

## On how to use anaphoric definites in Korean\*

Myung-Kwan Park  
(Dongguk University)

**Park, Myung-Kwan. 2022. On how to use anaphoric definites in Korean.** *Linguistic Research* 39(1): 25-54. This paper investigates the anaphoric definite use of bare NPs in Korean, especially responding to Kim's (2021a, b) recent proposed analysis for bare NPs and demonstratives (i.e., demonstrative *ku* plus NPs) in certain structural environments. Specifically, Kim (ibid.) claims that continuing topics prefer to be expressed by demonstratives rather than bare NPs, and that likewise, the Nominative Case-marked subjects of verbs are more likely expressed not by bare NPs but demonstratives than those of adjectives. Kim suggests a cartography-cum-optimality approach in accounting for the two forms of anaphoric definites in Korean, but this syntactic approach is grounded on the unmotivated assumption that bare and demonstrative NPs belong to the same category and compete with each other to encode anaphoric definiteness in Korean. We take a different tack from Kim's, proposing that the preference for demonstratives rather than bare NPs as a (continuing) topic is attributed to the fact that NUN as a topic marker increases the discourse salience of the NP with it, and that the demonstrative *ku* encoding familiarity serves as a reinforcing device to do so. On the other hand, the tendency for Nominative anaphoric definite subject NPs of verbal predicates to come with the demonstrative follows from the information structure-theoretic dynamics. While Nominative subject NPs of verbs can enter intothetic (vs. categorical) interpretation in Spec,VP, they may be construed as indefinites. But when they come with the demonstrative, they can surely undergo proper interpretation as anaphoric definites. (Dongguk University)

**Keywords** anaphoric definite, bare NPs, demonstratives, discourse salience, information structure

### 1. Introduction

Korean allows anaphoric/strongly familiar definite use of bare NPs. Anaphoric/strongly familiar definites are definites whose antecedents are introduced in the preceding discourse contexts (cf. Schwarz 2009). Bare NPs are nouns standing alone

---

\* I would like to thank three anonymous reviewers for valuable comments and suggestions that have helped improve this paper. Thanks are also due to Min-Joo Kim for her recent works on Korean definites, which have deepened my understanding of the issues on them explored in this paper. The usual disclaimer applies.

without any determiner or modifier preceding them. In the following examples taken from internet sources there occurs an indefinite expression composed of a bare NP plus a numeral classifier (e.g., *haksayng han-myung* ‘student one-CL’ as in (1)), which serves as an antecedent for the following bare anaphoric definite NP that refers back to the foregoing indefinite antecedent.

- (1) *Imsangsilsup-ul tol-ko iss-nun haksayng han myeng-i*  
 clinical-practice-ACC round-MOD student one CL-NOM  
 “uyhak oycekin cilmwun-ul han kaci hayto toynya”-ko.  
 non-medical question-ACC one CL ask can-COMP  
 Com uyoy-i-ki-nun hay-to haksayng-i mwule-po-keyss-ta-nuntey . . .  
 bit surprising-TOP do-though student-NOM ask-try-will-DCL-CIRCUM  
 ‘A student in clinical practice asked, “Can I ask you a non-medical  
 question?” It was a bit surprising, but since the student was going to ask,...’
- (2) *Enuhakkyo-uy swuepsikan-ey haksayng han myeng-i chayksang-ey*  
 a school-GEN class-in student one CL-NOM table-on  
 ephtulye ca-ko iss-ess-ta. Sensayng-i hwa-ka na-se  
 lie sleeping be-PST-DCL teacher-NOM anger-NOM get-and  
 pwunphi-lul haksayng-eykey tency-ess-nuntey, yongkhey haksayng  
 chalk-ACC student-to throw-PST-CIRCUM luckily student  
 ima-ey machy-ess-ta. Haksayng-i kkamccak nolla pwususu  
 forehead-at hit-PST-DEC student-NOM extreme surprise slowly  
 ilenaca, sensayng-i haksayng-eykey mwule-ess-ta.  
 wake up teacher-NOM student-to ask-PST-DCL  
 ‘In class at a school, a student was sleeping on his desk. The teacher got  
 angry and threw a chalk at the student, but it hit the student’s forehead.  
 When the student woke up in surprise, the teacher asked the student.’
- (3) *Cinanhay 5-wel... han icang-eykey cenhwa-ka w-ass-ta.*  
 last year May one director-to telephone-NOM come-PST-DCL  
 halmeni han pwun-i ... kenkang-i kupkyekhi akhwatwa-yss-ta-nun  
 grandma one CL-NOM health-NOM rapidly deteriorated-MOD  
 cenhwa-y-ess-ta. Ichang-un ... halmeni\*(-lul) sinsokha-key  
 call-COP-PST-DCL director grandma-ACC quickly  
 pyengwen-uloolmky-ess-ta.

hospital-to take-PST-DCL

‘Last May ... a village director got a phone call. It was a call saying that an old woman’s health had deteriorated rapidly. The village director had the old woman quickly taken the hospital.’

- (4) Kapcaki nathana-n kay hanmali-ka ku-ka cha-n kong-ul  
 suddenly appear-MOD dog one CL-NOM he-NOM hit ball-ACC  
 mwul-ko talanassta. Pwunnoha-n capeyli-nun... 2-pal  
 bite-CONN ran away angry-MOD Javery-TOP 2-CL  
 isang-ul kay\*(-lul) hyanghay ssw-ass-ko, ....  
 more-ACC dog-ACC toward shoot-PST-CONN

‘A dog suddenly appeared and ran away with the ball he had hit. Being angry, Javery ... fired at least two shots at the dog, ...’

Concerning the grammatical system of giving rise to an anaphoric definite interpretation of bare NPs (cf. Barrie et al. 2021), in Park and Kang (2020) we propose that just as noun-to-classifier raising in Mandarin Chinese and insertion of an overt classifier alone in Cantonese Chinese contributes at the syntax-semantics interface to morphologically lexicalizing an iota operator (as proposed in Cheng and Sybesma 1999), Case/case (or postposition) morphology in the Korean bare nominal structure acts at the same level on lexically supporting a null anaphoric shifter (Moroney 2019, 2021) or a null anaphoric index argument (Schwarz 2009), thereby bare NPs alone functioning as an anaphoric definite. In tandem, we note that according to Schwarz’s (2009) influential analysis for anaphoric definites, the anaphoric index argument that like a pronoun serves to link them to their antecedents is phonologically null in German and English, while the phonologically overt definite articles in these languages just encode uniqueness. Thus, Korean aligns with German and English in light of the system of anaphoric definite having a phonologically null anaphoric index argument, but the former only differs from the latter in regard to the morphological status of D that encodes uniqueness.

Park and Kang’s (2020) proposed analysis for the interpretation of bare NPs in Korean predicts that when marked with Case/case particles, they can be construed as anaphoric definites in unrestricted structural contexts of this language. However, Kim (2021a) observes that their distribution as anaphoric definites is in fact restricted in two environments. One is where anaphoric definite NPs are attached with the so-called topic marker NUN. Kim first notes with (5) below (taken from Kim *ibid.*) that like bare

anaphoric definite NPs in general, the NP in the second sentence of (5) as part of fairy tale openers/beginnings can come either without or with the anaphoricity-encoding demonstrative to be interpreted as an anaphoric definite.

- (5) Yes-nal enu swup-sok-ey thokki han-mari-ka sal-ko  
 old-day some forest-inside rabbit one-CL-NOM live-CONN  
 ‘Once upon a time, in some forest, there lived a rabbit.’  
 iss-ess-ta. (Ku) thokki-NUN meri-ka acwu coh-ass-ta.  
 AUX-PST-DCL that rabbit-TOP brain-NOM very be.good-PST-DCL  
 ‘The rabbit was very smart.’ (from Kim 2021a)

But Kim crucially claims that in canonical topic constructions, there is a strong tendency for continuing topics in Korean to be expressed by the demonstrative marker *ku* ‘that’ plus NP, calling attention to the following example (taken from Kim 2021a):

- (6) Ecey -- haksayng han-myeng-kwa sangtam-ul hay-ess-ta.  
 yesterday student one-CL-with conference-ACC do-PST-DCL  
 ‘Yesterday I had a meeting with a student.’  
 \*(Ku) haksayng-un cikum sa.hak.nyen-i-ta.  
 that student-TOP currently fourth.school.year-COP-DCL  
 ‘The student is currently in his/her/their fourth year (in college).’

