



Scopus® doi

Journal of Vibration Engineering

ISSN:1004-4523

Registered



SCOPUS



GOOGLE SCHOLAR



DIGITAL OBJECT
IDENTIFIER (DOI)



IMPACT FACTOR 6.1



Our Website
www.jove.science

Syntax and Semantics of Overlapping Reference: Focusing on English and Korean

Namkil Kang¹

(Prof, Far East University, South Korea)

Yoon Mo Yang²

(Prof, Far East University, South Korea)

This paper aims to provide in-depth syntactic and semantic analyses of overlapping reference in English and Korean. A point to note is that the existence of overlapping reference is attributed to the fact that pronouns can function as free pronouns, referring to someone else (or people) or coreferential pronouns, referring to the same entity. A further point to note is that only singular QPs permit overlapping reference, but not with plural QPs. A major point of this paper is that the conjunct such as *A wa B* 'A and B' in Korean never yields overlapping reference since it is semantically plural. On the other hand, *A to B to* 'not only A but also B' in Korean and *A ppwunman anila B to* 'not only A but also B' in Korean easily yield overlapping reference. It is worth observing that the Korean reflexive *caki-casin-tul* 'self-self-pl' produces overlapping reference unlike English plural reflexive *themselves*, but it is interpreted as bound to local antecedents as well as non-local antecedents. On the other hand, the Korean reflexive *caki-tul* 'self-pl' is interpreted as bound to only non-local antecedents. It must be stressed, on the other hand, that English reflexives have no reference. So they must always look for their linguistic antecedent for full interpretation, but they do not require someone else (or people) in discourse. It is worth noting that the Korean suffix *tul* 'plurality' bears someone else (or people), which makes overlapping reference available in Korean. It is significant to note that the plural morpheme *tul* 'plurality' makes NPs plural and triggers a bound variable reading, a group reading, overlapping reference, and a free reading. Finally, it is worthwhile observing that overlapping reference of *caki-casin-tul* 'self-self' is licensed by the SEM after the first Transfer or the second Transfer. On the other hand, that of *caki-tul* 'self-pl' is licensed by the SEM after the second Transfer. Exactly the same can be said of the plural pronoun *ku-tul* 'he-pl'. It shares the same property with *caki-tul* 'self-pl'. Put differently, overlapping reference of Korean pronominals and reflexives is licensed by Transfer and semantic computations within Chomsky (2019a/b).

Keywords: overlapping reference, suffix *tul*, a bound variable reading, a group reading, a free reading, semantic computations

1. Introduction

This paper aims to analyze the so-called overlapping reference in English and Korean, which is well-known as a property of pronouns. More specifically, while the English pronoun *they* permits overlapping reference, the English reflexive *themselves* does not permit the overlap of reference. Quite interestingly, the so-called Korean plural reflexives produce overlapping reference. Note, however, that the Korean plural reflexive *caki-casin-tul* 'self-self-pl' can be bound to both local antecedents and non-local antecedents. It is worth pointing out that the Korean plural reflexive *caki-tul* 'self-pl' can be bound to only non-local antecedents. This in fact happens, due to the fact that the plural suffix *tul* 'plurality' does something. This is the so-called parameter making a difference between English and Korean. To begin with, we delve into the interaction between pronouns and quantifiers. More interestingly, overlapping reference is available with singular quantifiers, but not with plural quantifiers. This, in turn, indicates that plural pronouns and reflexives can be bound to quantifiers, but they never allow the overlap of reference. The Korean suffix *tul* 'plurality' enables pronouns and reflexives to permit two readings such as a bound variable reading and a group reading. Second, the conjunct A and B never permit overlapping reference in English and Korean. In this case, a singular NP plays a role. That is to say, plural pronouns and plural reflexives permit overlapping reference with a singular NP. Simply put, plural pronouns and plural reflexives allowing overlapping reference require their reference to be singular. Third, the Korean plural reflexive *caki-casin-tul* 'self-self-pl' can be interpreted as bound to local antecedents and non-local antecedents, inducing overlapping reference. It is

