

## The Coargument-based Condition A

Namkil Kang  
Far East University  
South Korea

---

The main purpose of this paper is to demonstrate that the coargument-based binding theory (Pollard and Sag (1992), Reinhart and Reuland (1993), Safir (2004), Reuland (2005, 2011), Charnavel and Sportiche (2016)) is the most influential one of binding theories. This paper argues that Condition A applies between the coarguments of a predicate and Korean binding requires the coargument-based condition A and lexical constraints. A major point of this paper is that Korean binding requires the coargument-based binding theory which applies between two arguments of a predicate. The coargument-based binding theory explains where the complementarity problem comes from, which is a core part in the Binding Theory. A further point to note is that the Korean reflexive *caki-casin* 'self-self' is a true SELF anaphor, but *ku-casin* 'he-self' and *caki* 'self' may not. It is worth noting that Korean binding requires the coargument-based binding theory plus lexical constraints such as the same form condition. It is noteworthy that in Korean, only the same form allows coreference between anaphoric elements.

**Keywords:** binding, binding condition A, anaphor, pronoun, complementary distribution, coreference

---

Date of Submission: 28-11-2020

Date of Acceptance: 13-12-2020

---

### I. INTRODUCTION

The ultimate goal of this paper is to show that the coargument-based binding theory (Pollard and Sag (1992), Reinhart and Reuland (1993), Safir (2004), Reuland (2005, 2011), Charnavel and Sportiche (2016)) is the most plausible one of binding theories. The current paper argues that Condition A applies between the coarguments of a predicate and Korean binding requires the coargument-based condition A plus lexical constraints. The organization of this paper is as follows. In section 2, we show why the coargument-based binding theory is the most influential one of binding theories. Korean binding requires the coargument-based binding theory which applies between the coarguments of a predicate. In section 2, we also explain where the complementarity problem comes from, which is a core part in the Binding Theory. In section 3, we argue that *caki-casin* 'self-self' is a true SELF anaphor, but *ku-casin* 'he-self' and *caki* 'self' may not. In section 4, we show that Korean binding requires the coargument-based binding theory plus lexical constraints such as the same form condition. It is worth noting that in Korean, only the same form allows coreference between anaphoric elements.

### II. THE COARGUMENT-BASED BINDING THEORY

The coargument-based binding theory is advocated by Pollard and Sag (1992), Reinhart and Reuland (1993), Safir (2004), Reuland (2005, 2011), and Charnavel and Sportiche (2016). Reuland (2005) and Charnavel and Sportiche (2016) define Binding Condition A as follows:

(1) Binding Condition A:

“A reflexive-marked syntactic predicate is reflexive.

A syntactic predicate is reflexive-marked if one of its arguments is a SELF anaphor”. (Reuland 2005: 8)

(2) Binding Condition A:

“A SELF anaphor must be bound by an eligible syntactic coargument. It is exempt if and only if it does not have such a coargument”.

(Charnavel and Sportiche 2016: 48)

(1) and (2) have one thing in common. That is, Binding Condition A applies between two arguments of a predicate. Let us observe the following sentences:

(3) Mary<sub>i</sub> saw a snake near her<sub>i</sub>.

(4) Mary<sub>i</sub> saw a snake near herself<sub>i</sub>.

Interestingly, anaphors and pronouns appear in the same position. This in turn indicates that Chomsky's (1981, 1982, 1986, 1995) Binding Theory cannot capture the fact that anaphors and pronouns can occur in the same position. That is, the standard Binding Theory

cannot explain the grammaticality of (3) and (4) since Binding Condition A and Binding Condition B state that the distribution of anaphors and pronouns must be complementary, as indicated in (5).

- (5) a. Binding Condition A:  
 An anaphor is bound in its governing category.  
 b. Binding Condition B:  
 A pronoun is free in its governing category.