The second environment where Kim (2021a) observes that bare NPs and demonstrative-preceded NPs (in short, demonstratives) are not in free variation is the Nominative Case-marked subject of a verbal predicate. Kim claims that to function as an anaphoric definite, the Nominative Case-marked subject of a verbal predicate requires the demonstrative on an anaphoric definite NP, whereas that of an adjectival predicate does not, as in (7a) and (7b), taken from Kim (2021a):

- (7) a. Cankyo-ka melise kwunin han myeng-ul pwullessta.  
 officer-NOM from.afar soldier one CL-ACC call.out-PST-DCL  
 ‘From afar, the officer called out to one soldier.’  
 ??/\*(Ku) kwunin-i twiewa-se insa-lul ha-yss-ta.  
 that soldier-NOM run-and greet-ACC did-PST-DCL

‘The soldier ran and greeted (the officer).’<sup>1</sup>

- b. Ecey \_\_\_ haksayng han-myeng-kwa sangtam-ul hay-ess-ta.  
 yesterday student one-CL-with consultation-ACC do-PST-DCL  
 ‘Yesterday (I) had a meeting with one student.’  
 (??/\*Ku) haksayng-i cham ttoktokhay-ss-ta. Kurayse ...  
 that student-NOM really smart-COP-PST-DCL so  
 ‘The student was really smart. So ...’

Kim (2021a, b) accounts for the two sets of facts by taking a cartographic approach grounded on Chou (2013) and Speas and Tenny (2003),<sup>2</sup> and by adopting the notion of competition in Optimality Theory. Kim suggests that in Korean-type languages, both bare NPs and demonstratives encode anaphoric definiteness by occurring at Spec,DP whose head carries [situation-internal/external Point of View (POV) feature], but demonstratives need to be in the m-command domain of the relevant point of view (POV) licensing heads, which Kim argues to host Top<sub>0</sub>, v<sub>0</sub>, and V<sub>0</sub> in Korean.

In this paper we are to counter the validity of these empirical claims that Kim (2021a, b) makes on the anaphoric definite use of bare NPs in Korean and the requirement for the demonstrative on them in some structural environments. Kim’s cartography-cum-competition-based analysis may work in accounting for the gradient preference/tendency in the use of either anaphoric definite form in Korean, but the

1 Kim uses the following example in (i) (taken from the abstract version of Kim 2021a) instead of (7a), but we replace it with (7a) to make it parallel in structure to (7b) with the human referent of the subject NP in the second sentence and without the coordinating conjunction at its beginning.

(i) Kakey an-uro kangaci han-mari-ka tulleo-ass-ta.  
 store inside-to puppy one-CL-NOM come.in-PST-DCL  
 ‘A puppy came into the store.’  
 Kuriko \*/?? (ku) kangaci-ka na-uy pal-ul mwul-ess-ta.  
 and that puppy-NOM I-GEN foot-ACC bite-PST-DCL  
 ‘And the puppy bit my foot.’

In addition, we employ the word *kwunin* ‘soldier’ in (7a), since this word cannot be used as a vocative and is less likely used as a bare anaphoric definite NP (cf. Kim 2021a).

2 Kim (2021a) postulates the following fine-grained clausal structure of Korean, where SAP = speech act phrase; POV = point of view; v = valued; u = unvalued; op = operator. We will not go into details about the working of this system:

(i) [<sub>SAP</sub> [<sub>SentenceP</sub> [attitude holder] [<sub>TopP</sub> [POV-op] [<sub>TopP</sub> [DP [vPOV] ] [<sub>FocusP</sub> [<sub>TP</sub> [<sub>VP</sub> [POV-op] [<sub>VP</sub> [<sub>VP</sub> [POV-op] [<sub>VP</sub> ]]]]]]]]]]]

problematic aspect of Kim's analysis is that in Korean, bare and demonstrative forms belong to the same category and compete in realizing the anaphoric definite system. This assumption is, however, ill conceived because non-demonstrative (like English definite article 'the') and demonstrative (like English demonstrative *that*) anaphoric markers are used for different purposes. In this paper we seek an alternative account for the issues in question, proposing that the discourse function of the topic or contrast marker NUN (as well as focus particles) and the information structure-theoretic dynamics play an instrumental role for opting for demonstratives rather than bare anaphoric definite NPs. Section 2 and Section 3 each investigates the preference for demonstrative-marked forms in continuing topic position and in the Nominative subject position of a verbal predicate, respectively. Section 4 summarizes the discussion in this paper and wraps up with a conclusion.

## 2. On the tendency for demonstrative modification with continuing topics

Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl (2007) propose that there are, at least, three types of topic to be distinguished, namely aboutness (or shifting) topic,<sup>3</sup> contrastive topic, and familiar topic. Building on Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl (2007), Jiménez-Fernández and Miyagawa (2014: 284) offer the following definition of familiar topic, which in turn characterizes continuing topic:

- (8) Familiar topic: a given or accessible (Chafe 1987) constituent, which is typically destressed and realized in a pronominal form (Pesetsky 1987); when a familiar topic is textually given and D-linked with a pre-established aboutness topic, it is defined as a continuing topic (Givón 1983).

The case in point where the notion of familiar topic is relevant is the example in (9), repeated below, where Kim (2021a, b) claims that the continuing topic in the second sentence has a strong tendency to be expressed with demonstrative *ku*, being realized as *ku haksang-un* 'DEM student-TOP':

---

3 In Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl's (2007) conception, aboutness topic is characterized as follows: "what the sentence is about" (Reinhart 1981, Lambrecht 1994); in particular a constituent that is "newly introduced, newly changed or newly returned to" (cf. Givón 1983: 8), which is proposed as "a matter of standing and current interest or concern" (Strawson 1964).

- (9) Ecey -- haksayng han-myeng-kwa sangtam-ul hay-ess-ta.  
 yesterday student one-CL-with conference-ACC do-PST-DCL  
 ‘Yesterday I had a meeting with a student.’  
 \*(Ku) haksayng-un cikum sa.hak.nyen-i-ta.  
 that student-TOP currently fourth.school.year-COP-DCL  
 ‘The student is currently in his/her/their fourth year (in college).’

Kim’s claim on the strong tendency for a continuing topic NP to be modified by the demonstrative solicits a couple of questions. The first question is whether it is empirically correct. To verify her claim, we also used internet text data and readily found the following examples, where continuing topics of the second sentences are realized without the demonstrative.

- (10) Cwungmwucangha-n yowen twu myeng-i yeca  
 heavily.armed-MOD agent two CL-NOM woman  
 han myeng-ul kkulko tulew-ass-ta. Yeca-nun ...  
 one CL-ACC drag enter-PST-DCL woman-TOP  
 changpaykha-n phipwu-ka insangcekin minyey-ess-ta.  
 pale-MOD skin-NOM impressive beauty-COP-DCL  
 ‘Two heavily armed agents dragged a woman in. The woman was a  
 beautiful woman with an impressive pale skin. 『Tribe 3』’
- (11) Namca sey myeng-i yeca han myeng insinmaymay-lul  
 man three CL-NOM woman one CL trafficking-ACC  
 sitoha-yess-supnita. Yeca-nun ppalu-key tomangchy-ese  
 attempt-PST-DCL woman-TOP quickly ran.away-CONN  
 eyllipeyithe-lo phisinha-yess-ko ....  
 elevator-to take.refuge-PST-CONN  
 ‘Three men attempted to traffic a woman. The woman quickly ran away  
 and took refuge in the elevator ... .’
- (12) Kukos-kkaci ka-nun kilmok-ey yehaksayng han myeng-ul  
 there-to go-MOD corner-at girl.student one CL-ACC  
 manna-ss-ta. Ye haksayng-un kanguytong-eyse nao-lye-taka ....  
 meet-PST-DCL girl.student-TOP lecture.building-out of exit-be.about.to  
 ‘On the way there, I met a girl. The female student is about to come out

of the lecture building... 『Evil Spirit』’

Second, since Kim’s empirical claim on this issue is not based on categorical grammaticality judgment but gradient tendency/preference, the examples in (10)~(12) cannot be literally taken to argue against her claim. Thus, we consulted Korean native speakers and found that a majority of them concurred with Kim regarding the tendency for continuing topic NPs to be modified by the demonstrative.<sup>4</sup>

This tendency is somewhat surprising in light of cross-linguistic perspectives. In his study of bare anaphoric definite NPs in Mandarin Chinese (MC), Jenks (2018) recently reports that in topic positions of this language they can occur either with or without the MC demonstrative *na* ‘that’, as follows.