¹ First author

² Corresponding author

worthwhile pointing out, on the other hand, that the Korean plural reflexive *caki-tul* ‘self-pl’ can be interpreted as bound to only non-local antecedents. It must be pointed out, on the other hand, that plural pronouns in English and Korean can be interpreted as bound to non-local antecedents, observing Binding Principle B. Fourth, we delve into the difference between pronouns and reflexives with respect to overlapping reference. English allows overlapping reference with pronominals, while it never permits overlapping reference with reflexives. However, things are different if we consider Korean. Korean permits overlapping reference with both plural pronominals and plural reflexives. Notice, however, that this takes place, due to the fact that the plural suffix *tul* ‘plurality’ triggers overlapping reference. This, in turn, enables us to grasp the difference between English and Korean. Fifth, it must be noted that English and Korean pronominals have overlapping reference outside the governing category, observing Binding Condition B. Sixth, it is worth observing that Korean plural reflexives have overlapping reference within their governing category or outside their governing category. Seventh, we attempt to contemplate the plural suffix *tul* ‘plurality’ that triggers five readings in Korean. Finally, we attempt to account for the existence of overlapping reference within Chomsky (2019a/b). We try to explain the overlap of reference in terms of Transfer (Adger & Sevenonius 2015) and semantic computations.

2. Results

2.1. Overlapping Reference

It is well-known that having overlapping reference is one of the properties of pronouns. It is noted by Giorgi 1984, Lebeaux 1985, Lasnik 1981, 1989, Lasnik & Uriagerreka (1988), and Büring 2005 among others. To begin with, let us consider relations between NPs:

Table 1 Relations between NPs

	Atomic parts of [NP1]]	Atomic parts of [[NP2]]
Disjoint reference	Ana, Bo, Carl	Dale, Ernst, Flo
Coreference	Ana, Bo, Carl	Ana, Bo, Carl
Overlapping reference	Ana, Bo, Carl	Carl, Dale, Ernst

(Büring 2005)

Previous studies on overlapping reference provide a test distinguishing pronouns from reflexives. While pronouns can have overlapping reference, reflexives cannot. As exemplified in Table 1, overlapping reference allows an overlap of reference, as evidenced by the fact that Carl in NP₁ and Carl in NP₂ overlap, but the other two do not overlap, as in Ana and Bo in NP₁ and Dale and Ernst in NP₂. This argument builds support for the claim that an NP can be a pronoun if it has overlapping reference, as illustrated in Table 1:

(1) Tom_i said that they_{i+j} went on a blind date.

It is worthwhile noting that in (1), the pronoun *they* can be interpreted as referring to *Tom* and someone else (or people) in discourse. Also, *they* can be interpreted as referring to some other people, thus counting as disjoint reference. Simply put, the English pronoun *they* can be two ways ambiguous in that *they* can induce overlapping reference and disjoint reference. A question that naturally arises is “why does the English pronoun *they* permit overlapping reference?” Why does this take place? We wish to argue that the English pronouns *they* functions as free pronouns and coreferential pronouns in the spirit of Montalbetti (1984) and Evans (1980):

(2) A Typology of Pronouns

- (i) Free Pronouns
- (ii) Coreferential Pronouns
- (iii) E-type Pronouns
- (iv) Bound pronouns

As Montalbetti points out, free pronouns are employed to make reference to an object present in the shared perceptual environment, as indicated in (3):

(3) I am glad they have left.

Second, coreferential pronouns are intended to be understood as being coreferential with a referring expression, as illustrated in (4):

(4) John thinks he walks smartly.

This leads us to conclude that the existence of overlapping reference is attributed to the fact that pronouns can function as free pronouns, referring to someone else (or people) or coreferential pronouns, referring to the same entity. It seems thus reasonable to contend that overlapping reference comes from the by-product of free pronouns and coreferential pronouns.