As alluded to in (5), Binding Condition A and Binding Condition B state that anaphors and pronouns must have two different governing category. However, the fact that anaphor and pronouns in (3) and (4) overlap in the same position suggests that Chomsky's standard Binding Theory is far from complete as indicated by the grammaticality of both (3) and (4). Now attention is paid to the coargument-based binding theory. The grammaticality of (3) and (4) can be easily accounted for under it. Note that the English reflexive *herself* is a SELF anaphor in the spirit of Reinhart & Reuland (1989, 1991, 1993). The SELP anaphor *herself* must be bound by an eligible syntactic coargument (Charnavel and Sportiche 2016). However, the English reflexive *herself* does not function as an argument of the predicate *saw*. The coarguments of the predicate *saw* are *Mary* and *a snake near herself*, not *Mary* and *herself*. Hence, Binding Condition A is not applicable to (4). That is, Binding Condition A is exempt since the English reflexive *herself* does not function as an argument of the predicate *saw*. Thus, reflexives and pronominals can overlap in the same position, which is captured by the coargument-based binding theory.

Now let us consider the following sentences:

- (6) *Mary<sub>i</sub> saw a picture of herself<sub>i</sub>.*  
 (7) *Mary<sub>i</sub> saw a picture of her<sub>i</sub>.*

Chomsky's (1981, 1982, 1986, 1995) Binding Theory cannot account for the fact that anaphors and pronouns overlap in the same position, as illustrated in (6) and (7). That is to say, Chomsky's (1981, 1982, 1986, 1995) Binding Condition A predicts that the English reflexive *herself* must be bound to the antecedent *Mary*, whereas his Binding Condition B predicts that the English pronoun *her* must be free in its governing category (from the antecedent *Mary*). In a word, Binding Condition A and Binding Condition B state that the distribution of anaphors and pronouns must be complementary. Thus, again, Chomsky's (1981, 1982, 1986, 1995) Binding Theory wrongly predicts that one of (6) and (7) must be ungrammatical. However, the coargument-based binding theory clearly account for why (6) and (7) are grammatical. In (6), the coarguments of *saw* are *Mary* and *a picture of herself*, not *Mary* and *herself*. Thus, the coargument-based binding theory clearly predict that anaphors and pronouns overlap in the same position. In (6), Binding Condition A is not applicable to this sentence since the English reflexive *herself* does not function as an argument of *saw*. Simply put, the coargument-based binding theory regulates only the coarguments of a predicate. Thus, it predicts that (6) and (7) are all grammatical and that the distribution of anaphors and pronouns is not be complementary.

Now attention is paid to Korean binding. Let us consider the following sentences:

- (8) \*Tom believes that himself is intelligent.  
 (9) a. Tom-i caki-ka ttoktokhata-ko mitnun-ta.  
 NOM self-NOM intelligent-COMP believe  
 (Tom believes that self is intelligent.)  
 b. Tom-i ku-casin-I ttoktokhata-ko mitnun-ta.  
 NOM he-self-NOM intelligent-COMP believe  
 (Tom believes that he-self is intelligent.)  
 c. Tom-i caki-casin-i ttoktokhata-ko mitnun-ta.  
 NOM self-self-NOM intelligent-COMP believe  
 (Tom believes that self-self is intelligent.)  
 (10) Tom-i ku-ka ttoktokhata-ko mitnun-ta.  
 NOM he-NOM intelligent-COMP believe  
 (Tom believes that he is intelligent.)

It must be noted that (9a), (9b), and (9c) are all grammatical. What this suggests is that the Korean anaphors *ku-casin* 'he-self', *caki-casin* 'self-self', and *caki* 'self' cannot be treated on a par with English anaphors. Clearly, (9) indicates that Korean does not have the TSC effect. The idea of the TSC is that a reflexive cannot become the subject of a tensed clause. Hence, (8) is ruled out by the TSC. However, (9a), (9b), and (9c) are grammatical even though they violate the TSC. Note, however, that the Korean pronoun *ku* 'he' can be the subject of a tensed clause. Again, Chomsky's (1981, 1982, 1986, 1995) Binding Theory wrongly predicts that the distribution of anaphors and pronouns must be complementary. Chomsky's (1981, 1982, 1986, 1995) Binding Conditions A and B cannot account for the fact that (9a), (9b), (9c), and (10) are all grammatical. However, the coargument-based binding theory (Pollard and Sag (1992),

Reinhart and Reuland (1993), Safir (2004), Reuland (2005, 2011), Chamavel and Sportiche (2016)) clearly accounts for why the distribution of Korean anaphors and pronouns is not complementary. The Korean reflexives *ku-casin* 'he-self', *caki-casin* 'self-self', and *caki* 'self' do not function as an argument of *believe*. Rather, they function as an argument of the predicate *is*. Thus, the coargument-based Binding Condition A is not applicable to these sentences, which leads to the fact that Korean anaphors and pronouns can overlap in the same position.