- (13) a. Jiaoshi    li        zuo-zhe   yi    ge    nansheng.  
           classroom inside sit-PROG one   CL   boy  
           ‘There are a boy sitting in the classroom.’  
       b. (Na ge) nansheng kanqilai you   er-shi   sui    zuoyou.  
           that CL boy        look        have two-ten year or.so  
           ‘The boy looks twenty years old or so.’ (Jenks 2018: (15a) & (15d))

Thus, it needs to be answered why there is a contrast between Korean and MC in terms of the preference for demonstrative modification in expressing continuing topics. To do so, we first discuss the grammatical status of the demonstrative marker and that of the so-called ‘topic’ marker in Korean. We then go on to account for the preference at issue.<sup>5</sup>

4 Like the corpus analysis, we only informally conducted an acceptability rating for the use of bare anaphoric definites as continuing topics.

5 To anticipate the discussion below, Korean is apparently similar to Chinese in the optionality of the demonstrative on an anaphoric NP with (continuing) topic construal. But the two languages differ regarding the source of topic construal; Korean marks a topic with the particle *-(nu)n*, whereas Chinese employs a functional category of implicitly realized Top. As will be argued below, the particle *-(nu)n* is responsible for the preference of the demonstrative on an anaphoric NP with (continuing) topic construal in Korean.



## 2.1 Demonstrative marker KU

Korean is described as having a three-way distal distinction in demonstratives (Sohn 1994): (i) *i*: ‘this’; (ii) *ce*: ‘that over there’; (iii) *ku*: ‘close to hearer or known to both speaker and hearer’. Relevant to the issue in this paper, Ahn (2017) recently argues that contrary to our naive expectation, the Korean demonstrative *ku* is not used in exophoric contexts, but in anaphoric contexts. Her argument relies on the following example in (14), where the hearer is holding and attending to one book, and the speaker indicates that she wants another one (behind the hearer), and not the one the hearer is holding.

- (14) Context: If the hearer went to the other side of the room to grab something I asked for, and is turned towards book A, and I want book B which is behind him: [pointing at book B]!  
 Ku-kes mal-ko! \* Ku-kes!<sup>6</sup> / ce-kes!  
 ku-thing not-CONN ku-thing ce-thing  
 ‘Not that book! That book!’  
 (Ahn 2017)

There is no pointing necessary (though it may be accompanied) in the first sentence, because the hearer is already attending to the book. Since *ku* occurs on the NP denoting the entity at hand that is known to the hearer as well as the speaker, Ahn suggests that *ku* actually encodes familiarity. Obviously, Ahn’s argument has some shortcomings. *Ku* in (14) is not recruited not based on discourse anaphoricity, but based on situational familiarity. There is no linguistic antecedent associated with *ku*-marked NP in (14).

Kang (2021) concurs with Ahn in light of the view that *ku* is employed to encode familiarity only, not uniqueness.<sup>7</sup> Based on the well-known distinction between the definite article *the* and the demonstrative *that* in English (cf. Wolter 2006), Kang goes on to note that the Korean demonstrative is analogized not to the definite article but to

6 One reviewer notes that *ku* here is not unacceptable to him/her.

7 As Kang (2021) notes, *ku* is not compatible with an NP that presupposes the existence/uniqueness of an entity in global-situation contexts, e.g., *tal* ‘moon’ or *hay* ‘sun’ as in (i).

- (i) (\*KU) tal-ul po-myense  
 moon-ACC see-while  
 (\*KU) hay-lul kitali-nun cwung-ipnita.  
 sun-ACC wait-be ing-COP  
 ‘(We) see the moon while waiting for the sun.’

the demonstrative in English, drawing attention to the following example:

- (15) Han yeca-ka<sub>i</sub> mwutay oynccok-eyse tuleo-ass-ta.  
 one woman-NOM stage left-from enter-PST-DCL  
 talun yeca-ka<sub>k</sub> mwutay oluncckok-eyse tuleo-ass-ta.  
 another woman-NOM stage right-from enter-PST-DCL  
 ?? (Ku) yeca-nun kkkochpawkuni-lul tul-ko.iss-ess-ta.  
 that woman-TOP basket.of.flowers-ACC carry-ASP-PST-DCL  
 ‘A woman<sub>i</sub> entered from stage left. Another woman<sub>k</sub> entered from stage  
 right. That/#the woman<sub>k</sub> was carrying a basket of flowers.’

Kang takes the use of *ku* as in (15) to show that the Korean demonstrative aligns with its counterparts in other languages in that they convey contrastivity (i.e., partitivity or anti-uniqueness (Barker 1998)). It is a cross-linguistic tendency that marking contrasted referents is a canonical function of anaphoric demonstratives (Diessel 1999).<sup>8</sup> The occurrence of *ku* also presupposes the existence of other entities (implicitly) contrasting with the NP argument to which it is attached. Thus, when *ku* is used anaphorically, it tends to add emphasis or contrastive meaning on the NP (Chang 1984; Ionin et al. 2012; a.o.).

In short, the Korean demonstrative *ku* is used in anaphoric contexts encoding familiarity/anaphoricity, at the same time conveying contrastivity (i.e., partitivity or anti-uniqueness).

## 2.2 Topic marker NUN

There are huge literature on the study of the so-called topic marker –nun (henceforth represented NUN) in Korean. As aptly documented by Kim (2015), there are broadly two approaches, each of which in turn falls further into two tracks. First, the derivational approach to NUN takes either topic- or contrast-marking to be the basic function of NUN

8 On top of traditionally well recognized donkey pronouns, demonstratives can occur in donkey anaphoric definite environments as in (ia) (Abbott 2002), as well as definite descriptions as in (ib) (Elbourne 2005):

(i) a. If a farmer has a donkey, he beats that donkey.  
 b. If a farmer has a donkey, he beats the donkey.

and views its other function as a secondary (or derived) property. The proponents of the ‘topic-as-basic’ approach (e.g. Park 1999) assert that the only dedicated function of NUN is to mark topic, while the contrastive interpretation is secondary and derived. The advocates of the ‘contrast-as-basic’ approach (e.g. Lee and Im 1983) claim that NUN is basically a contrast marker and its topic-marking function is only derived in a special syntactic position, that is, in the sentence initial position.

On the other hand, the non-derivational approach to NUN falls into unified and non-unified analyses. The unified analysis is to posit a single meaning of NUN, which is neither topic- nor contrast-marking, and derive those functions from that meaning. Pursuing this tack, one group of researchers (e.g. Han 1998) have taken a ‘presuppositional’ view, according to which the meaning of NUN is to indicate that the existence of the discourse referent of a NUN-marked phrase (and its alternative(s)) is presupposed (Han 1998). Another group of researchers (e.g. Kim 1983) have taken the ‘salience-based’ approach, attributing the meaning of NUN to the notion of salience or something similar to it such as attention and prominence in one’s mind. Meanwhile, in the non-unified analysis of NUN, researchers (e.g. Choe 1995) have either explicitly claimed or implicitly assumed that there are two different lexical items of NUN in the lexicon.

Evaluating the validity of several previous approaches to NUN in Korean, based on a corpus study Kim (2015) argues that NUN is not a topic/contrast marker per se but its function is to impose (discourse) salience on a discourse referent. Kim characterizes discourse salience not as something in the world or discourse but in the head of discourse participants; thus it is cognitive. Whether something is salient or not depends on its prominence in one’s mind, which is determined by the amount of attention allotted to it. That is, the more attention something gets, the more salient it becomes. Thus, discourse salience is gradient in nature rather than all-or-nothing.

