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A central question in recent linguistics literature:
How human language encodes different types of definiteness

What we know thanks largely to Schwarz (2009):

- Definites are at least of two kinds: unique definites and anaphoric definites.
- To account for relevant crosslinguistic data, both uniqueness-based (e.g., Frege 1892, Russell 1905, Strawson 1950) and familiarity-based (e.g., Christophersen 1939, Heim 1982) theories of definites are needed.
### Types of definites based on Hawkins (1978) and Schwarz (2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of definite use</th>
<th>Example from English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Immediate situation use</td>
<td>Open the door!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Larger situation use</td>
<td>The moon has risen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Anaphoric use</td>
<td>John bought a book and a magazine today. The book was expensive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Bridging: Product-Producer</td>
<td>John bought a book today. The author is French.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Bridging: Part-Whole</td>
<td>John bought a new house. The ceiling is very tall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Donkey anaphora</td>
<td>Every farmer who owns a donkey hits the donkey.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some recent findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Definite Use</th>
<th>German (Schwarz 2009)</th>
<th>Thai (Jenks 2015)</th>
<th>Mandarin (Jenks 2018)</th>
<th>Shan (Moroney 2019a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immediate situation</td>
<td>weak</td>
<td>bare</td>
<td>bare</td>
<td>bare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger situation</td>
<td>weak</td>
<td>bare</td>
<td>bare</td>
<td>bare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaphoric</td>
<td>strong</td>
<td>dem.</td>
<td>dem.</td>
<td>bare/dem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridging: Part-whole</td>
<td>weak</td>
<td>bare</td>
<td>bare</td>
<td>bare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donkey anaphora</td>
<td>strong</td>
<td>dem.</td>
<td>dem.</td>
<td>bare/dem.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Moroney 2021: Table 4)
Some qualifications about Mandarin

- According to Jenks (2018), Mandarin **anaphoric subjects** tend to be **bare nouns (BNs)**. This is because Mandarin subjects typically function as **topics** (Li and Thompson 1981), so they have special status.

- But Dayal and Jiang (to appear) have shown that Mandarin **BNs** can occur in **other anaphoric environments**, not just in subject positions.

- Given this, under scrutiny, Mandarin will most likely turn out to be **more akin to Shan** than what Jenks (2018) has made us believe.
Where does Korean fit in this picture?

- In the extant literature, it is already well known that:
  - Korean uses **BNs** to mark **unique definites** and **part-whole bridging** cases;
  - it uses **both BNs** and **demonstratives (DEMs)** to mark **anaphoric definites** (see, a.o., Ahn 2019, Park and Kang 2020, Kang 2021, and references therein).

- But **exactly when** a BN is chosen over a DEM-modified nominal in encoding anaphoric definiteness or vice versa is still poorly understood.
Goal of this paper

- Identify **when a DEM may occur** on Korean anaphoric definites and **when not**, based on grammaticality judgment tasks conducted with six Korean speakers (3 male and 3 female) and some corpus data obtained from Google searches.

Key claims

- DEM marking on anaphoric nominals in Korean is not really about anaphoric marking; rather, it’s about encoding situation-external point of view (POV).

- All else being equal, first mention continuing topics in Korean strongly prefer DEM-marking, contra Jenks (2018).

- For all types of Korean anaphoric nominals, their form is determined by POV, sentential predicate type, information structure, discourse coherence, and their ability to function as discourse-internally licensed names.

- Grammaticality judgments on anaphoric definiteness marking in Korean are rarely categorical because of the subjective and fluid nature of POV and the workings of violable constraints governing the phenomenon.
Roadmap

- Definiteness marking on continuing topics

- Definiteness marking on anaphoric objects, subjects, and other types of non-topic nominals

- Formally capturing the facts within a cartographic framework while resorting to an output filter

- Conclusion with some typological implications
Definiteness marking on continuing topics in Korean

Context: Speaker owns a convenience store.

(1) Kakey an-uro etten namca-ka tulleo-ass-ta.
store inside-to some man-NOM come.in-PST-DECL
‘A man came into the store.’

