin* are featureless in a Caseless position (a tail position of an A-chain) can be accounted for through a version of Chomsky's (1986) Visibility Condition that a noun phrase must satisfy: a noun phrase must have Case to be visible for theta role assignment. Suppose that NP must have Case since it functions to identify how the

NP is referentially interpreted in the theta structure. As I suggested in (9), if it is the case that whether or not an NP can be referentially interpreted depends upon the phi-features it carries, then we can say that Case functions to guarantee the referential interpretation of an NP in the relevant theta structure through properly licensing the phi-features the NP carries. This would entail that for an NP to be referential, the phi-features it carries must be properly licensed and be made visible by an additional feature, namely, Case feature. Such being the case, the phi-features of *kucasin* (a SELF anaphor) in (19) can not be properly licensed due to the lack of Case feature and would remain invisible. The unlicensed (invisible) phi-features the SELF anaphors carry will fail to yield a referential interpretation, hence the weakest degree of LO, obligatory local binding.

REFERENCES

- Bickerton, D. (1987). He himself: anaphor, pronoun, or --- ?. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 18, 345-348.
- Burzio, L. (1988). *On the non-existence of disjoint reference principles*. Paper presented at the 1988 annual meeting of the Linguistic Society of America.
- Chomsky, N. (1981). *Lectures on government and binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Chomsky, N. (1986). *Knowledge of language: Its nature, origin, and use*. New York: Praeger.
- Chomsky, N. (1995). *The minimalist program*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Enc, M. (1989). Pronouns, licensing and binding. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 7, 51-92.
- Enc, M. (1991). The semantics of specificity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 22, 1-25.

- Harbert, W. (1995). Binding theory, control, and pro. In G. Webelhuth (Ed.), *Government and binding theory and the minimalist program* (pp. 177-240). Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Heim, I., Lasnik, H., & May, R. (1991). Reciprocity and plurality. *Linguistic Inquiry* 22, 63-101.
- Huang, J. (1995). Logical form. In G. Webelhuth (Ed.), *Government and binding theory and the minimalist program* (pp. 125-175). Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Kim, S. (1993). The domains of syntax and pragmatics for *ca*ki binding. In S. Kuno et al (Eds.), *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics V* (pp. 495-508). Seoul, Korea: Hanshin.
- Lasnik, H. (1991). On the necessity of binding conditions. In Freidin (Ed.), (pp. 7-28).
- Lee, C. (1988). Issues in Korean anaphora. In E. Baek (Ed.), *Papers from the sixth international conference on Korean Linguistics at University of Toronto* (pp. 339-358). Seoul, Korea: Hanshin.
- Lee, G. (1997). Long distance binding as a gradational relation. In S. Kuno et al (Eds.), *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics VII* (pp. 384-398). Seoul, Korea: Hanshin.
- Li, Y. (1994). The Japanese dialectal monomorphemic *zisin* and its theoretical implications: a contrast with Chinese *ziji*. In B. Lust, G. Hermon, & J. Kornfilt (Eds.), *Binding, dependencies, and learnability* (pp. 83-90). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Park, K. (1988). Reflexive anaphora in Korean. In E. Baek (Ed.), *Papers from the sixth international conference on Korean Linguistics at University of Toronto* (pp. 601-614). Seoul, Korea: Hanshin.
- Reinhart, T. & Reuland, E. (1993). Reflexivity. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 24, 657-720.