Kim (2015) goes on to assert, in keeping with Kim (1983) and Park (2007), that in order to identify the nature of NUN, it is crucial to understand the motivation for imposing salience on a discourse referent. Clamons et al. (1993) claim that the motivation is “to select one of several potential topics as the primary topic of a particular sentence or to indicate contrast” (Clamons et al. 1993: 522). Likewise, Mulkern (2003, 2007) proposes two motivations for imposing salience: emphasis and contrast. According to her, to emphasize is “to increase the salience of a referent relative to other entities, including the establishment of the referent as the new topic of the discourse” (Mulkern 2007: 123).

To summarize, the central function of NUN is to increase the discourse salience of a topical referent, so that it becomes salient enough to be the center of attention in the hearer's mind. Another function is to highlight (only) one referent in contrast with another, so that contrastiveness arises in the hearer's mind between what is highlighted and what is not.

### 2.3 Why the demonstrative on continuing topics is preferred

Now, the reason for the tendency to recruit the demonstrative on continuing topics is evident. Continuing topics in Korean are marked with NUN that encodes discourse salience. Thus, the attachment of the demonstrative to the NUN-marked continuing topic is preferred to reinforce the discourse salience of the referent denoted by the latter as in (6); recall that the demonstrative signals familiarity, simultaneously conveying contrastivity (i.e., partitivity or anti-uniqueness).

On top of the tendency for continuing topics to be expressed by demonstratives, we note that contrastively-interpreted NPs with NUN in typically sentence-internal (i.e., not sentence-initial) positions also tend to be so, as follows:

- (16) Swuep-eyse swukangsayng han myeng-i etten tane-uy  
 class-in student one CL-NOM one word-GEN  
 palum-ul cal mos-hayessta. Na-nun ku palum-i  
 pronunciation well couldn't I-TOP the pronuciation-NOM  
 way ku swukangsayng-eykey-nun<sup>9</sup> an toy-lkka kwungkumha-yss-ta.  
 why that student-DAT-CONT not work-Q wonder-PST-DCL  
 'One of the students in the class did not pronounce a word well. I  
 wondered why the pronunciation didn't work for the student.'
- (17) Chacang-kwa kwacang-i ecey ciwenca han myeng-ul  
 deputy-CORD chief-NOM yesterday applicant one CL-ACC  
 myencepha-yss-ta. Chacang-un ku ciwenca-nun il-ul  
 interview-PST-DCL deputy-TOP that applicant-CONT work-ACC  
 cal ha-l kes-i-lako

---

9 One reviewer notes that a contrastive construal for *ku swukangsayng-eykey-nun* 'to that student' is not available to him/her.

well do-will-DCL

malha-yss-ta.

say-PST-DCL

‘The deputy manager and the chief interviewed an applicant yesterday. The deputy manager said the applicant would do a good job.’

The examples in (16) and (17) render additional evidence showing that not topicality but discourse salience plays a decisive role in the deployment of the demonstrative on NUN-marked anaphoric definite NPs.

Likewise, focus particles such as *-to* ‘also’ or *-man* ‘only’ on anaphoric definite NPs also prefer or require the demonstrative on them, as in (18)-(19):<sup>10</sup>

- (18) Saylo cacenke han tay-lul sa-ss-ciman,ku cacenke-to  
 newly bike one CL-ACC buy-PST-but that bike-also  
 how longcina-ci anha naylimakkil-ey sako na-se ...  
 elma pass-not.do downhill-on accident occur-af  
 ‘I bought a new bike, but not long after that, I had an accident on the bike while going downhill ...’

- (19) Chayk han kwen-ul chwuchen tuli-camyeon, ... ku chayk-man  
 book one volume-ACC recommend-could-if that book-only  
 cengtokha-myeon talu-n chayk-un pol philyo-ka eps-supnita  
 thorough.read-if other-MOD book-CT read need-NOM don’t.  
 ‘If I could recommend a book, ... If you read that book thoroughly, you don’t need to look at other books.’

As is generally acknowledged, focus particles are assumed to serve to increase the discourse salience of the NPs marked with them. On a par with NUN as a continuing topic or contrastive topic marker, anaphoric definite NPs marked with focus particles prefer to come with the demonstrative *ku* that reinforces the discourse salience of their referents relative to other entities.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>10</sup> In (18) and (19), the demonstrative seems to be obligatory. However, if other alternative referents than the entity denoted by the antecedent of *ku*-marked NP are given, the demonstrative is not obligatorily but optionally supported.

<sup>11</sup> One of the anonymous reviewers notes that the demonstrative on an anaphoric NP is more preferentially

One question to be raised at this point is how we identify the exact role of the demonstrative *ku* in Korean. There are two scenarios in answering this question. One scenario is that the demonstrative in Korean is supported only for the sake of reinforcing the discourse salience of the referent denoted by an anaphoric definite NP, while not contributing much other than merely morphologically supporting the anaphoric index argument. The other scenario is that the adjunction of the demonstrative to an anaphoric definite NP performs two functions; it not only scales up the discourse salience of the referent at hand, but also contributes to binding the anaphoric index argument by virtue of familiarity that it encodes.

We may decide which scenario is on the right track, in light of Jenks' (2018) pragmatic principle of Index! in (20), which says that when an indexical element like a demonstrative is available, it must be used, meaning that a bare NP cannot stand alone to express anaphoric definiteness in a language utilizing a demonstrative.

(20) Index!

Represent and bind all possible indices.

(Jenks 2018: (50))

As Korean does allow bare NPs to express anaphoric definiteness as shown above and the demonstrative is not obligatory in all anaphoric definite contexts, it is clear that the demonstrative in this language is not solely reserved for binding an anaphoric index argument that links its hosting NP to the antecedent (See also Dayal and Jiang (to appear) for a critique of Jenks' (2018) Chinese anaphoric definites based on Index! in (20)). It follows that we cannot rely on the pragmatic principle, Index!, since it can be over-ruled randomly, failing to make strong predictions about the distribution of *ku*-marked anaphoric definites in Korean. We thus argue that the scenario one is correct. The Korean demonstrative principally does not grammatically contribute much to supporting the function of an anaphoric index argument. Its primary role is, as argued above, to reinforce the discourse salience of a referent denoted by the NP marked with it; the apparent by-product of the demonstrative modification on the NP is to facilitate the linking between the NP and its antecedent by virtue of familiarity/anaphoricity that the

---

used with particles such as *-to* and *-man* as in (18) and (19) than with particle *-nun*. We conjecture that this contrast lies in the fact that particles *-to* and *-man* only serve as a focus marker, but particle *-nun* serves either as a focus or a topic marker. The latter's ambiguous use confounds the preference of the demonstrative on an anaphoric NP.

demonstrative encodes.

Summarizing, we take bare anaphoric definite NPs to be grammatically acceptable in Korean as continuing topics with NUN and nominal focuses with *-man* ‘only’ or *-to* ‘also’, and them to be in free variation with demonstrative marked definite NPs. But the latter are preferred in everyday use of language for communicative needs. We are in keeping with Kim (2015) in characterizing discourse salience not as something in the world or discourse but in the head of discourse participants; thus it is cognitive. To facilitate successful communicative exchanges, Korean speakers prefer to resort to the demonstrative to reinforce the discourse salience of a referent denoted by the NP marked with it when the NP comes with a topic or focus marker that increases the discourse salience of the referent at hand. Taken together, the preference for a demonstrative on a topic or focus particle marked NP does not stem from the core system of grammar (i.e., syntax or semantics), but from pragmatics where concepts such as discourse salience come into play. Speaker variation in the use of the demonstrative on topic or focus particle marked NPs is due to the fact that demonstrative modification in Korean is essentially governed by pragmatics (cf. Rhee 2020).

Meanwhile, as Kim (2021a, b) notes, NUN-marked anaphoric definite NPs do not always require the placement of the demonstrative on them. First, in a discourse context like fairy-tale beginnings/openings (cf. Lambrecht 1994: 154) as in (5), repeated below as (21), the continuing topic need not recruit the demonstrative on it (though it may).