?(Ku) namca-nun kapang-ul tul-ko iss-ess-ta.
that man-TOP bag-ACC carry-CONN AUX-PST-DECL
Intended: ‘The man was carrying a bag.’

• (1) seems to suggest that DEM marking on continuing topics in Korean is optional.
Definiteness marking on continuing topics in Korean cont’d

Context: Speaker is a college professor.

(2) Ecey haksayng han-myeng-i na-lul chacao-ass-ta.
yesterday student one-CL-NOM I-ACC come.and.visit-PST-DECL
‘Yesterday a student came to see me.’

*(Ku) haksayng-un cikum sa.hak.nyen-i-ta.
that student-TOP currently fourth.school.year-COP-DECL
Intended: ‘The student is currently in his/her/their fourth year (in college).’

• (2) seems to suggest that DEM marking on continuing topics in Korean is not (entirely) optional.
Choice of the topic nominal matters

Context: Speaker owns a convenience store.

(3) Kakey an-uro etten yeca-ay-ka tulleo-ass-ta.
    store inside-to some woman-kid-NOM come.in-PST-DECL
    ‘A young girl came into the store.’

??(Ku) yeca-ay-nun kapang-ul tul-ko iss-ess-ta.
    that woman-kid-TOP bag-ACC carry-CONN AUX-PST-DECL
    Intended: ‘The young girl was carrying a bag.’

(3’) Kakey an-uro etten sonye-ka tulleo-ass-ta.
    store inside-to some small woman-NOM come.in-PST-DECL
    ‘A young girl came into the store.’

??(Ku) sonye-nun kapang-ul tul-ko iss-ess-ta.
    that small woman-TOP bag-ACC carry-CONN AUX-PST-DECL
    Intended: ‘The young girl was carrying a bag.’
Choice of the sentential predicate matters

Context: Speaker is a college professor.

(2) Ecey haksayng han-myeng-i na-lul chacao-ass-ta.
yesterday student one-CL-NOM I-ACC come.and.visit-PST-DECL
‘Yesterday a student came to see me.’

*(Ku) haksayng-un cikum sa.hak.nyen-i-ta.
that student-TOP currently fourth.school.year-COP-DECL
Intended: ‘The student is currently in his/her/their fourth year (in college).’

yesterday student one-CL-NOM I-ACC come.and.visit-PST-DECL
‘Yesterday a student came to see me.’

?(Ku) haksayng-un chwuchense-ka philyohata-ko hay-ss-ta.
that student-TOP recommendation.letter-NOM need-COMP say-PST-DECL
Intended: ‘The student said he/she/they needed a recommendation letter.’
Some corpus data findings

- I conducted Google searches using the following template:
  \[\text{[Text [ S1 \ldots [indefinite NP]}_i \ldots ] [S2 [NP-\text{nun/un}]}_i \ldots ] [S3 [NP]}_i \ldots ] \]

- All these nominals involved non-defective Ns such as kwutwu 'shoe', kangaci ‘puppy’, kay ‘dog’, koyangi ‘cat’, hwanca ‘patient’, haksayng ‘student’, moksa ‘pastor’, pohoca ‘guardian’, cip ‘house’, maul ‘town’, and mwuncey ‘problem’, which can occur as BNs, unlike the case with defective Ns like kes ‘thing’, kos ‘place’, and ttay ‘time’ (e.g., *(ku)kes/kos ‘the/that thing/place’).

- The data were drawn from newspaper stories, encyclopedia entries, tourism Ads, fables, children’s books, (translated) fictions, sermons, personal letters, and blogs.
Corpus data search findings cont’d

- In total, 71 tokens of **phonologically overt** continuing topics were obtained.
- Of these, 49 were modified by a DEM, three were only modified by a possessive pronominal determiner, six were only modified by a relative clause (RC), and 13 were in the form of a BN.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Continuing Topics (n = 71)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEM marked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 (69.01%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- In the data I obtained, **no** bare nominal continuing topic was a **first mention** continuing topic.
Illustration of DEM marked and bare nominal continuing topics within the same text