Now attention is paid to Korean genitive anaphors and pronouns. Let us observe the following sentences:

- (11) a. Tom-i caki-uy sensayngnim-ul conkyeonghanta.  
 NOM self-GEN teacher-ACC respect  
 (Tom respects self's teacher.)  
 b. Tom-i ku-casin-uy sensayngnim-ul conkyeonghanta.  
 NOM he-self-GEN teacher-ACC respect  
 (Tom respects he-self's teacher.)  
 c. Tom-i caki-casin-uy sensayngnim-ul conkyeonghanta.  
 NOM self-self-GEN teacher-ACC respect  
 (Tom respects self-self's teacher.)  
 d. \*Tom respects himself's teacher.
- (12) Tom-i ku-uy sensayngnim-ul conkeyonghanta.  
 NOM he-GEN teacher-ACC respect  
 (Tom respects his teacher.)

The Korean reflexives *ku-casin* 'he-self', *caki-casin* 'self-self', and *caki* 'self' can occur in the prenominal possessive position, as alluded to in (11a), (11b), and (11c), whereas the English reflexive *himself* cannot, as indicated in (11d). What (11a), (11b), (11c), and (12) suggest is that the distribution of Korean anaphors and pronouns is not complementary. Simply put, Korean anaphors and pronouns can overlap in the same position. Again, Chomsky's (1981, 1982, 1986, 1995) Binding Theory fails to account for the grammaticality of (11a), (11b), (11c), and (12). His Binding Conditions A and B wrongly predict that the distribution of anaphors and pronouns must be complementary. However, the coargument-based binding theory (Pollard and Sag (1992), Reinhart and Reuland (1993), Safir (2004), Reuland (2005, 2011), Chamavel and Sportiche (2016)) clearly accounts for why (11a), (11b), (11c), and (12) are all grammatical. That is to say, it predicts that anaphors and pronouns can overlap in the same position. In (11), *ku-casin* 'he-self', *caki-casin* 'self-self' and *caki* 'self' do not function as an argument of the predicate *respect*. The coarguments of the predicate *respectare Tom*, and *ku-casin* 'he-self', *caki-casin* 'self-self', and *caki*'s 'self' teacher, not *Tom* and *ku-casin* 'he-self', *caki-casin* 'self-self', and *caki* 'self'. Thus, the coargument-based binding theory is not applicable to these sentences, which leads to the fact that anaphors and pronouns can overlap in the same position. We thus conclude that the coargument-based binding theory (Pollard and Sag (1992), Reinhart and Reuland (1993), Safir (2004), Reuland (2005, 2011), Chamavel and Sportiche (2016)) is the most plausible one of binding theories. Even it works for Korean binding.

### III. SE ANAPHORS AND SELF ANAPHORS

Reinhart and Reuland (1989, 1991, 1993), Reuland (2005), and Chamavel and Sportiche (2016) argue that the coarguments of a predicate are licensed by SELF anaphors. Typological differences between SELF anaphors and SE anaphors are as follows:

- (13) a. SELF anaphors:  
 local, no subject orientation, polymorphemic  
 (Norwegian *seg selv*, Dutch *zichzelf*, English *himself*)  
 b. SE anaphors:  
 subject-oriented, long-distance, monomorphemic  
 (Italian *se*, Norwegian *seg*, Dutch *zich*)

Reinhart and Reuland (1989, 1991, 1993), Reuland (2005), and Chamavel and Sportiche (2016) contend that the coarguments of a predicate are licensed not by SE anaphors but by SELF anaphors. That is, Reinhart & Reuland (1989, 1991, 1993) maintain that the coarguments of a reflexive are licensed either by the occurrence of SELF anaphors or by intrinsically reflexive predicates.