- (21) Yes-nal enu swup-sok-ey thokki han-mari-ka sal-ko  
 old-day some forest-inside rabbit one-CL-NOM live-CONN  
 iss-ess-ta.  
 AUX-PST-DCL  
 ‘Once upon a time, in some forest, there lived a rabbit.’  
 (Ku) thokki-NUN meri-ka acwu coh-ass-ta.  
 that rabbit-TOP brain-NOM very be.good-PST-DCL  
 ‘The rabbit was very smart.’ (from Kim 2021a)

The first sentence in (21) is a so-called presentational construction. The dedicated communicative function of this construction in a discourse is to introduce, or ‘present,’ the previously discourse-inactive, brand-new referent *thokki han-mari-ka* ‘one rabbit’ in the text-internal world and thereby to make it discourse-old/active and ready for a

predication in subsequent sentences. Crucially, since the referent newly introduced in the presentational construction is a unique entity or unique set of entities, its realization as a continuing topic in the following sentence will be optimal without the demonstrative. If the NUN-marked NP, on the other hand, comes with the demonstrative, the familiarity construal is reinforced by the latter, while the contrastivity or anti-uniqueness construal is also accompanied.

Second, as Kim (2021a, b) also notes, when two contrastive entities are introduced in the preceding context and one or both of them are mentioned in the following context, the use of bare anaphoric definite NPs for the latter is strongly preferred instead of demonstrative-preceded NPs. The following example taken from Kim (2021a) makes a point:

- (22) Kakey an-uro etten namca-wa etten yeca-ka tulleo-ass-ta.  
 store inside-to some man-and some woman-NOM come.in-PST-DCL  
 ‘A man and a woman came into the store.’  
 (??/\* Ku) namca-nun kapang-ul tul-ko iss-ess-ko  
 that man-TOP bag-ACC carry-PST-CONN  
 (??/\* ku) yeca-nun wusan-ul tul-koiss-ess-ta.  
 that woman-TOP umbrella-ACC carry-PST-DCL  
 ‘The man was carrying a bag and the woman was carrying an umbrella.’

Recall that the occurrence of a demonstrative on an anaphoric definite NP presupposes the existence of other entities (implicitly) contrasting with the NP to which it is adjoined. When two contrasting entities are introduced explicitly as in (22), the recruitment of a demonstrative to induce such a presupposition is obviated even in contexts where an anaphoric definite NP comes with the discourse salience-encoding particle NUN.

The obviation of a demonstrative given two contrasting entities in the preceding discourse can also be accounted for in line with the suggestion made by Jiang (2012) that in Mandarin Chinese, bare anaphoric definite NPs are licensed by contrast, especially when two contrasting entities are introduced in a preceding discourse. (23b) illustrates the discourse structure of a contrastive topic, where a list of salient alternatives is being described that is relevant to some question under discussion (QUD). In particular, if we



introduce the topic in the narrative sequence with the MC contrastive topic (CT) marker *ne* (Constant 2014), a bare anaphoric definite NP is preferred.

- (23) a. Jiaoshi li zuo-zhe yi ge nanshenghe yi ge nusheng.  
           classroom inside sit-PROG one CL boy and one CL girl  
           ‘There are a boy and a girl sitting in the classroom.’  
       b. Nansheng ne, wo hen bu xihuan.  
           boy CT I really not like  
           ‘The boy, I really don’t like.’

When two contrasting entities are introduced in the preceding discourse, in the ensuing discourse the use of the demonstrative to refer to one of them is also avoided in English; in this discourse, the definite article is used, as follows.<sup>12</sup>

- (24) The curtain rose. A woman and a man came onto the stage. Then #that/the woman started singing and dancing. (Ionin et al. 2012: (8b))

When one entity is in contrast with another in a discourse context, one of them is picked up for a subsequent narration, which means that its uniqueness is presupposed. In this case, typical anaphoric definites (i.e., bare NPs in Korean and Chinese, and definite article-preceded NPs in English) are favored more strongly than demonstrative-preceded NPs.

---

12 By contrast, recall (15), where the demonstrative is preferred to the definite article when the two tokens of the same type are introduced in the preceding discourse context (Kang 2021 in Korean; Wolter 2006 in English). (15) as well as (22)-(23) (in addition to (24) in English) shows that on top of topic or focus marking on anaphoric definite NPs, the way of introducing antecedent NPs of anaphoric definites plays an important role in determining whether the demonstrative needs to be recruited or not. In Korean the choice is between bare and demonstrative-marked definites, while in English the choice is between definite-article and demonstrative-marked definites, which renders additional compelling evidence showing that bare definites in Korean correspond in use to definite-article marked definites in English. The absence of the demonstrative in such cases as (15) and (23) also provides clear evidence that its primary role in Korean and Chinese is not to bind the index argument of an anaphoric definite NP.

### 3. Nom-marked bare NPs in verbal vs. adjectival predication

Recall that Kim (2021a) argues that Nominative Case-marked bare and demonstrative-preceded NPs as a subject of a verbal predicate are also not in free variation. Kim claims that to serve as an anaphoric definite, the Nom-marked subject of a verbal predicate requires to be served by a demonstrative NP, whereas that of an adjectival predicate can be served by a bare NP, as in (6a-b) repeated below as (25):

- (25) a. Cangkyo-ka meli.se kwunin han myeng-ul pwullessta.  
 officer-NOM from.afar soldier one CL-ACC call.out-PST-DCL  
 ‘From afar, an officer called out to one soldier.’  
 ??/\*(Ku) kwunin-i twiewa-se insa-lul ha-yss-ta.  
 that soldier-NOM run-and greeting-ACC do-PST-DCL  
 ‘The soldier ran and greeted (the officer).’  
 b. Ecey \_\_\_ haksayng han-myeng-kwa sangtam-ul hay-ess-ta.  
 yesterday pro student one-CL-with conference-ACC do-PST-DCL  
 ‘Yesterday I had a meeting with a student.’  
 (??/\* Ku) haksayng-i cham tokttokhay-ss-ta. Kurayse ...  
 that student-NOM really smart-COP-PST-DCL so  
 ‘The student was really smart. So ...’

The Nom-marked subjects of the second sentences in (25a-b) are also interpreted as continuing topics; their referents are introduced in the previous sentences, and they are now picked up for predications in the second sentences.

We also informally tested this empirical claim made by Kim (2021a) using internet sources and had no difficulty in finding the following examples:

- (26) Kim ssi-nun yephcp-eyse kangaci han mali-lul et-ese kiluki  
 Kim Mr.-TOP next.door-at puppy one CL-ACC get-CONN raise  
 sicakha-yss-ta. Elma cen kapcaki kangaci-ka ... selsa-lul hay  
 began while ago suddenly puppy-NOM diarrhea-ACC have  
 cheumulo tongmwulpyengwen mwun-ul twutuly-ess-ta.  
 first vet door-ACC knock-PST-DCL  
 ‘Kim got a puppy from the house next door and started raising it. Not

long ago, the puppy suddenly had diarrhea and knocked on the door of the vet for the first time.’

- (27) Chinchekcip-eyse kay han mali-lul cip-ulo  
 relative.house-from dog one CL-ACC home-to  
 teylye-wa khiw-ess-ta. Ku kay-ka yeysang-kwa  
 bring-CONN raised that dog-NOM expectation-from  
 talli mwuchek sanaw-ess-ta.<sup>13</sup>  
 different more ferocious-PST-DCL  
 ‘I brought a dog home from a relative’s house and raised it. The dog was more ferocious than expected.’

(26) represents examples where the subject NP of the second sentence with the verbal predicate is bare without the demonstrative. On the other hand, (27) represents examples where the demonstrative is supported on the subject NP of the second sentence with the adjectival predicate.

In the following sub-sections, we first rehearse the proposal made in the literature that in Korean, the Nominative Case marker as well as the salience-encoding topic marker (as discussed in the previous section) encodes the familiar/continuing topic of a sentence, and go on to account for why there is a preference for the demonstrative to be supported on the subject NP of a verbal predicate unlike that of an adjective predicate in Korean.