1. 백만 년이나 죽지 않은 고양이가 (koyangi-ka ‘cat-NOM’) 있었습니다.
2. 그 고양이는 (ku koyangi-nun ‘DEM cat-TOP’) 백만 번이나 죽고 백만 번이나 살았습니다.
3. 백만 명의 사람의 고양이였으며, 백만 명의 사람이 귀여웠습니다.
4. 백만 명의 사람이 그 고양이가 죽을 때 였습니다.
5. 하지만 그 고양이는 단 한 번도 울지 않았습니다.
6. 그러던 한때 고양이는 (koyangi-nun ‘cat-TOP’) 누구의 고양이도 아닌 자기만의 고양이가 되었습니다.
7. 그 고양이는 하얀 고양이를 만나게 됩니다.
8. 고양이는 하얀 고양이 결에 눈 붙이 있습니다.
9. 하얀 고양이를 만나고 난 후 고양이는 더는 말하지 않습니다.
10. “난 백만 번이나....” 하얀 고양이가 움직이지 않던 날, 고양이는 영영 목을 놓아 울었습니다.
11. 그리고 두 번 다시는 되살아나지 않았습니다.

https://market.bookshopmap.com/100 만-변-산-고양이/
Turning to non-topic anaphoric nominals: Corpus analysis results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-topic anaphoric definites (n = 76)*</th>
<th>DEM marked</th>
<th>Bare</th>
<th>RC + N</th>
<th>Possessive + N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subject (n = 26)</strong></td>
<td>14 (53.85%)</td>
<td>10 (38.46%)</td>
<td>2 (7.69%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct Object (n = 17)</strong></td>
<td>8 (47.05%)</td>
<td>6 (35.29%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>3 (17.64%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indirect Object (n = 6)</strong></td>
<td>5 (83.33%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (16.66%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Genitive/Possessor (n = 15)</strong></td>
<td>9 (60%)</td>
<td>5 (33.33%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (6.66%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Locative (n = 4)</strong></td>
<td>4 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other (e.g., Instrumental, Comitative) (n = 8)</strong></td>
<td>6 (75%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (25%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus-particle (e.g., -to ‘also’, -man ‘only’) bearing (n = 8)</strong></td>
<td>6 (75%)</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Focus-particle marked tokens were not included in the total.
Anaphoric BN subjects or objects are typically co-indexed with a DEM marked continuing topic or subject which occurs before them: e.g.,

1. 말그대로입니다.
2. 강아지를 집에 혼자 몇날만칠 방치하는 친구가 있어요.
3. 그 강아지는 예전에 어느 누군가가 파양해서 임시보호하다가
4. 정이 들어서 계속 키우고있는거로 알고있습니다.
5. 근데 중요한건.. 키우는건 키우는건데
6. 이천구가 일도 바쁘고 사람들도 많이 만나야 하는 직업이라..
7. 봄계까지 숲먹고 반딧불에 혹은 새벽에 들어가는 경우도 많고,
8. 여행도 자주가는 편인데 2 박 3 일동안 강아지가 혼자 있는경우도 많아요..

https://pann.nate.com/talk/346167386
Closer look at anaphoric marking on direct objects

(5) Na-nun caknyen-ev etten phathiy-se etten chengnyen han-myeng-ul
I-TOP last year-LOC some party-LOC some young man one-CL-ACC
manna-ss-ta.
meet-PST-DECL
‘Last year, at some party, I met some young man.’
Na-nun cinan cewy-ev ??*/(ku) chengnyen-ul sey-pen te
I-TOP last week that young man-ACC three-CL more
manna-ss-ta.
meet-PST-DECL
Intended: ‘I met the young man three more times this past week.’

mom-NOM I-DAT apple one-CL-ACC give-HON-PST-DECL
‘Mom gave me an apple.’
I-TOP today that apple-ACC lunch-as cat-PST-DECL
Intended: ‘Today I ate the apple for lunch.’
Spatiotemporal overlap matters