Now attention is paid to Korean binding. Let us consider the following sentences:

- (14) a. Tom-i caki-casin-ul kyeklyehayssta.  
 NOM self-self-ACC encouraged  
 (Tom encouraged self-self.)  
 b. Tom-i ku-casin-ul kyeklyehayssta.  
 NOM he-self-ACC encouraged  
 (Tom encouraged he-self.)

- c. Tom-i caki-lul kyeklyehayssta.  
 NOM self-ACC encouraged  
 (Tom encouraged self.)

The above examples are judged to be grammatical. The coarguments of the predicate *encourage* are licensed by the occurrence of *ku-casin* 'he-self', *caki-casin* 'self-self', and *caki* 'self'. That is to say, in (14), *ku-casin* 'he-self', *caki-casin* 'self-self', and *caki* 'self' function as an argument of the predicate *encourage*. The coarguments of the predicate *encourage* *Tom* and *ku-casin* 'he-self', *caki-casin* 'self-self', and *caki* 'self'. Thus, the coarguments of a predicate are licensed by the occurrence of *ku-casin* 'he-self', *caki-casin* 'self-self', and *caki* 'self', which meets Binding Condition A. Then some might suggest that *ku-casin* 'he-self', *caki-casin* 'self-self', and *caki* 'self' are all SELF anaphors, but this is not the case in bound anaphora.

Now let us observe the following examples:

- (15) a. ???Nwu<sub>i</sub>-ka caki<sub>i</sub>-lul kyeklyehayssta?  
 NOM self-ACC encouraged  
 (Who encouraged self?)  
 b. Nwu<sub>i</sub>-ka caki-casin<sub>i</sub>-ul kyeklyehayssta?  
 NOM self-self-ACC encouraged  
 (Who encouraged self-self?)
- (16) a. ???Nwukwuna<sub>i</sub>caki<sub>i</sub>-lul chaykmanghayssta.  
 everyone self-ACC blamed  
 (Everyone blamed self.)  
 b. Nwukwuna<sub>i</sub>caki-casin<sub>i</sub>-ul chaykmanghayssta.  
 everyone self-self-ACC blamed  
 (Everyone blamed self-self.)

In (15) and (16), the occurrence of *caki-casin* 'self-self' as an argument of the predicates *encourage* and *blame* along with a Wh-word antecedent or a QP antecedent is natural. However, that of *caki* 'self' as that of the predicates *encourage* and *blame* is not natural. That is to say, *caki-casin* 'self-self' functions as an argument of the predicates *encourage* and *blame* and is interpreted as a bound variable, whereas *caki* 'self' functions as an argument of the predicates *encourage* and *blame*, but it may not be construed as a bound variable. This in turn indicates that *caki-casin* 'self-self' is a SELF anaphor, whereas *caki* 'self' may not. Charnavel and Sportiche (2016) argue that a SELF anaphor must be bound by an eligible syntactic coargument. In (15) and (16), *caki-casin* 'self-self' is bound by the QP antecedent or the Wh-word antecedent which is one of the coarguments of the predicates *encourage* and *blame*, but *caki* 'self' may not. In (15) and (16), the hearer is preferred over the linguistic antecedent as the antecedent of *caki* 'self', which suggests that in (15a) and (16a), a bound variable reading of *caki* 'self' may not be available.

Now let us turn our attention to *ku-casin* 'he-self'.

- (17) a. ??Nwu<sub>i</sub>-ka ku-casin<sub>i</sub>-ul kkocipess nunka?  
 who-NOM he-self-ACC pinched Q  
 (Who pinched he-self?)  
 b. Nwu<sub>i</sub>-ka caki-casin<sub>i</sub>-ul kkocipess nunka?  
 who-NOM self-self-ACC pinched Q  
 (Who pinched self-self?)
- (18) a. ??Nwukwuna<sub>i</sub>ku-casin<sub>i</sub>-ul kyeklyehayssta?  
 everyone he-self-ACC encouraged  
 (Everyone encouraged he-self?)  
 b. Nwukwuna<sub>i</sub>caki-casin<sub>i</sub>-ul kyeklyehayssta?  
 everyone self-self-ACC encouraged  
 (Everyone encouraged self-self?)