### 3.1 Nom Case marker as a familiar/continuing topic marker

It has long been noted (e.g. Haig 1983) that unlike in Japanese, in Korean the Nominative Case marker can function as a familiar/continuing topic marker (see Kuroda (2005) and Lee and Shimojo (2016) for the more recent discussion of the Korean vs. Japanese distinction in topic and subject). For example, according to Choi (1997: 553), the Nom Case can mark continuing topics (that belong to familiar topics) in Korean. Let us look at the following examples from Choi (ibid.):

- (28) Yeysnal-ey han maul-ey Swuni-lanun ai-ka salassta.  
 past-in one village-in Swuni-named child-NOM lived

13 The subject of the second sentence *ku kay-ka* ‘that dog’ can have the demonstrative omitted.

Swuni-ka halwunun yeph maul-ey nollekassta.

Swuni-NOM one.day next village-to went

‘Once upon a time, there lived a child named Swuni in a village.

One day Swuni went to a neighboring village.’

(29) A: Kobe-eyse cicin-i nasse.

Kobe-in earthquake-NOM broke.out

‘There was an earthquake (*ka*) in Kobe.’

B: Cicin-i encey nass-e?<sup>14</sup>

earthquake-NOM when broke.out-Q

‘When did the earthquake (*ka*) happen?’

In (28), the first sentence, which newly introduces a referent denoted by *ai* ‘child’, is uttered discourse-initially, so it does not have any presupposition: this sentence has sentence-focus structure (that is, it is a presentational construction, and thus the Nom Case-marking is required as a sentence-focus marker). However, notice that the same referent in the second sentence of (28) is discourse-active and still Nom Case-marked. Based on the fact that this Nom Case-marked referent is discourse-active, Choi claims that it is a continuing topic and that the Nom Case marker can encode a continuing topic in Korean. Likewise, Choi asserts that while in the first sentence of (29) the referent of the Nom Case-marked subject NP that is newly introduced into the discourse is focal, that of the same NP in the second sentence is discourse-active and serves the role of a continuing topic.

Kim and Choi (2013) also note in their study on attestations of topic or Nom(inative) Case particle-marked NPs in a Korean novel<sup>15</sup> that the following examples illustrate the topic use of Nom Case marked nominals:

(30) a. Ku-nun hoyngselwuselha-yss-ta. Na-nun son-ul sotokha-yss-ta.  
           he-TOP gibberish-said I-TOP hand-ACC disinfected  
           Kapang sok-ey imi kikwu-ka chayngky-ecye iss-ess-ta.

14 Since the continuing topic in the second sentence of (29b) enters into verbal predication, this example constitutes an argument against Kim’s (2021a) claim that topics with Nominative Case marking are preferentially realized with the demonstrative.

15 The title of the novel is 『Ku Kaul-uy Samil Tongan』 ‘Three Days in That Autumn’ written by the famous Korean novelist Wan-suh Park.

bag inside already tool-NOM pack-CONN was  
 Hwang ssi-ka ttelli-nun son-ulo kapang-ul  
 Hwang Mr.-NOM tremble-MOD hand-with book  
 patatul-ko kyeytan-ul kontwupakcilchy-e-nayly-ess-ta.  
 take-CONN stair-ACC slump.down-PST-DCL  
 ‘He ... said gibberish. ... . I ... disinfected my hands. There were  
 already ... tools in the bag. Hwang took the bag with trembling hands  
 and slumped down the stairs.’

- b. Kulena thaya-nun twupwu-man ... iltan cengciha-yss-ta.  
 however fetus-TOP head-only once stop-PST-DCL  
 Nollapkeyto ku kyenghwang cwung-ey thaya-ka nwun-ul  
 surprisingly the crisis midst-in fetus-NOM eye-ACC  
 panccak tt-ess-ta.  
 brightly open-PST-DCL  
 ‘However, only the head of the fetus ... once stopped. Surprisingly, in the  
 midst of the crisis, the fetus opened her eyes.’

Kim and Choi (2013) go on to argue that the Nominative Case marker in (30) that signals the familiar topic of the sentence can be replaced by the topic marker NUN,<sup>16</sup> but such sentences tend to be more likely construed as presenting a newly-developing situation or event than sentence with the NUN marker on subject NPs.

### 3.2 Verbal vs. adjective predication and preference for demonstrative modification

In tandem with Kratzer’s (1995) and Diesing’s (1992) distinction between

16 As also noted by Lee (2019), the replacement of the Nominative marker with the NUN marker is impossible in certain contexts involving ‘direct perception’, as follows:

- (i) A: (Yuchiwen-eyse) ce kkoma mal-i-ntey-yo. Ce kkoma cham  
 kindergarten-in that little.boy mean that little very  
 calsayngky-ess-ci-yo?  
 handsome-PST-ITERR-HEARER.HON  
 ‘(In a kindergarten) I mean that little boy. That little boy is so handsome, isn’t he?’  
 B: Yey, kkoma-ka/(\*nun) cengmal calsayngky-ess-ney-yo.  
 yes little.boy-NOM really handsome-PST-MIR-HEARER.HON  
 ‘Yes. That little boy is really handsome.’

individual-level and stage-level predicates, Kim (1990) and Choi (1997) assert that Nom Case-marked subject NPs have different focus interpretations depending on their predicate types; if the predicate is individual-level, the sentence is construed only as involving argument focus<sup>17</sup>, but if the predicate is stage-level, the sentence is construed as involving either argument focus or sentence focus. To bolster her argument, Choi (1997) gives the following examples:

- (31) a. Mary-ka     John-ul     manna-ko issta.  
           Mary-NOM John-ACC meeting is  
           ‘There’s Mary meeting John.’  
           ‘It is Mary (not others) who is meeting John.’  
       b. Mary-ka     ttokttokhata.  
           Mary-NOM be.smart  
           ‘It is Mary who is smart.’

As the English translations of the sentences indicate, (31a) with a stage-level predicate has two readings. It is interpreted as having either a sentence-focus reading (Choi calls it a “presentational” reading) or an argument-focus reading. On the other hand, (31b) with an individual-level predicate has only one reading. It is interpreted as having an argument-focus reading. In line with Diesing (1992), Choi (1997) assumes that the two sentences have different interpretations because their subjects occupy the different positions when they undergo interpretations. That is, the subject of an individual-level predicate is placed in the Spec of TP, but the subject of a stage-level predicate is placed in the Spec either of vP or of TP via scrambling (cf. Kratzer 1995; Diesing 1992).

Building on the discussion by Choi (1997), we now turn to the following examples, where unlike those in (31), the two sentences are in sequence, and the discourse-active subject NP in the second sentence occurs with a stage- or individual-predicate:

- (32) A: Cheli-ka     ettehkey toy-ess-ni?  
           Cheli-NOM how     become-PST-Q  
           ‘What became of Cheli?’  
       B: Cheli-ka     kyelkwuk ku i-lul     kkuthnaysseyo.

---

17 The argument XP which completes the open proposition is in focus, and the open proposition is presupposed.

- Cheli-NOM finally that work finished  
 ‘Cheli finished the work.’
- (33) A: Cheli-ka ettayss-ni?  
 Cheli-NOM how-PST-Q  
 ‘How was Cheli?’
- B: Cheli-ka cham ttokttokhaysseyo.  
 Chli-NOM really was smart  
 ‘Cheli was smart.’

The construal of (33B) with the individual-level predicate seems to be straightforward. The sentence has a typical topic-comment partition, entering into what Kuroda (1972) calls categorical predication; the Nom-marked subject and the predicate function as a topic and as a comment, respectively. On the other hand, the predicate in (32B) is stage-level, and the sentence reports a (hearer-new) event by a proposition which involves a discourse-active/accessible Nom Case-marked subject referent. In this case, there is a tension due to the interaction between the discourse-active subject and the stage-level predicate. On the one hand, according to Kratzer’s (1995) and Diesing’s (1992) proposal that the Nom Case marked subject NP of a stage-level predicate is interpreted either in Spec of vP or Spec of TP, it as a subject of the stage-level predicate can undergo an interpretation in either of the positions; [Spec,vP] and [Spec,TP]. On the other hand, in light of the discourse context where it occurs, the Korean Nom Case-marked subject NP in (32B) is construed as a topic, thus enforcing its interpretation in the Spec of TP.