(7) Na-nun caknyen-ey etten phathi-eyse etten chengnyen han-myeng-ul
I-TOP last year-LOC some party-LOC some young man one-CL-ACC
manna-ss-ta.
meet-PST-DECL
‘Last year, at some party, I met some young man.’
Na-nun ku cari-eyse (ku) chengnyen-ul ___ nampyen-eykey
I-TOP that spot-LOC ___ that young-man-ACC pro husband-DAT
paro sokayhay-ss-ta.
right away introduce-PST-DECL
Intended: ‘I immediately introduced the young man to my husband right there.’

mom-NOM I-DAT apple one-CL-ACC give-HON-PST-DECL
‘Mom gave me an apple.’
Na-nun (ku) sakwa-lul ku cari-eyse paro mek-ess-ta.
I-TOP that apple-ACC that spot-LOC right away eat-PST-DECL
Intended: ‘I ate the apple right there.’
But social relations may also matter

(9) Onul wuri tongney-eyse etten halmeni-kkeyse. today our neighborhood-LOC some grandmother-NOM.HON
kil-ul ilh-ko heymey-ko kyesi-ess-ta. direction-ACC lose-CONN wander-CONN AUX.HON-PST-DECL
‘Today, an old lady was wandering around in our neighborhood, being lost.’
Kurayse na-nun (ku) halmeni-lul kyengchalse-ey mosi-eta so I-TOP that old.lady-ACC police.station-to take.HON-CONN
turi-ess-ta. AUX.HON-PST-DECL
‘So, I escorted the old lady to the police station.’

(10) Onul wuri tongney-eyse etten kwunin-i today our neighborhood-LOC some soldier-NOM
kil-ul ilh-ko heymey-ko iss-ess-ta. direction-ACC lose-CONN wander-CONN AUX-PST-DECL
‘Today, a soldier was wandering around in our neighborhood, being lost.’
Kurayse na-nun ??(ku) kwunin-ul kyengchalse-ey teyri-eta so I-TOP that soldier-ACC police.station-to take-CONN
cwu-ess-ta. AUX-PST-DECL
Intended: ‘So, I escorted the soldier to the police station.’
Social relations may also matter cont’d

(10) Onul wuri tongney-eyse etten kwunin-i
today our neighborhood-LOC some soldier-NOM
kil-ul ihh-ko heymey-ko iss-ess-ta.
direction-ACC lose-CONN wander-CONN AUX-PST-DECL
‘Today, a soldier was wandering around in our neighborhood, being lost.’
Kurayse na-nun ??(ku) kwunin-ul kyengchalse-ey teyri-eta
so I-TOP that soldier-ACC police-station-to take-CONN

(11) Onul wuri tongney-eyse etten kwunin-aceysi-ka
today our neighborhood-LOC some soldier-uncle-NOM
kil-ul ihh-ko heymey-ko iss-ess-ta.
direction-ACC lose-CONN wander-CONN AUX-PST-DECL
‘Today, a male soldier was wandering around in our neighborhood, being lost.’
Kurayse na-nun (ku) kwunin-aceysi-lul kyengchalse-ey teyri-eta
so I-TOP that soldier-uncle-ACC police-station-to take-CONN

Intended: ‘So, I escorted the soldier to the police station.’
What’s the difference between halmeni/kwunin-acessi and kwunin?

- Nominals like halmeni/kwunin-acessi can occur as vocatives but nominals like kwunin do not.

> Context: On the bus, yielding my seat

(12) **Halmeni/kwunin-acessi**, yeki ancu-seyo.

- grandmother/soldier-uncle
- here

‘Please take my seat, Ma’am/Sir.’ (Lit.: ‘Please sit here, Grandmother/Soldier-uncle.’)

(13) */??**Kwunin**, yeki ancu-seyo.

- soldier
- here

Intended: ‘Please take my seat, Solider.’
Closer look at anaphoric marking on subjects

Again, spatiotemporal overlap between situations involved matters.

(14) Na-nun caknyen-ey etten phathi-eyse etten chengnyen han-myeng-ul manna-ss-ta.
I-TOP last-year-LOC some party-LOC some young.man one-CL-ACC
meet-PST-DECL
‘Last year, at some party, I met some young man.’

Onul ??/*(ku) chengnyen-i na-eykey cenhwa-lul hay-ss-ta.
I-TOP that young.man-NOM I-DAT call-ACC do-PST-DECL
Intended: ‘Today the young man called me.’

