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1 Introduction

It has been generally observed (e.g., Li and Thompson 1976) that East-Asian languages such as Chinese, Japanese, and Korean possess a certain feature of long-distance anaphora. This feature is quite unique and has not been thoroughly investigated in other languages.

Firstly, one of the long-established characteristics of East-Asian languages is their context-dependence. Unlike other languages, these languages do not rely on strong agreement to determine anaphoric reference. Instead, they use contextual and discourse features to identify the antecedent.

Secondly, these languages allow double nominative constructions, which means that the same person can be the subject and object of the same clause. This feature is not typical in other languages.

Lastly, long-distance anaphora is also a prominent feature in these languages. The use of anaphoric elements such as 'ziji' in Chinese, 'zibun' in Japanese, and 'caki' in Korean allows for long-distance reference.

These three features - context-dependence, double nominative constructions, and long-distance anaphora - are closely related to each other. In this paper, we will explore the interaction of these features, focusing on the context-dependence aspect.

Research for this paper was partially supported by the Faculty of Arts at the University of Edinburgh. I am indebted to Ronnie Cann and George Tsoulas for ideas and detailed comments on earlier versions of this paper. I would also like to thank Ivan Sag and Masayo Iida for their helpful discussions. All errors are mine.
Long-Distance Anaphora. It is not, however, always clear whether these conditions are proposed in order to replace the contextual factors or to be taken in conjunction with them. In this paper, we will propose an account for long-distance anaphora in more structural and formal terms rather than depending on contextual factors.

We will not discuss the examples like (1a) where the antecedent is bound by the reference. We will consider data in Korean, usually cited in favour of the contextual/discourse approach to long-distance anaphora. We will argue that the phenomenon can be best explained rather in terms of the interaction of the common properties of East-Asian languages: Topic-orientedness and Double Nominative constructions. That is, caki-binding in Korean in the relevant data is very closely related to topicalised constructions which, as we claim, are closely related to the null-topic constructions and share the same underlying structure with the Double Nominative construction in Korean. This paper will also outline the questions we would like to raise and try to answer in this paper.

The long-distance anaphor...
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As for John, self went.
No, self went.

Is it Mary who went to the party or somebody else instead?
Go.

Do you mean the party to other person?
Mary.

As for John, self went.
John top self-PAST PSE

C. John-

The difference between the two is that in the former, each occurrence is a complete sentence with an expression interpreted as a discourse function and the latter does not.

These examples are often considered as a case of discourse binding, and the following is one of discourse-based account of long-distance anaphors. There is also a set of data which was shown in a previous section as the evidence of the discourse function of topic (see Huang 1984).

NP These examples are often considered as a case of discourse binding.

The difference between the two is that in the former, each occurrence is a complete sentence with an expression interpreted as a discourse function and the latter does not.

No, self went.

Is it Mary who went to the party or somebody else instead?
Go.

Do you mean the party to other person?
Mary.
3 Topic Binding in Double Nominative Constructions

The binding in such contexts is licensed only in double nominative constructions. Hence, the anaphoric binding can be safely visible in conversely nominative sentences. Furthermore, the discourse approach can deal with instances like (3), a sentence structure like (3) is licensed when a discourse approach can deal with some instances like (3), a sentence structure like (3) is licensed when a discourse approach can deal with some instances like (3), a sentence structure like (3) is licensed when a discourse approach can deal with some instances like (3).
A. Mary-ka
ku
the
pati-e
party-to
go-Q
"Is it Mary who went to the party or somebody else instead?"

B. Ani,  
\[ e \]
caki-ka
self-NOM
kasse
went
"No, [e] self went."

In B of (4), the topic nominal in question can be read as having undergone contrastive focus (Choi 1996). Also note that in double nominative constructions, the second nominative nominal is marked with -nun. The order of the two nominals is rigid, for instance, the scrambling of the two nominals is not allowed (Yoon 1987).

If these second nominative nominals are marked with -nun, it gives a reading of the contrastive focus (Choi 1996). Also note that in double nominative constructions, the second nominative nominal is marked with -nun. The order of the two nominals is rigid, for instance, the scrambling of the two nominals is not allowed (Yoon 1987).
This proposal, however, is not, as it stands, really dependent on these sentences being double nominatives.

There is, however, evidence which clearly suggests that this is indeed the case. This evidence comes from the range of semantic relations that must hold between the two nouns in double nominative constructions. There is evidence from the two nouns in double nominative constructions, which is given in various examples in the following chapter, that the relations between the two nouns in double nominative constructions hold between the two nouns in double nominative constructions.

The relations in question are precisely the ones of alienable possession (5a), inalienable possession (5b), part-whole (5c) and identity which are the only ones that occur between the outer and inner nominative in a double nominative construction.

As for the examples we have seen for caki-binding, the relation in (1b) is alienable possession, the relation in (1c) is identity, which is the only one that occurs between the two nouns in double nominative constructions.

Moreover, in the following example, as an answer to the question in (2), caki cannot be topic-marked itself:

It then follows from the above that topic binding of caki can only occur in a double nominative construction.

Moreover, in the following example, as an answer to the question in (2), caki cannot be topic-marked itself:

It is also possible that a phonologically null topic is simply present in the sentence.
In a discourse approach, this example will not differ from Bin (2) and there is no way of explaining the ungrammaticality of (7) in any way except by assuming a particular relation with a subsequent nominal phrase in the discourse. This is impossible with a single nominal phrase in a discourse. Therefore, the answer is rather straightforward. Caki being a topic itself, it cannot be entitled to have another topic phrase available by the condition that Korean allows ony topic per sentence (Moon 1994, Chang 1995). Thus, there is no possible antecedent for caki. Its ungrammaticality also shows that caki in (7) cannot be an antecedent for caki in another sentence, for example: "As for John, Bill gave the book to self."