2.2. Quantifiers and Overlapping Reference

This section is devoted to going over the interaction between quantifiers and anaphoric elements. To start with, take a look at (5):

(5) Nwukwuna ku-tul-i yenglihata-ko sayngkakhanta.
(Everyone thinks that they are smart.)

It must be pointed out that the Korean pronoun *ku-tul* ‘they’ can be interpreted as related to the quantifier everyone. More specifically, the Korean pronoun *ku-tul* ‘he-pl’ can be interpreted as bound to the QP *nwukuwuna* ‘everyone’, thereby inducing the following interpretation: John thinks he is smart, Tom thinks he is smart, Bill thinks he is smart, etc. It is worth noticing, on the other hand, that the Korean pronoun *ku-tul* ‘he-pl’ can also be interpreted as referring to some other people in discourse. Consequently, the Korean pronoun *ku-tul* ‘they’ can be two ways ambiguous, namely a bound variable reading and a free reading. More importantly, the Korean pronoun *ku-tul* ‘he-pl’ permits two readings, but it never induces overlapping reference. Why does this happen? We wish to argue that everyone is semantically plural, so the Korean plural pronoun *ku-tul* ‘he-pl’ never permits overlapping reference, as evidenced by the fact that only singular antecedents enable the Korean plural pronouns *ku-tul* ‘they’ to permit overlapping reference:

(6) John-i ku-tul-i party-lul lyelkessila-ko malhayssta.

(John said that they would have a party.)

(7) John-i ku-tul-i ohlassta-ko malhayssta.

(John said that they were right.)

As indicated in (6) and (7), the Korean pronoun *ku-tul* ‘they’ easily induces overlapping reference since its antecedent is singular. Someone-type QPs lend their support to the fact that only singular antecedents permit overlapping reference:

(8) Nwukwunka ku-tul-i ohlassta-ko malhayssta.

(Someone said that they were right.)

It worthwhile observing that (8) is two ways ambiguous in that *ku-tul* ‘they’ refers someone and someone else (or people) or some other people. Put differently, *ku-tul* ‘they’ can refer to someone and someone else (or people) in discourse, giving rise to overlapping reference and some other people, yielding a free reading. Each-type QPs provide further evidence that only singular antecedents permit overlapping reference:

(9) Kakca-ka ku-tul-i ku-tul-uy sensayng-nim-ul mannassta-ko malhayssta.

(Each person said that he met his teacher.)

Note, furthermore that each person is semantically plural since it refers to all individuals. Put differently, “all individuals left” is true only if each person left. That is why in (9), *ku-tul* ‘he-pl’ does not induce overlapping reference. Rather, the Korean plural pronoun *ku-tul* ‘he-pl’ is interpreted as related to each-type QPs, yielding the following interpretation: John said that he met his teacher, Tom said that he met his teacher, Bill said that he met

his teacher, etc. It seems thus reasonable to assume that the Korean plural pronoun *ku-tul* ‘he-pl’ gives rise to only a bound variable reading. From all of this, it is clear that only singular QPs permit overlapping reference, but not with plural QPs.

2.3. A Conjunct and Overlapping Reference

This section is dedicated to looking into the possibility of overlapping reference in the conjunct. It should be pointed out that the conjunct (A and B) never induces overlapping reference, but phrases like “not only A but also B” is likely to induce overlapping reference. More specifically, the conjunct such as *A wa B* ‘A and B’ in Korean never yields overlapping reference since it is semantically plural. On the other hand, *A to B to* ‘not only A but also B’ in Korean and *A ppwunman anila B to* ‘not only A but also B’ in Korean easily yield overlapping reference. These phrases are supposed to be singular denoting expressions and hence overlapping reference is available:

(10) John kwa Tom-i ku-tul-uy chinkwu-lul mannassta.

(John and Tom met their friend.)

(11) John kwa Tom-i ku-tul-uy zip-ul ciessta.

(John and Tom built their house.)