(15) Na-nun caknyen-ey etten phathi-eyse etten chengnyen han-myeng-ul manna-ss-ta.
I-TOP last-year-LOC some party-LOC some young.man one-CL-ACC
meet-PST-DECL
‘Last year, at some party, I met some young man.’

(Ku) chengnyen-i ku cari-eyse na-uv cenhwa penho-lul paro
that young.man-NOM that spot-LOC I-GEN call number-ACC Right.away
mywul-ess-ta.
ask-PST-DECL
Intended: ‘The young man immediately asked for my phone number right there.’
Social relations may matter too

(16) Na-nun onul pesu-eyse etten halmeni-kkeyse cari-lul
I-TOP today bus-LOC some grandmother-DAT.HON seat-ACC
yangpohay-ss-ta.
yield-PST-DECL
‘Today, on the bus, I yielded my seat to an old lady (Lit.: ‘a grandmother’).’
Kurayssteni (ku) halmeni-kkeyse na-ekey sathang-ul
and.then that grandmother-NOM.HON I-DAT hard candy-ACC
cwu-si-ess-ta.
give-HON-PST-DECL
Intended: ‘And the old lady gave me a hard candy (in return for my kindness).’

(17) Na-nun onul pesu-eyse etten kwunin-acessi-ekey cari-lul
I-TOP today bus-LOC some soldier-uncle-DAT seat-ACC
yangpohay-ss-ta.
yield-PST-DECL
‘Today, on the bus, I yielded my seat to a soldier.’
Kurayssteni (ku) kwunin-acessi-ka nay-key sathang-ul
and.then that soldier-uncle-NOM I-DAT hard candy-ACC
cwu-si-ess-ta.
give-HON-PST-DECL
Intended: ‘And the soldier gave me a hard candy (in return for my kindness).’
Social relations may matter cont’d

(17) Na-nun onul pesu-eyse etten kwunin-acessi-ekey cari-lul
   I-TOP today bus-LOC some soldier-uncle-DAT seat-ACC
   yangpohay-ss-ta.
yield-PST-DECL
‘Today, on the bus, I yielded my seat to a soldier.’
Kurayssteni *(ku) kwunin-acessi-ka nay-key sathang-ul
   and.then that soldier-uncle-NOM I-DAT hard.candy-ACC
cwu-si-ess-ta.
give-HON-PST-DECL
Intended: ‘And the soldier gave me a hard candy (in return for my kindness).’

(18) Na-nun onul pesu-eyse etten kwunin-ekey cari-lul
   I-TOP today bus-LOC some soldier-DAT seat-ACC
   yangpohay-ss-ta.
yield-PST-DECL
‘Today, on the bus, I yielded my seat to a soldier.’
Kurayssteni *(ku) kwunin-i nay-key sathang-ul cwu-ess-ta.
   and.then that soldier-NOM I-DAT hard.candy-ACC give-PST-DECL
Intended: ‘And then the soldier gave me a hard candy (in return for kindness).’
Choice of the sentential predicate also matters

- When the sentential predicate is **adjectival**, under ordinary circumstances, using a **bare** anaphoric subject is preferred.

yesterday pro student one-CL-with conference-ACC do-PST-DECL

‘Yesterday I had a meeting with a student.’

(??Ku) haksayng-i cham ttokttokhay-ss-ta.
that student-NOM really be.smart-PST-DECL

‘The student was really smart.’

(20) Emma-ka oul _ kwaca-lul mantul-e cwu-si-ess-ta.
mom-NOM today pro cookie-ACC make-CONN give-HON-PST-DECL

‘Mom baked me/us cookies today.’