We return to the paradigm noted by Kim (2021a), as in (25). In this paradigm, the NP subject of an (individual-level) adjectival predicate as in (25b) need not be supported by the demonstrative. We attributed the unnecessary of the demonstrative in this case to the fact that the subject of such a predicate tends to function as a (familiar/continuing) topic of the sentence. Thus, its surface position in the Spec of TP (or its interpretation based on its information structure) is appropriate enough for a bare NP subject to serve as a familiar/continuing topic of the sentence. By contrast, the subject NP of a (stage-level) verbal predicate as in (25a) more likely comes with the demonstrative. Since the Nom Case-marked bare subject NP of such a predicate can be interpreted in the Spec of vP thus prompting a sentence-focus or presentational reading, the attachment of the familiarity-encoding demonstrative on the subject NP can preempt a topic interpretation

of the subject in that Spec in complying with the information structure of the topic subject followed by the stage-level predicate. All in all, the strategy for preferentially opting for the support of the demonstrative on Nom Case-marked NP subjects of stage-level predicates is taken to facilitate their familiar/continuing topic reading, while suppressing their otherwise available sentence-focus/presentational reading.

Though effective in explaining the verb vs. adjective distinction at issue, however, this approach can hardly be extended to account for Kim's (2021a) claim that "structural [Case/]case-marked anaphoric definites typically require a DEM(onstrative)". Particularly, Accusative Case marked object NPs also rather prefers to carry the demonstrative, as follows:

- (34) Cikwen-pwu-ni cha han-tay-lul hochwulhay.cwu.pnita.  
 staff-NOM car one-CL-ACC call.give  
 'The staff will call you a car.'  
 kulem (ku) cha-lul thako olla.ka-myen toy.pnita.  
 then that car-ACC get-in climb.go-if will do  
 'Then you get in the car and go up.'

To accommodate cases like (34), we adopt the more general version of Diesing's (1992) so-called Mapping Hypothesis, formulated as follows:

- (35) a. Material situated in the VP/vP will be mapped into the nuclear scope  
 (i.e., into the domain of 'existential closure').  
 b. Material outside VP/vP will be mapped into the restriction of a  
 quantificational structure.

(35) is intended to capture the different interpretations available to indefinites in different structural positions. In Diesing's view of indefinites, they do not have quantificational force of their own; rather the variable introduced by an indefinite has to be bound by another element of the structure like an existential operator at the periphery of VP/vP. According to (35a), every indefinite inside VP/vP gets an existential reading. But according to (35b), indefinites outside VP/vP can get a 'strong' reading such as a generic, partitive, or specific reading.

Returning to bare NPs in such contexts as in (34), they are also more likely construed



as indefinites, though they are grammatically allowed to occur as anaphoric definites given their antecedents they referentially associate with. In other words, bare NPs in Korean are vulnerable to different interpretations such as indefinite and anaphoric definite ones. When different interpretations are in competition, language users tend to resort to a certain device to avoid confusion due to ambiguity and facilitate successful communication in the use of bare NPs. Evidently, the familiarity-encoding demonstrative is an optimal device in signaling that the NP supported by it is an anaphoric definite. This accounts for the optional, but communicatively preferential use of the demonstrative on the object NP in the second sentence of (34).<sup>18</sup>

#### 4. Summary and conclusion

This paper sets out to re-examine the empirical generalization offered in Kim (2021a, b) that the alternation between bare and demonstrative NPs as anaphoric definites are only apparent in certain contexts, such as in continuing topic position and in the Nominative subject position of a verbal predicate. Taking Kim's cartographic approach to the preference for demonstratives in these two contexts to be not appropriate as a viable analytic option, we go on to suggest that the preference for demonstratives as a continuing topic follows from the pragmatic function of the so-called topic or contrast marker NUN (as well as focus particles), which is deployed to increase the discourse salience of the referents denoted by the NPs marked with it. Discourse salience is cognitive, so that by using the demonstrative the speaker calls the hearer's more attention to the referent of the NP supported by it to facilitate the linkage between the NP with its antecedent. On the other hand, the Nominative subject of a verbal predicate may tend to enter intothetic (vs. categorical) judgement interpretation in the Spec of vP, but when it is interpreted as a familiar/continuing topic, the speaker can support the subject NP explicitly using the demonstrative, enabling it to properly undergo its interpretation as a familiar/continuing topic rather than as an otherwise available indefinite.

One relevant remaining issue is the apparent alternation between bare anaphoric definite NPs and demonstratives in other contexts. Srinivas and Rawlins (2020) and

---

18 In this analysis based on (35), the preference for the demonstrative on the subject NP of a verbal predicate as noted above is due to the fact that the subject NP of a verbal predicate may be reconstructed into VP-internal position; thus without the demonstrative, the subject bare NP is more likely construed as an indefinite, contrary to fact.

Simpson and Wu (to appear) (also Kim 2021a, b for Korean) claim that in Kannada and Mandarin Chinese, when there are breaks in discourse coherence caused by changes in event time, place and perspective-shift, the speaker chooses a more explicit means of reference (e.g. demonstratives rather than bare anaphoric definite NPs) to make up for the lowering of individual referents' activation level. Simpson and Wu (to appear) call attention to the following example in Mandarin Chinese:

- (36) a. Jiaoshi    li        zuo-zhe    yi    ge    nansheng  
           classroom inside sit-PROG    one    CL boy  
           he    yi    ge    nusheng.  
           and    one CL    girl  
           'There are a boy and a girl sitting in the classroom.'
- b. wo zuotian    yudao #(na    ge) nansheng.  
           I    yesterday meet    that CL boy  
           'I met the boy yesterday.'
- (Jenks 2018)

This pair of sentences involve a shift in time and (presumably) place between the situation described in (36a) and the event in (36b), which took place on a preceding day (and most probably in a different location). Simpson and Wu (to appear) argue that for this reason, the use of the demonstrative in (36b) is more felicitous/preferred.

Discourse coherence between the sentence containing its antecedent and the sentence containing an anaphoric definite NP is also at work in Korean. In (37a) and (37b) where the first and the second sentences meet discourse coherence, the bare anaphoric definite NP is acceptable.<sup>19</sup> Cases such as (37) evidently bolster the claim that in Korean, bare anaphoric definites are by default available to Korean. However, in (37a) and (37c) where they do not, it is rather difficult to bridge the anaphoric link between the bare NP and its antecedent NP. In this situation, the demonstrative is preferentially recruited on the NP, thereby facilitating the anaphoric link at hand:

- (37) a. Nay-ka ecey        khemphyuthe    han tay-ul        kwuiphaysseyo.  
           I-NOM yesterday computer        one CL-ACC    bought

<sup>19</sup> The less use of the demonstrative on anaphoric definite NPs in fairy tales or fables in Korean can be accounted for in this line of analysis. That type genre of texts tend to conform to discourse coherence between sentences where event time, place and perspective are consistently kept.

- ‘I bought a computer yesterday.’
- b. Kuliko palo                    maycang-eyse   khemphyuthe-lul   seysephaysseyo.  
     and           immediately shop-in                    computer-ACC   set-up  
     ‘And (I) immediately set up the computer in the shop.’
- c. Kulentey onul   nwukwunka #(ku)   khemphyuthe-lul  
     but           today   someone           the computer  
     hwumchye kasseyo.  
     took away  
     ‘But someone took away the computer today.’

Though a more in-depth study of the paradigm in (37) is left open for future work, discourse properties such as discourse coherence as well as discourse-relating topic marker and information structure dynamics crucially come into play in accounting for the distribution of bare anaphoric definite NPs and demonstrative-marked ones in Korean.

## References

- Ahn, Dorothy. 2017. Definite and demonstrative descriptions: a micro-typology. In Michael Yoshitaka Erlewine (ed.), *Proceedings of GLOW in Asia XI*, 33-48. Seoul: Hankwuk Publishing Co.
- Barker, Chris. 1998. Partitives, double genitives and anti-uniqueness. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 16: 679-717.
- Barrie, Michael Jonathan Mathew, Audrey Li, Martina Wiltschko, and Jong Un Park. 2021. In defense of DP (or KP). *Language Research* 38(2): 207-238.
- Chafe, Wallace. 1987. Cognitive constraints on information flow. In Russell Tomlin (ed.), *Coherence and grounding in discourse*, 21-51. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Chang, Seok-Jin. 1984. Cisiwa coung [Reference and anaphora (written in Korean)]. *Hangul* 186: 115-49.
- Cheng, Lisa L-S. and Rint Sybesma. 1999. Bare and not-so-bare nouns and the structure of NP. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30: 509-542.
- Choe, Hyon Sook. 1995. Focus and topic movement in Korean and licensing. In Katalin É. Kiss (ed.), *Discourse configurational languages*, 269-334. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Choi, Hye-Won. 1996. *Optimizing structure in context: scrambling and information structure*. PhD Dissertation. Stanford University.

