

Phase and Long-distance antecedency

Kook-Hee Gill

(University of Sheffield)

In a recent attempt to reinterpret the binding conditions within Minimalism, Hicks (2004) shows that the binding conditions do not need any special modification while the notion of binding domain can be understood as Chomsky's (2001, 2003, 2005) *phase* rather than the governing category which is problematic as Minimalism dispenses with the notion of government. The aim of this paper is to extend this approach to long-distance anaphors in Korean and long distance anaphora in general. The basic question arising within this framework is that the long-distance anaphor will not be accessible to its long-distance binder due to the phase impenetrability condition, unless it is located at the edge of the immediately subordinate phase to the one containing the binder. This, however is only a rare case.

As the following examples show the long distance anaphor in Korean, *caki*, can be anteceded ambiguously by the local subject as well as the matrix subject.

- (1) a. John_i-un [Mary_j-ka caki_{i/j}-lul sungjin-ey chuchenhayssta-ko] mitessta
 John-TOP Mary-NOM caki-ACC promotion-in recommended-COMP criticized
 'John_i believed that Mary_j recommended caki_{i/j} for promotion'
 b. John_i-un [caki_j-ka Mary-lul sungjin-ey chuchenhayssta-ko] cucanghayssta
 John-TOP self-NOM Mary-ACC promotion-in recommended-COMP claimed
 'John_i claimed that self_i recommended Mary for promotion'

The previous approaches toward this kind of binding patterns have been mainly either to state what can be the potential binder of such anaphors (e.g., subject conditions, any X-commanding NPs) or to extend the local binding domain (e.g., up to the matrix clauses/root clauses). However, in a minimalist approach where the binding domain would be strictly defined by the phase, it would be hard to explain the status of the long-distance antecedents indicated by *i* above.

In this paper, we propose that *caki* is similar to any locally bound reflexives in that it has an uninterpretable REF feature (Hicks 2004) that needs to be checked/valued by an interpretable referent (pronouns or referential expressions) within the phase. As mentioned above, in order to become accessible to higher antecedents *caki* must move to the edge of the phase, which in (1) it does not.

To solve this problem we will suggest that these cases are similar to the cases Japanese cases studied by Saito (2003) (see also Tsoulas 2003 for a comparison involving the Korean anaphor *cakicasin* which behaves differently from *caki* that we look at here) Saito studies examples like the following:

- (2) Taroo-ga_i [_{CP} zibunzisin_{i/j/k} Hanako-ga_j [_{CP} t Ziroo-ga_k t hihansita to] itta to omotteiry
 Tarii-NOM self-ACC Hanako-NOM Ziroo-NOM criticized that said that think
 (koto)
 fact
 'Taroo_i thinks that self_{i/j/k} Hanako_j said that Ziroo-ga_k criticized'

In Japanese, when an anaphor like *zibunzisin* is scrambled long-distance its array of possible binders increases proportionally to the distance that it has moved away from its base position. While passing through the intermediate [spec, CP] positions, the anaphor maintains its A(naphoric) (Semantic) features. At any point, it is possible to scramble only the P(honetic) features and in that case there will be no increase in the potential binders. What I will propose here for the Korean anaphor *caki* is that essentially we have the mirror image of the Japanese case. Essentially the proposal here is that long-distance binding involves successive cyclic long-distance scrambling of only the semantic features of the anaphor. When the long distance anaphor like *caki* is long distance bound across clausal boundaries, (copies of) its semantic features will be available at each [spec CP] position but it is only the base position (its θ -position) that will retain its P-features. This allows us to explain the data in (1) where *caki* is spelled out in its base position, yet it can be still visible to the possible higher antecedents. This way, the long-distance antecedency is explained away by the phasal derivation and does not need any alteration of Condition A for long-distance anaphora. Furthermore, long-distance anaphors are assimilated to short distance ones. A welcome result.