(??Ku) kwaca-ka cengmal masiss-ess-ta.
that cookie-NOM really be.delicious-PST-DECL

Intended: ‘The cookies were really delicious.’
Interim summary

- Continuing topics in Korean:
  - Mostly DEM marked; some are bare, but some are also modified by an RC or a possessive determiner.
  - Bare ones are usually found in the middle of a discourse.
  - In marking a continuing topic, both the selection of the topic nominal and the type of the sentential predicate seem to play a role, too.
Interim summary cont’d

- Non-topic anaphoric nominals in Korean:
  - More frequently modified by a DEM than other types of N modifiers.
  - Bare forms are commonly used in subject and object positions.
  - But they may be used if:
    (a) they can occur as vocatives or names; and/or
    (b) there is spatiotemporal overlap between the situations involved.
  - When the sentential predicate is adjectival, in neutral contexts, bare forms are used for nominative case (NOM)-marked subjects.
How to interpret these generalizations?

My claim:

- DEM marking on anaphoric definites in Korean is a way of referring to a discourse referent that has been introduced into the discourse from a **POV** that is external to the situation under description.

- Correlatively, it’s a way of indicating an activated or familiar status of the discourse referent at hand in the sense of Gundel et al. (1993).

- Whenever discourse referents can function as *text-internally licensed unique definites*, bare forms can be used unless there is a need to refer to their referents from an external **POV**.

- But given the robustness of DEM marking on anaphoric definites, which is sometimes required, it must be governed by some **grammatical** principles as well as pragmatic ones.
My strategy to account for the phenomena

- Build on previous work on the *Syntax of Sentience*.

- Resort to an *output filter*, which is comprised of violable constraints, whose relative ranking may vary from speaker to speaker or language to language.
Syntax of sentience

- Syntactic literature has shown that **grammatically encoding** cognitive notions like **point of view** and **sentience** yields positive outcomes in dealing with various linguistic phenomena at the syntax-pragmatics interface such as **logophoricity**, **switch reference**, **topic/focus**, **evidentiality**, and the **syntax of vocatives** (e.g., Sells 1987; Koopman and Sportiche 1989; Sterling 1993; Rizzi 1997; Cinque 1999; Speas and Tenny 2003; Speas 2004; Tenny 2006; Hill 2007; Chou 2012; Haddad 2014; Solcum 2016).

- Therefore, I take a similar approach in accounting for anaphoric definiteness marking in Korean.
My POV based analysis of Korean anaphoric definiteness marking

- Drawing on Chou 2012, which is concerned with wh-the-hell questions in Mandarin, I assume that certain nominals in any language come with unvalued (u) POV features, which must be licensed by entering into a probe-goal relation with the closest c-commanding POV operator (POV-op).

- But since the phenomenon we are concerned with here differs from what Chou (2012) is concerned with, my POV based analysis differs from his in several respects.
My POV based analysis of Korean anaphoric definiteness marking cont’d

- The POV-ops Chou posits encode the negative attitude of the relevant discourse participant toward the propositional content of the *wh-the-hell* question at issue, so are specified for [+/- discourse participant] and [+/- 1st and 2nd person]; those I posit for Korean definiteness marking are specified for situation-internal (POV-int) and situation-external (POV-ext), depending on where the attitude holder’s POV is located in describing the situation in which the discourse referent denoted by the anaphoric nominal at hand occurs.

- The POV operators Chou posits for *wh-the-hell* questions in Mandarin are located at the edge of each phase (i.e., CP and v*P in the sense of Chomsky 2000, 2001); what I call POV-op-int and POV-op-ext are located at an adjoined specifier (Spec) position of a continuing TopP, FocP, vP, and VP.
Additional assumptions

- In any language, functional projections (FPs) with any syntactic features must be **phonologically visible** by having their **head** or **Spec** position filled, where “or” is interpreted both disjunctively and non-disjunctively (Dimitrova-Vulchanova and Giusti 1998).

- In **Korean**, FPs with syntactic features are pronounced by having their **Spec** position filled by a **phrasal** category (Kim 2019).

- DEMs, RCs, and possessive determiners in Korean are all **phrasal** N modifiers that merge at a Spec position (Kim 2019).

- **Nominal structure** contains an **FP** that is concerned with **POV**. For convenience, I’ll call this FP **DP** here.

- In Korean, this FP must be **visible** by having its Spec position filled by a phrasal element such as a DEM, a possessor, an RC, and an NP.