In (17), the occurrence of *ku-casin* 'he-self' as an argument of the predicate *pinch* along with the Wh-word antecedent which is one of the coarguments of *pinch* is not natural, compared to *caki-casin* 'self-self'. However, that of *caki-casin* 'self' in the same argument position is more natural than *ku-casin* 'he-self'. This in turn suggests that *caki-casin* 'self-self' is a SELF anaphor, whereas *ku-casin* 'he-self' may not. In (17), *caki-casin* 'self-self' is bound by an eligible syntactic coargument, but *ku-casin* 'he-self' may not. Exactly the same can be said of (18). In (18), the coarguments of the predicate *encourage* are the QP *everyone* and *ku-casin* 'he-self' and *caki-casin* 'self'. Interestingly, *caki-casin* 'self-self' is bound by the QP antecedent which is one of the coarguments of the predicate *encourage*, whereas *ku-casin* 'he-self' may not. This indicates that *caki-casin* 'self-self' is a SELF anaphor, whereas *ku-casin* 'he-self' may not. We thus conclude that the Korean reflexive *caki-casin* 'self' functions as a SELF anaphor, whereas *ku-casin* 'he-self' and

*caki*'self' may not. *Caki-casin*'self-self' is bound by an eligible syntactic coargument, but *ku-casin*'he-self' and *caki*'self' may not. Now let us consider another property of SELF anaphors and SE anaphors.

- (19) a. Tom<sub>i</sub>-un ku-casin<sub>i</sub>-i Mary-lul chaykmanghayss-ko  
 TOP he-self-NOM ACC blamed-COMP  
 malhayssta.  
 said  
 (Tom said that he-self blamed Mary.)
- b. Tom<sub>i</sub>-un caki-casin<sub>i</sub>-i Mary-lul chaykmanghayss-ko  
 TOP self-self-NOM ACC blamed-COMP  
 malhayssta.  
 said  
 (Tom said that self-self blamed Mary.)
- c. Tom<sub>i</sub>-un caki<sub>i</sub>-ka Mary-lul chaykmanghayss-ko  
 TOP self-NOM ACC blamed-COMP  
 malhayssta.  
 said  
 (Tom said that he-self blamed Mary.)
- d. Tom<sub>i</sub>-un [<sub>e</sub><sub>i</sub>Mary-lul chaykmanghayss-ko]  
 TOP ACC blamed-COMP  
 malhayssta.  
 said  
 (Tom said that he blamed Mary.)

The assumption that the Korean polymorphemic anaphors *caki-casin* and *ku-csin*'he-self' are strictly local anaphors has been widely accepted. However, the LD-binding (long distance-binding) such as (19a) and (19b) poses a problem. As a matter of fact, native speakers of Korean agree that the nominative *caki-casin*'self-self' and *ku-casin*'he-self' in the embedded clause have an emphatic reading. For instance, in (19a) and (19b), native speakers of Korean have the reading of 'Tom said that TOM blamed Mary'. Thus, it is reasonable to assume that the nominative *caki-casin*'self-self' and *ku-casin*'he-self' in the embedded clause are used as emphatic reflexives. This in turn suggests that *ku-casin*'he-self' and *caki-casin*'self-self' have two properties of SELF anaphors (polymorphemic and local anaphors). On the other hand, *caki*'self' and a null argument in (19c) and (19d) show the LD-binding without any emphatic reading. We thus conclude that *caki-casin*'self-self' is a polymorphemic and local anaphor, hence a SELF anaphor. Note that *ku-casin*'he-self' is a polymorphemic and local anaphor, but it may not be bound to a Wh-word antecedent or a QP antecedent, which indicates that *ku-casin*'he-self' may not be a SELF anaphor.

#### IV. BEYOND THE COARGUMENT-BASED BINDING THEORY

In what follows, we examine Korean binding which does not fall on the coargument-based binding theory (Pollard and Sag (1992), Reinhart and Reuland (1993), Safir (2004), Reuland (2005, 2011), Chamavel and Sportiche (2016)). For this, we propose a lexical constraint. Note that two occurrences of reflexives and pronouns can bear the same index. Let us consider the following sentences.