It is worthwhile noting that in (10), the Korean pronoun *ku-tul* ‘he-pl’ never induces overlapping reference since the conjunct is a plural denoting expression. Rather, the Korean plural pronoun *ku-tul* ‘he-pl’ is coreferential with *John* and *Tom*. Exactly the same can be said of (11). As expected, the Korean plural pronoun *ku-tul* ‘he-pl’ never yields overlapping reference. In this case, *ku-tul* ‘he-pl’ is coreferential with the conjunct. This, in turn, indicates that the plural pronoun *ku-tul* ‘he-pl’ never gives rise to overlapping reference. However, things are different if we consider phrases like a singular denoting one:

(12) John to Bill to ku-tul-uy chinkwu-lul mannassta.

(Not only John but also Bill met his friend.)

It is important to note that the antecedent *John* permits overlapping reference and the antecedent *Bill* yields it as well. (12) provides confirmation that only singular denoting expressions are supposed to produce overlapping reference. It must be noted that *A ppwunman anila B to* ‘not only A but also B’ in Korean reveals the same property as in (12):

(13) John ppwunman anila Bill to ku-tul-uy chinkwu-lul mannassta.

(Not only John but also Bill met his friend.)

It is significant to note that as illustrated in (13), the antecedent *John* produces overlapping reference, due to the fact that it is a singular denoting entity. Exactly, the same can be said of the antecedent *Bill*. As expected, it creates overlapping reference just as in the case of the antecedent *John*. Again, overlapping reference is available, due to the fact that it is a singular denoting entity. From all of this, it is evident that while plural denoting entities never induce overlapping reference, singular denoting entities easily yield it.

2.4. Plural Anaphoric Elements and Overlapping Reference

This section focuses on looking into the different semantic properties of Korean plural reflexives’. To be more specific, the Korean reflexive *caki-casin-tul* ‘self-self-pl’ produces overlapping reference unlike English plural reflexive *themselves*, but it is interpreted as bound to local antecedents as well as non-local antecedents. On the other hand, the Korean reflexive *caki-tul* ‘self-pl’ is interpreted as bound to only non-local antecedents. Quite interestingly, as observed earlier, they are bound to quantifiers, but they never induce overlapping reference:

(14) John-i caki-casin-tul-ul onghohayssta.

(John defended himself (and someone else (or people).)

(15) John-i caki-casin-tul-uy chinkwu-lul onghohayssta.

(John defended his (and someone else’s (or people’s) friend.)

It is worth noticing that in (14), the Korean plural reflexive *caki-casin-tul* ‘self-self-pl’ produces overlapping reference unlike the English plural reflexive *themselves*. It should be pointed out that overlapping reference in (14) is available in local context. The governing category for *caki-casin-tul* ‘self-self-pl’ is the whole sentence in which *caki-casin-tul* ‘self-self-pl’ is bound to its antecedent. Note, however, that someone else (or people) does not turn

up within its governing category. Put differently, *caki-casin-tul* 'self-self-pl' is bound to its local antecedent and someone else (or people) in discourse. It is worth observing, on the other hand, that as exemplified in (15), *caki-casin-tul* 'self-self-pl' is bound to the non-local antecedent *John* and someone else (or people) in discourse. This seems to suggest that *caki-casin-tul* 'self-self-pl' gives rise to overlapping reference within local or non-local contexts. The governing category for *caki-casin-tul* 'self-self-pl' in (15) is *caki-casin-tul*'s chinkwu 'DP', which, in turn, indicates that it is an anaphor that allows local binding as well as non-local binding, thus observing Binding Condition A or violating Binding Condition A. Note, however, that *caki-casin-tul* 'self-self-pl' is interpreted as bound to quantifiers, but it never induces overlapping reference:

- (16) Nwukwuna caki-casin-tul-uy chinkwu-lul onghohayssta.
(Everyone defended his friend.)