- FP hosting **[uPOV-ext]** can only be pronounced by a **DEM** in Korean.
(21) Position of **POV-ops** in clausal structure of Korean:

\[
\text{SAP [SentienceP [attitude holder] [TopP POV-op TopP FocP POV-op FocP TP POV-op TP ]]]]]\]

- Here, *sap* and *SentienceP* respectively represent the **Speech Act Phrase** and **Sentience Phrase** in the sense of Speas and Tenny (2003); *sap* governs illocutionary force. *SentenceP* (comparable to Cinque’s (1999) *EvalP*) determines from whose *POV* the propositional content of the utterance at hand will be evaluated.

- *TopP* here is comparable, but may not be identical, to the higher *TopP* in Rizzian structure (Rizzi 1997: 297, (41)).

- I do not equate the two because, unlike Rizzi’s (1997) *TopP*, what I call *TopP* never hosts contrastive topics (more on this later).
Quick application to some data

Context: Speaker owns a convenience store.

(1) Kakey an-uro etten namca-ka tulleo-ass-ta.
    store inside-to some man-NOM come.in-PST-DECL
‘A man came into the store.’

?((Ku) nameca-nun kapang-ul tul-ko iss-ess-ta.
    that man-TOP bag-ACC carry-CONN AUX-PST-DECL
Intended: ‘The man was carrying a bag.’

(22) Licensing of the POV-features of the continuing topic in (1):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{sap} & \quad \text{SentenceP} \quad \text{[speaker]} \quad \text{TopP} \quad \text{[POV-op-exi]} \quad \text{TopP} \quad \text{[DP} \quad [\text{uPOV-exi}]] \quad \text{ku nameca-nun} \quad \text{[TP} \quad \text{[VP [VP ]]]]}
\end{align*}
\]

- Nominal internal structure:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[DP} \quad \text{DemP} \quad \text{ku]} \quad \text{[D} \quad \text{[uPOV-exi]} \quad \text{]} \quad \text{[NP nameca]}]
\end{align*}
\]
Quick application to some data cont’d

(20) Emma-ka oul __ kwaca-lul mantul-e cwu-si-ess-ta.
    mom-NOM today pro cookie-ACC make-CONN give-HON-PST-DECL

    ‘Mom baked me/us cookies today.’

(??Ku) kwaca-ka cengmal masiss-ess-ta.
    that cookie-NOM really be.delicious-PST-DECL

Intended: ‘The cookies were really delicious.’

(23) Licensing of the POV-features of the anaphoric nominal in (20):

[sap [SentenceP [speaker] [TP [NP kwaca-ka] [T’ [T [PredP [AP cengmal masissessta]]]]]]]

- With no POV feature licenser inherently present in the structure, the subject surfaces as a bare NP, not as a DP. This captures the sort of “intensional” interpretation of this nominal.
Quick application to some data cont’d

(24) Emma-ka *ou* __ kwaca-lul mantul-e cwu-si-ess-ta.
    mom-NOM today pro cookie-ACC make-CONN give-HON-PST-DECL
    ‘Mom baked me/us cookies today.’

Na-nun (ku) kwaca-ka cengmal masiss-ess-ta.
I-NOM that cookie-NOM really be.delicious-PST-DECL

Intended: ‘The cookies were really delicious to me.’

(25) Licensing of the POV-features of the anaphoric nominal in (24):

```
[ sap [SentenceP [speaker] [TopP [POV-op] [TopP [DP na-nun] [TP [DP [POV] (ku) kwaca-ka]]]] ... ]]]]
```

- Crucial difference between (20) and (24): (24) has an **overt continuing topic** which c-commands the anaphoric subject DP of the AP.
- So, the subject nominal may surface as a DP, **optionally** modified by a DEM, depending on whether the POV-op at Spec,TopP is situation *-internal* or *external*. 
Resorting to an output filter

- Two relevant constraints proposed in recent literature:

(26)  
\[
\text{Index!} \\
\text{Represent and bind all possible indices.}
\]  
(Jenks 2018: 524, (50))

(27)  
\[
\text{Don’t Overdetermine!} \\
\text{Block } \beta \text{ if} \\
\exists \alpha: \alpha \in \text{ALT}(\beta) \land \forall P < \beta \lambda wP.([[\beta]]^{D,g}) \subseteq \lambda wP.([[\alpha]]^{D,g})
\]  
(Ahn 2019: 73, (90))
Need to make some amendments

- *Index!* and *Don’t Overdetermine!* are at odds with each other, so if we apply both of them to Korean without ranking them relative to each other, then:

  depending on which of the two principles they comply with, anaphoric definites will surface either DEM marked or as bare, but the two types of definite forms will occur in essentially random distribution.