- (20) a. Tom<sub>i</sub>-i caki<sub>i</sub>-ka caki<sub>i</sub>-uy tongsayng-ul  
 NOM self-NOM self-GEN brother-ACC  
 chaykmanghayssta-ko malhayssta.  
 blamed-COMP said  
 (Tom said that self blamed self's brother.)
- b. Tom<sub>i</sub>-i ku-casin<sub>i</sub>-i ku-casin<sub>i</sub>-uy tongsayng-ul  
 NOM he-self-NOM he-self-GEN brother-ACC  
 chaykmanghayssta-ko malhayssta.  
 blamed-COMP said  
 (Tom said that he-self blamed he-self's brother.)
- c. Tom<sub>i</sub>-i caki-casin<sub>i</sub>-i caki-casin<sub>i</sub>-uy tongsayng-ul  
 NOM self-self-NOM self-self-GEN brother-ACC  
 chaykmanghayssta-ko malhayssta.  
 blamed-COMP said  
 (Tom said that self-self blamed self-self's brother.)
- (21) Tom<sub>i</sub>-i ku<sub>i</sub>-ka ku<sub>i</sub>-uy tongsayng-ul  
 NOM he-NOM he-GEN brother-ACC

chaykmanghayssta-ko malhayssta.  
 blamed-COMP said  
 (Tom said that he blamed his brother.)

In (20) and (21), two occurrences of *caki* 'self', *caki-casin* 'self-self', and *ku-casin* 'he-self', and *ku* 'he' can have the same index. How do we account for this within the coargument-based binding theory (Pollard and Sag (1992), Reinhart and Reuland (1993), Safir (2004), Reuland (2005, 2011), Chamavel and Sportiche (2016))? In (20a), (20b), and (20c), the coarguments of the predicate *blame* are reflexives (*caki* 'self', *caki-casin* 'self-self', and *ku-casin* 'he-self') and *Tom*'s brother, not reflexives and *Tom*. Thus, the coargument-based binding theory is not applicable to these examples since the second reflexives are not an argument of the predicate *blame*. Simply put, the second reflexives do not function as an argument of the predicate *blame*. Thus, reflexives and pronouns can overlap in the same argument position. Note, however, that reflexives and pronouns which occur twice in the embedded clause are also bound to *Tom* in the matrix clause. Chomsky's (1981, 1982, 1986, 1995) Binding Theory cannot account for this since the distribution of reflexives and pronouns must be complementary. However, the coargument-based binding theory (Pollard and Sag (1992), Reinhart and Reuland (1993), Safir (2004), Reuland (2005, 2011), Chamavel and Sportiche (2016)) clearly accounts for the grammaticality of (20) and (21). In (20), reflexives do not function as an argument of the predicates *said* and *blame*. Thus, reflexives and pronouns can overlap in the same position since Binding Condition A is not applicable to these sentences. Note that Binding Condition A applies between the coarguments of a predicate.

Now let us consider the following examples:

- (22) a. \*Tom<sub>i</sub>-i caki-ka ku<sub>i</sub>-lul  
       NOM self-NOM he-ACC  
       chaykmanghayssta-ko malhayssta.  
       blamed-COMP said  
       (Tom said that self blamed him.)
- b. \*Tom<sub>i</sub>-i caki-casin<sub>i</sub>-i ku<sub>i</sub>-lul  
       NOM self-self-NOM he-ACC  
       chaykmanghayssta-ko malhayssta.  
       blamed-COMP said  
       (Tom said that self blamed him.)
- c. Tom<sub>i</sub>-i ku-casin<sub>i</sub>-i ku<sub>i</sub>-lul  
       NOM he-self-NOM he-GEN brother-ACC  
       chaykmanghayssta-ko malhayssta.  
       blamed-COMP said  
       (Tom said that self blamed him.)