It should be noted that while *caki-casin-tul* 'self-self-pl' in (16) never yields overlapping reference, it induces two readings. More specifically, *caki-casin* 'self-self' is interpreted as related to the quantifier everyone, inducing the following interpretation: John defended his friend, Tom defended his friend, Bill defended his friend, etc. Also, *caki-casin-tul* 'self-self-pl' is interpreted as related to the quantifier everyone, but it induces a group reading: All individuals defended a friend of them. As observed earlier, QPs that are semantically plural permit a bound variable reading and a group reading, but they never induce overlapping reference. Notice, furthermore, that the Korean reflexive *caki-tul* 'self-pl' induces overlapping reference, but it is not bound to a local antecedent. Take a look at (17):

- (17) John-i caki-tul-ul onghohayssta.
(John defended himself and someone else (or people).)
(18) John-i caki-casin-tul-ul onghohayssta.
(John defended himself and someone else (or people).)
(19) John-i caki-tul-uy chinkwu-lul onghohayssta.
(John defended his and someone else's friend (or people).)

It is worth pointing out that (17) sounds weird if overlapping reference is intended in this example. (18) is much better than (17) if overlapping reference is intended from (17) and (18). This seems to say that *caki-tul* 'self-pl' may not induce overlapping reference in the local context. More specifically, the governing category for *caki-tul* 'self-pl' is the whole sentence in which it may not be bound to the antecedent *John*, hence overlapping reference not being available. Note, however, that (19) is much better than (17), which, in turn, indicates that *caki-tul* 'self-pl' can be bound to a non-local antecedent, hence yielding overlapping reference. This seems to suggest that *caki-tul* 'self-pl' can be bound to a non-local antecedent and someone else (or people) in discourse. From all of this, it is clear that *caki-casin-tul* 'self-self-pl' and *caki-tul* 'self-pl' exhibit the different semantic contribution towards overlapping reference.

2.5. The Difference between English and Korean

This section is devoted to exploring the difference between English and Korean with respect to overlapping reference. To begin with, we wish to argue that while the English plural pronouns *they* induces overlapping reference, the English plural reflexive *themselves* never induces it:

- (20) *John_i told Tom about themselves_{i+j}.
(21) John_i defended their_{i+j} friend.

It is interesting to observe that while English plural pronouns *they* easily yields overlapping reference, the English plural reflexive *themselves* never induces it. A question that naturally arise is "Why does this take place?" We wish to argue that English reflexives have no reference. Simply put, they are non-referential, so they must look for linguistic antecedents for full interpretation. Notice, furthermore, that overlapping reference is available with a linguistic antecedent and someone else (or people) in discourse. This, in turn, indicates that overlapping reference is impossible with the English plural reflexive *themselves*. It must always look for its linguistic antecedent for full interpretation, but it does not require someone else (or people) in discourse. A question that immediately arises is "Why do Korean plural reflexives permit overlapping reference?" We wish to argue that the Korean suffix *tul* 'plurality' bears someone else (or people). For instance, *ku-tul* 'he-pl' refers to him and someone else (or people). Also, *caki-casin-tul* 'self-self-pl' refers to himself (herself) and someone else. It is not surprising if we consider Korean. Korean allows the suffix *tul* 'plurality' to be attached to all NPs, as evidenced by (22):

- (22) a. *ku-tul* ‘he-pl’
 b. *ku-casin-tul* ‘himself-pl’
 c. *caki-casin-tul* ‘self-pl’
 d. *casin-tul* ‘self-pl’
 e. *caki-tul* ‘self-pl’

As alluded to in (22), the suffix *tul* ‘plurality’ can be attached to all NPs, thereby permitting overlapping reference. It seems thus reasonable to conclude that Korean and English are different from each other in that Korean allows the suffix *tul* ‘plurality’ to be attached to NPs, permitting overlapping reference.

2.6. The Function of the Plural Morpheme *tul* ‘plurality’

This section aims to go over the semantic contribution of the plural morpheme *tul* ‘plurality’. First, the suffix *tul* ‘plurality’ is used as a plural marker of NPs. This morpheme can freely be attached to NPs, referring to plural entities, as exemplified in (23):

- (23) *Manun haksayng-i ku-tul-i ttokttokhata-ko sayngkakhanta.*
 (Many students think that they are intelligent.)