To sum up, we argue that the binder for caki in (4) is not a topic in discourse. The central evidence for this approach is twofold: syntactically it comes from the otherwise unexplained fact that caki can never be bound in a discourse. The central evidence for this approach is twofold: syntactically it comes from the otherwise unexplained fact that caki can never be bound in a discourse. Thus, the ungrammaticality of (7) is explained away with no further stipulation. In other words, the topic binds caki in these instances is always in a legitimate nominal position. This configuration is licensed in a double nominative structure, in other words, the topic binds caki in these instances is always in a legitimate nominal position. This configuration is licensed in a double nominative structure, in other words, the topic binds caki in these instances is always in a legitimate nominal position. This configuration is licensed in a double nominative structure, in other words, the topic binds caki in these instances is always in a legitimate nominal position. This configuration is licensed in a double nominative structure, in other words, the topic binds caki in these instances is always in a legitimate nominal position. This configuration is licensed in a double nominative structure.
4 Topic-Orientedness and the Expression of Topics

When such over topic phrase cannot be heeded, the topic is still not expressed explicitly. Hence, the topic of B should express the topic explicitly in any case (e.g., (3), (5)). On the other hand, the topic can be easily prominent in the context, in which the topic is already introduced in a sentence and is repeated subsequently. Given the sentence in (9), B's reply is ellipsed.

(9) A: ‘Who did you say fought with Yong?’
B: ‘Who did you say fought with Yong?’
Given the sentence in the initial dialogue A in (9), B's reply is ellipsed.

(10) Mia becomes a high school third grader. She goes to college next year. So
Kulayse (Kaya-nun/Mia-nun) (Kuyinchen-Kaya-nun/ko-gap-e-yo)
next-year-college-to
so
Kulayse Mia-high-3rd grade-College-to
Kulayse (Kuyinchen-Kaya-nun) (Kuyinchen-Kaya-nun/ko-gap-e-yo)
next-year-college-to
Kulayse (Kaya-nun/Mia-nun) (Kuyinchen-Kaya-nun/ko-gap-e-yo)
next-year-college-to

In the above discourse setting, Mia is the topic in the first sentence. If there-
The failure of licensing can also be found when there is more than one prominent topic in the discourse and when the topic is not properly reintroduced to disambiguate between those prominent topics. Such a case can be illustrated in (3), where we saw above that Mary and John are equally prominent in discourse and when the topic is not properly reintroduced to disambiguate between those prominent topics. The failure of licensing can also occur when there is more than one prominent topic in the discourse and when the topic is not properly reintroduced to disambiguate between those prominent topics.

**5 HPSG Approach**

In this section, we saw that the outer nominal can take the topic marker -nun in English. In other languages, the outer nominal is not necessarily overt. However, in English, the fact that the outer nominal is not overt provides a basis for double nominative constructions. In this way, the chain of the topic marker is not overt. The outer nominal can take the topic marker -nun in English, and the fact that the outer nominal is not overt provides a basis for double nominative constructions. In this way, the chain of the topic marker is not overt.

PerhapsthepronominalinquestionisakintoPRO,whichalsoneedstobebound andcannottakesplitantecedents.However,wewillleavethatissueopenforthetime being.
As for the basic mechanism of this lexical rule, the input of the rule should be a lexical entry with a single subject (indicated by !\text{NP})

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{ARG-ST} \\
\text{TOPIC}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{CONX} \\
\text{CONT} \\
\text{VAL}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{NP} \\
\text{NP} \\
\text{NP}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{np} \\
\text{np} \\
\text{np}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{ARG-ST} \\
\text{TOPIC}
\end{array}
\]
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(12) below is due to the fact that the topic is underspecified, and the other nominal is covert. Furthermore, as the outer nominal is covert, there is no way of ensuring that the DNC-relevant relations (R-relations) are properly satisfied.

Furthermore, in this case, even though the outer nominal is covered, there is no contextual backup which allows the recovery of the content of the missing element in (12). Observe that when a topic can be determined as supplied, as in (4), the case for (4),

Conceivably, where a topic can be determined as supplied, as is also the case for (4),

Turning back to (12), observe that becomes fully unremarked when a

Furthermore, as the outer nominal is covert, there is no way of ensuring that

Therefore, DNC is not licensed, if there may exist any catch-up.

Therefore, DNC constructions and the first two nominals John and Bill do not hold any

the basis of the DNC lexical rule, the examples in (8) we observed earlier is

Indications that the two nominals are in a proper R-relation, Furthermore, our

In this case, even though the outer nominal is covered, there is no way of ensuring that

Furthermore, as the outer nominal is covert, there is no way of ensuring that

Therefore, DNC is not licensed, if there may exist any catch-up.
Conclusion

In this paper, we have looked closely at the data of long-distance anaphora, which have been widely treated by discourse accounts, and tried to reduce the explanation of the phenomenon to a more formal and structural account. We have argued that the data in question are an instance of topic binding where the topic phrase is licensed in an outer nominative nominal position in double nominative constructions. Also, exploiting the fact that Korean is a highly topic-oriented language, the topic antecedent of $caki$ can be covert and not be repeated, or overt to disambiguate or reintroduce the topic. This proves to be a correct account of the phenomenon, and shows that this set of properties instead of being a mere curiosity and interesting set of "real features" in fact represents a tightly knit network and one of the best solutions to the long-distance anaphora question.

In conclusion, we brought together a set of seemingly unrelated properties of a particular set of languages under a special mode of interaction of the syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic components of linguistic theory and showed that this set of properties represents a tightly knit network and one of the best solutions to the long-distance anaphora question.
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