- Choi, Hye-Won. 1997. Topic and focus in Korean: the information partition by phrase structure and morphology. *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 6: 545-561.
- Chou, Chao-Ting Tim. 2012. Syntax-pragmatics interface: Mandarin Chinese *wh-the-hell* and point-of-view operator. *Syntax* 15(1): 1-24.
- Clamons, C. Robin, Ann E. Mulkern, and Gerald Sanders. 1993. Saliency signaling in Oromo. *Journal of Pragmatics* 19: 519-536.
- Constant, Noah. 2014. *Contrastive topic: Meanings and realizations*. PhD Dissertation. University of Massachusetts at Amherst.
- Dayal, Veneeta and Julie Jiang. To appear. The puzzle of anaphoric bare nouns in Mandarin: A counterpoint to Index! *Linguistic Inquiry*.
- Diesing, Molly. 1992. *Indefinites*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Diessel, Holger. 1999. *Demonstratives: Form, function and grammaticalization*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Frascarelli, Mara and Ronald Hinterhölzl. 2007. Types of topics in German and Italian. In Kerstin Schwabe and Susanne Winkler (eds.), *On information structure, meaning and form*, 87-116. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Givón, Talmy. 1983. *Topic continuity in discourse: A quantitative cross-language study*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Haig, John H. 1983. Japanese *ga* and Korean *ka/i*. *Korean Linguistics* 3: 33-46.
- Han, Chung-hye. 1998. Asymmetry in the interpretation of *-(n)un* in Korean. *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 7: 1-15.
- Ionin, Tania, Soondo Baek, Eunah Kim, Heejeong Ko, and Kenneth Wexler. 2012. That's not so different from the: Definite and demonstrative descriptions in second language acquisition. *Second Language Research* 28: 69-101.
- Kang, Arum. 2021. Marking definiteness in an articleless language: The role of the domain restrictor KU in Korean. *Language and Linguistics* 22(2): 301-336.
- Kim, Ilkyu. 2015. Is Korean *-(n)un* a topic marker? On the nature of *-(n)un* and its relation to information structure. *Lingua* 154: 87-109.
- Kim, Kwang-Sup. 1990. Where do the contrastive and focus readings come from? *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 1: 395-412.
- Kim, Min-Joo. 2021a. Apparent optionality in marking anaphoric definites in Korean. An abstract/handout in *The Korean Linguistics in Crosslinguistic Context (KLCC) 2021 (Syntax-Semantics-Pragmatics Interface)*. Department of Linguistics, Cornell University. June 4-6, 2021.
- Kim, Min-Joo. 2021b. Anaphoric definiteness marking in Korean and the role of point of view. A handout delivered at *The 2021 Fall Online Conference of the Korean Generative Grammar Circle (KGGC)*, November 6th, 2021 and the Korean Society for Language and Information (KSLI), November 6, 2021.
- Kim, Su-Jeong and Dong-Ju Choi. 2013. A study on the form of subjects in Korean written text.

- Hanmincokemwunhak* 64: 37-69.
- Kim, Sung-Uk. 1983. *Topic realization in Korean: Sentence-initial position and the particle 'nun'*. PhD Dissertation. University of Florida.
- Kratzer, Angelika. 1995. Individual-level and stage-level predicates. In Gregory N. Carlson and Francis Jeffrey Pelletier (eds.), *The generic book*, 125–175. Chicago, IL: Chicago University Press.
- Kuroda, Sige-Yuki. 1972. The categorical and the thetic judgement. *Foundations of Language* 9: 153-185.
- Kuroda, Sige-Yuki. 2005. Focusing on the matter of topic: A study of *wa* and *ga* in Japanese. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 14(1): 1-58
- Jiang, L. Julie. 2012. *Nominal arguments and language variation*. PhD Dissertation. Harvard University.
- Jiménez-Fernández, Ángel and Shigeru Miyagawa. 2014. A feature-inheritance approach to root phenomena and parametric variation. *Lingua* 145: 275-302.
- Lambrecht, Knud. 1994. *Information structure and sentence form: Topic, focus, and the mental representation of discourse referents*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lee, EunHee and Mitsuaki Shimojo. 2016. Mismatch of topic between Japanese and Korean. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 25: 81-112.
- Lee, Ik Sop and Hong Pin Im. 1983. *Theories of Korean grammar* (written in Korean). Seoul: Hakyensa.
- Lee, Jong Kun. 2019. The nominative case markers *i/ka* and marking topic in Korean. *The Journal of Studies in Language* 34(4): 593-605.
- Moroney, Mary. 2019. Definiteness with bare nouns in Shan. In Jennifer Sikos and Eric Pacuit (eds.), *At the intersection of language, logic, and information (Lecture Notes in Computer Science)*, 108-123. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-59620-3\\_7](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-59620-3_7).
- Moroney, Mary. 2021. Updating the typology of definiteness: Evidence from bare nouns in Shan. *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics* 6(1): 56. 1-28.
- Mulkern, Ann. 2003. *Cognitive status, discourse salience, and information structure: Evidence from Irish and Oromo*. PhD Dissertation. University of Minnesota.
- Mulkern, Ann. 2007. Knowing who's important: relative discourse salience and Irish pronominal forms. In Nancy A. Hedberg and Ron Zacharski (eds.), *The grammar-iragmatics interface: Essays in honor of Jeanette K. Gundel*, 113-142. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Park, Chulwoo. 1999. Topic in Korean: from a viewpoint of information structure (written in Korean). *Language Research* 19: 75-97.
- Park, Ho-gwan. 2007. Basic meaning function of the postpositional word '-neun' viewed in dual structure of sentence formation. *Urimalgeul (The Korean language and literature)* 39: 91-116.
- Park, Myung-Kwan and Arum Kang. 2020. Korean vs. Chinese on anaphoric definites without a determiner. Ms. Dongguk University and Hankyung National University.
- Pesetsky, David. 1987. Wh-in-situ: Movement and unselective binding. In Eric J. Reuland and Alice

- ter Meulen (eds.), *The representation of (in)definiteness*, 98-129. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Rhee, Seongha. 2020. On determinants of discourse marker functions: Grammaticalization and discourse-analytic perspectives. *Language Research* 37(2): 289-325.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In Liliane Haegeman (ed.), *Elements of grammar: A handbook of generative syntax*, 281-337. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Schwarz, Florian. 2009. *Two types of definites in natural language*. PhD Dissertation. University of Massachusetts Amherst.
- Simpson, Andrew and Zoe Wu. To appear. Constraints on the representation of anaphoric definiteness in Mandarin Chinese: a reassessment. In Andrew Simpson (ed.), *New explorations in Chinese theoretical syntax*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Sohn, Ho-Min. 1994. *Korean*. New York: Routledge.
- Speas, Margaret and Carol L. Tenny. 2003. Configurational properties of point of view roles. In Anna Maria Di Sciullo (ed.), *Asymmetry in grammar*, 315-344. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Srinivas, Sadhwi and Kyle Rawlins 2020. Anaphoric variability in Kannada bare nominals. A talk delivered at *(Formal) Approaches to South Asian Languages ((F)ASAL)*. Linguistics Department, Ohio State University. March 21-22, 2020.
- Wolter, Lynsey. 2006. *That's that: the semantics and pragmatics of demonstrative noun phrases*. PhD Dissertation. University of California, Santa Cruz.

**Myung-Kwan Park**

Professor

Department of English

Dongguk University

30, Pildong-ro 1-gil, Jung-gu,

Seoul 04620, Korea

E-mail: parkmk@dgu.edu

Received: 2021. 7. 14.

Revised: 2022. 03. 09.

Accepted: 2022. 03. 10.