It is worth observing that *ku-tul* ‘he-pl’ refers to *many students*. Interestingly, the plural marker *tul* ‘plurality’ makes NPs plural. Simply put, the first function of the suffix *tul* ‘he’ is a plural marker of NPs. The second semantic contribution of the plural morpheme *tul* ‘plurality’ is that it triggers a bound variable reading, as evidenced by (24):

- (24) *Nwukwuna ku-tul-i ttokttokhatako sayngkakhanta.*
 (Everyone thinks that they are intelligent.)

As illustrated in (24), the suffix *tul* ‘plurality’ renders (24) a bound variable reading as in (25):

- (25) (Every *x*: *x* a person) *x* thinks that *x* is intelligent.

Put differently, *ku-tul* ‘he-pl’ can be interpreted as bound to the QP *nwukwuna* with the following interpretation: John thinks that he is intelligent, Bill thinks that he is intelligent, Tom thinks that he is intelligent, etc. The third semantic contribution of the suffix *tul* ‘plurality’ is that it triggers a group reading, as shown in (24):

- (26) There is a group *G* of everyone, each of whom is an *x* such that *x* thinks *G* are all intelligent.

Put differently, in (24), *ku-tul* ‘he-pl’ can be interpreted as bound to the QP *nwukwuna* ‘everyone’ with the following interpretation: John thinks that a group *G* of everyone are all intelligent, Bill thinks that a group *G* of everyone are all intelligent, Tom thinks that a group *G* of everyone are all intelligent, etc. The fourth semantic contribution of the suffix *tul* ‘plurality’ is that it triggers overlapping reference, as observed earlier:

- (27) *John-i ku-tul-i ku-tul-uy emeni-lu mannassta-ko malhayssta.*
 (John said that they met their mother.)

It is important to note that *ku-tul* ‘he-pl’ can be interpreted as referring to the antecedent *John* and someone else (or people) in discourse. The fifth semantic contribution of the plural morpheme *tul* ‘plurality’ is that it triggers a free reading. It is interesting to observe that in (27), *ku-tul* ‘he-pl’ can refer to some other people in discourse. From all of this, it is clear that the suffix *tul* plays five pivotal semantic roles in a sentence. It seems thus reasonable to conclude that the plural morpheme *tul* ‘plurality’ triggers five semantic interpretations within a sentence.

2.7. Overlapping Reference in Chomsky (2019a/b)

In what follows, we attempt to capture overlapping reference within current generative grammar (Chomsky 2019a/b, Adger & Sevenonius 2015). We will try to capture the governing category for pronominals and plural reflexives in terms of Transfer (Adger & Sevenonius 2015). Adger & Sevenonius (2015) employ Transfer in order to account for the governing category as in (28):

- (28) Transfer: Transfer the minimal structure containing the finite complementizer to phonological and semantic computations. Once a structure has been transferred, it is no longer accessible to further syntactic computation.

Chomsky (2019b) tries to argue that “while no firm conclusions can be drawn, it is plausible that Merge and Transfer are rooted in principles of efficient computation” (Chomsky 2019b). In this paper, following Chomsky (2019a/b), we define a syntactic unit as follows:

- (29) a. Lexical items are syntactic units.
b. If A and B are syntactic units then Merge $(A, B) = \{A, B\}$ is a syntactic unit.

In this paper, we attempt to provide the following theorem of anaphoric elements:

- (30) a. Overlapping reference of *caki-casin-tul* ‘self-self-pl’ is licensed by the SEM after the first Transfer or the second Transfer.
b. Overlapping reference of *caki-tul* ‘self-pl’ is licensed by the SEM after the second Transfer.
c. Overlapping reference of *ku-tul* ‘he-pl’ is licensed by the SEM after the second Transfer.