In (22a), (22b), and (22c), reflexives do not function as an argument of the predicate *said* in the matrix clause, but reflexives function as an argument of the predicate *blame* in the embedded clause. This in turn indicates that Binding Condition A is applicable to reflexives and pronouns, but it is not applicable to *Tom* and reflexives. Both Chomsky's (1981, 1982, 1986, 1995) Binding Theory and the coargument-based binding theory (Pollard and Sag (1992), Reinhart and Reuland (1993), Safir (2004), Reuland (2005, 2011), Chamavel and Sportiche (2016)) are silent about this. Note that in (22), *ku-casin* 'he-self' binds *ku* 'he', but *caki-casin* 'self-self' and *caki* 'self' do not bind *ku* 'he'. Why does this happen? We wish to argue that only the same form allows coreference between anaphoric elements in Korean.

(23) Same Form Condition:

In Korean, only the same form allows coreference between anaphoric elements.

(23) clearly accounts for why (20), (21), and (22c) are all grammatical. (20) and (21) are grammatical since they meet the same form condition. In (20), two occurrences of the same reflexives can have the same index since reflexives meet the same form condition. Likewise, in (21), two occurrences of the same pronouns can have the same index since pronouns observe the same form condition. Exactly the same can be said about (22c). (22a) and (22b) are not grammatical since *caki-casin* 'self-self' and *caki* 'self' violate the same form condition. However, (22c) is grammatical since *ku-casin* 'he-self' can bind *ku* 'he'. This is possible since *ku* 'he' in *ku-casin* 'he-self' and the second *ku* 'he' are the same form. Clearly, (22c) falls on the same form condition. We thus conclude that Korean binding requires the coargument-based binding theory (Pollard and Sag (1992), Reinhart and Reuland (1993), Safir (2004), Reuland (2005, 2011), Chamavel and Sportiche (2016)) rather than Chomsky's (1981, 1982, 1986, 1995) Binding Theory and lexical constraints such as the same form condition.

## V. CONCLUSION

The main goal of this paper is to demonstrate that the coargument-based binding theory (Pollard and Sag (1992), Reinhart and Reuland (1993), Safir (2004), Reuland (2005, 2011), Charnavel and Sportiche (2016)) is the most plausible one of binding theories. This paper argues that Condition A applies between the coarguments of a predicate and Korean binding requires the coargument-based condition A and lexical constraints. In section 2, we have shown why the coargument-based binding theory is the most influential one of binding theories. We have maintained that Korean binding requires the coargument-based binding theory which applies between the coarguments of a predicate. In section 2, we have shown where the complementarity problem comes from, which is a core part in the Binding Theory. In section 3, we have contended that *caki-casin* 'self-self' is a true SELF anaphor, but *caki* 'self' and *ku-casin* 'he-self' may not. In section 4, we have shown that Korean binding requires the coargument-based binding theory plus lexical constraints such as the same form condition. We have argued that in Korean, only the same form allows coreference between anaphoric elements.

## REFERENCES

- [1]. Charnavel, I and Sportiche, D. (2016). Anaphor Binding: What French Inanimate Anaphors Show. *Linguistic Inquiry*47 (1): 35-87.
- [2]. Chomsky, N. (1981). *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Foris Dordrecht.
- [3]. Chomsky, N. (1982). Some Concepts and Consequences of the Theory of Government and Binding. *Linguistic Inquiry Monograph*6, Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- [4]. Chomsky, N. (1986). Barriers. *Linguistic Inquiry Monograph*13. Cambridge, MIT Press.
- [5]. Chomsky, N. (1995). *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- [6]. Pollard, C and Sag, I. (1992). Anaphors and the Scope of Binding Theory. *Linguistic Inquiry*23: 261-303.
- [7]. Reinhart, T and Reuland, E. (1993). Reflexivity. *Linguistic Inquiry*24: 657-720.
- [8]. Reuland, E. (2005). An Overview of Binding Principles. ms. Utrecht Institute of Linguistics OTS.
- [9]. Reuland, E. (2011). *Anaphora and Language Design*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- [10]. Safir, K. (2004). *The Syntax of Anaphora*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Namkil Kang. "The Coargument-based Condition A." *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)*, 25(12), 2020, pp. 01-07.