To begin with, let us consider (31):

- (31) John-i caki-casin-tul-uy emeni-lul mannasstako malhassta.
(John said that they met their mother.)
(32) Merge (they, met) = {they, met}
Merge {they, {met, {their}}}
Merge {they, {met, {their, {mother}}}}
(that, {met, {their, {mother}}})
The first Transfer takes place because *that* is a finite complementizer
SEM: [x=a person, y=a person or people] [x+y met x+y’s mother]
Merge (said, {that, {they, {met, {their, {mother}}}}})
Merge (John, {said, {that, {they, {met, {their, {mother}}}}}})
{John, {said, {that, {they, {met, {their, {mother}}}}}}}
The second Transfer takes place because the derivation is finished.
SEM: [x=a person, y=a person or people] [x said that x+y met x+y’s mother]

Note that the so-called SEM refers to semantic computations and that overlapping reference must be dealt with in terms of semantic computations. It is significant to note that in (31), overlapping reference in the case of non-local binding is licensed by the SEM after the second Transfer. More specifically, overlapping reference is captured by the SEM with the following interpretation: x said that x+y met x+y’s mother.

Now attention is paid to local binding of *caki-casin-tul* ‘self-self-pl’:

- (33) John-i caki-casin-tul-ul onhohayssta.
(John defended himself and someone else (or people).)
(34) Merge (John, defended) = {John, defended}
Merge {John, {defended, {themselves}}}
Merge {John, {defended, {themselves}}}
The first Transfer takes place because the derivation is finished.
SEM: [x=a person, y=a person or people] [x defended x+y]

Note that in the case of local binding, overlapping reference of *caki-casin-tul* ‘self-self-pl’ is licensed the SEM after the first Transfer. More specifically, *caki-casin-tul* ‘self-self-pl’ is interpreted as referring to John and someone else (or people) in discourse, which is captured by the SEM, rendering (33) the following interpretation: x defended x+y.

Now let us turn our attention to overlapping reference of *caki-tul* ‘self-pl’:

- (35) John-i caki-tul-i ohlassta-ko malhayssta.
(John said that they were right.)
(36) Merge (they, were) = {they, were}
Merge {they, {were, {right}}}
Merge (that, {they, {were, {right}}})
The first Transfer takes place because *that* is a finite complementizer.
SEM: [x: a person, y: a person or people] [x+y was right]
Merge (said, {that, {they, {were, {right}}}})

Merge (John, {said, {that, {they, {were, {right}}}}}})
 Merge {John, {said, {that, {they, {were, {right}}}}}}}
 The second Transfer takes place because the derivation is finished.
 SEM: [x=a person, y=a person or people] [x said that x+y was right]

It is worthwhile noting that in the case of overlapping reference of *caki-tul* 'self-pl', it is licensed by the SEM after the second Transfer. It should be pointed out that *caki-tul* 'self-pl' can be interpreted as John and someone else or people in discourse. This is captured by the SEM, which renders (35) the following interpretation: x said that x+y was right.

Finally, let us turn our attention to the Korean plural pronoun *ku-tul* 'he-pl':

- (37) John-i ku-tul-i ku-tul-uy emeni-lul salanghayssta-ko malhayssta.
 (John said that they loved their mother.)
 (38) Merge (they, loved) = {they, loved}
 Merge {they, {loved, (their)}}
 Merge {they, {loved, {their, (mother)}}}
 (that, {they, {loved, {their, {mother}}}})
 The first Transfer takes place because *that* is a finite complemenizer.
 SEM: [x: a person, y: a person or people] [x+y loved x+y's mother]
 Merge (said, {that, {they, {loved, {their, {mother}}}}})
 Merge (John, {said, {that, {they, {loved, {their, {mother}}}}}})
 Merge {John, {said, {that, {they, {loved, {their, {mother}}}}}}}
 The second Transfer takes place because the derivation is finished.
 SEM: [x: a person, y: a person or people] [x said that x+y loved x+y's mother]

It should be pointed out that in the case of the Korean plural pronoun *ku-tul* 'he-pl', its overlapping reference is licensed by the SEM after the second Transfer. The SEM states that x said that x+y loved x+y's mother, which licenses overlapping reference of the Korean plural pronoun *ku-tul* 'he-pl'. To sum up, overlapping reference of *caki-casin-tul* 'self-self' is licensed by the SEM after the first Transfer or the second Transfer. On the other hand, that of *caki-tul* 'self-pl' is licensed by the SEM after the second Transfer. Exactly the same can be said of the plural pronoun *ku-tul* 'he-pl'. It shares the same property with *caki-tul* 'self-pl'. From all of this, it is clear that overlapping reference of Korean plural reflexives and pronouns are licensed by the SEM and Transfer within Chomsky (2019a/b).

3. Conclusion

To summarize, we have attributed the existence of overlapping reference in Korean to the plural morpheme *tul* 'plurality' and attempted to capture it within Chomsky (2019a/b). It is worth noting that the existence of overlapping reference is attributed to the fact that pronouns can function as free pronouns, referring to someone else (or people) or coreferential pronouns, referring to the same entity. It is important to note that only singular QPs permit overlapping reference, but not with plural QPs. It is worthwhile pointing out, on the other hand, that the conjunct such as *A wa B* 'A and B' in Korean never yields overlapping reference since it is semantically plural. On the other hand, *A to B to* 'not only A but also B' in Korean and *A ppwunman anila B to* 'not only A but also B' in Korean easily yield overlapping reference. It is worth observing that the Korean reflexive *caki-casin-tul* 'self-self-pl' produces overlapping reference unlike English plural reflexive *themselves*, but it is interpreted as bound to local antecedents as well as non-local antecedents. On the other hand, the Korean reflexive *caki-tul* 'self-pl' is interpreted as bound to only non-local antecedents. It must be stressed that English reflexives have no reference. They must always look for their linguistic antecedent for full interpretation, but they do not require someone else (or people) in discourse. Then why do Korean plural reflexives permit overlapping reference? We wish to argue that the Korean suffix *tul* 'plurality' bears someone else (or people), which makes overlapping reference available in Korean. It is significant to note that the plural morpheme *tul* 'plurality' makes NPs plural and triggers a bound variable reading, a group reading, overlapping reference, and a free reading. Finally, it is worthwhile observing that overlapping reference of *caki-casin-tul* 'self-self' is licensed by the SEM after the first Transfer or the second Transfer. On the other hand, that of *caki-tul* 'self-pl' is licensed by the SEM after the second Transfer. Exactly the same can be said of the plural pronoun *ku-tul* 'he-pl'. It shares the same property with *caki-tul* 'self-pl'. Put differently, overlapping reference of Korean pronominals and reflexives is licensed by Transfer and semantic computations within Chomsky (2019a/b).

References

- [1] Adger, David & Svenonius, Peter. (2015). Linguistic explanation and domain specialization: a case study in bound variable anaphora. *Frontiers in Psychology*: 1-25.
- [2] Büring, D. (2005). *Binding Theory*. Cambridge University Press.
- [3] Chomsky, N. (2019a). Some puzzling foundational Issues. *Catalan Journal of Linguistics Special Issue*: 263-285.
- [4] Chomsky, N. (2019b). Generative grammar and the faculty of language: Insights, questions, and challenges. *Catalan Journal of Linguistics Special Issue*: 229-261.
- [5] Evans, G. (1980). Pronouns. *Linguistic Inquiry* 11 (2): 337-362.
- [6] Giorgi, A. (1984). Long-Distance Anaphora. *The Linguistic Review* 4: 307-361.
- [7] Lasnik, H. (1981). On Two Recent Treatments of Disjoint Reference. *Journal of Linguistic Research* 1: 48-58.
- [8] Lasnik, H. (1989). *Essays on Anaphora*. Kluwer.
- [9] Lasnik, Howard, and Juan Uriagereka (1988). *A Course in GB Syntax*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- [10] Lebeaux, D. (1985). Locality and Anaphoric Binding. *The Linguistic Review* 3: 342-363.
- [11] Montalbetti, M. (1984). *After Binding: On the Interpretation of Pronouns*. Ph. D dissertation, MIT.