- **BUT:**
  - We cannot rank *Index!* above *Don’t Overdetermine!* for Korean because there are contexts where only bare nominals may be used to mark anaphoric definites (e.g., (20)).
  - We cannot rank *Don’t Overdetermine!* over *Index!* either because doing so will wrongly predict that almost all anaphoric definites in Korean are bare nominals.
My proposal

- Universal Grammar (UG) consists of both a derivational mechanism and an output filter, and the output filter consists of violable constraints whose relative rankings vary depending on the language (or the speaker).

- The output filter governing the way anaphoric definites in human language are pronounced contains *Index!* and *Don’t Overdetermiate*.

- But it also contains the following violable constraints:

  (28) *Index Continuing Topics!* *(INDEXCONTTOP)*
  Represent and bind all possible indices on a continuing topic.

  (29) *Use Bare Nouns as Quasi-names!* *(USEBNAMES)*
  Use bare nouns as quasi-names as much as the language at hand allows.

  (30) *Mark External Point of View!* *(MARKPOV-EXT)*
  Morpho-syntactically mark a POV-external feature on a nominal.
In Korean, the constraints relevant for our purposes are ranked as follows:

- **INDEXCONTOP**, **USEBnNAMES**, and **MARKPOV-EXT** are not ranked relative to each other, but all of them outrank both **Index!** and **Don’t Overdetermine!**.

- Between **Index!** and **Don’t Overdetermine!**, the former outranks the latter.

(31) **Ranking between the relevant constraints**

\[ \{\text{INDEXCONTOP, USEBnNAMES, MARKPOV-EXT}\} \gg \text{Index!} \gg \text{Don’t Overdetermine!} \]
How this analysis accounts for the facts

- **Continuing topics** may occur as bare if they occur as quasi-names in narrative contexts, but even in such contexts, all else being equal, a DEM marked form is preferred because of the workings of `INDEXCONTOP` and `MARKPOV-Ext`.

- **Non-topic** anaphoric nominals may be in bare forms more frequently than topics because they are not subject to `INDEXCONTOP`, and `USEBNAMES`, and `MARKPOV-Ext` both outrank `Index!`. But `Index!` still outranks `Don’t Overdetermine!`, so they occur more often modified by a DEM than not.

- Anaphoric **subjects** of **adjectival** sentences occur in BN forms unless they are under the scope of an overt TopP or an overt FocP in the absence of a vP or a VP in the clausal structure.
What about the data involving contrastive topics?

**The puzzle:** Unlike the case with data like (1), when there are two topics being contrasted with each other, using a DEM to mark an anaphoric nominal is judged ungrammatical or marginal.

Context: Speaker owns a convenience store.

    store inside-to some man-and some woman-NOM come.in-PST-DECL

    ‘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-CONN AUX-PST-CONN

(??ku)_yeca-nun wusan-ul tul-ko iss-ess-ta.
that woman-TOP umbrella-ACC carry-CONN AUX-PST-DECL

Intended: ‘The man was carrying a bag and the woman was carrying an umbrella.’
Why the contrast between data like (1) and (32)?

- **My answer:** In (32), the **POV-ops** the TopPs host are “indexed” to the **same** attitude holder since both sap and SentienceP are always higher than a TopP.

- So, the sentence has the following indexation template:

  \[(33) \left[ \text{sap} \left[ \text{SentienceP} [\text{speaker}]_1 \right] \left[ \text{CP}_1 \ldots \left[ \text{TopP}[\text{NP}]_1 \ldots \text{VP} \right] \right] \text{ and } \left[ \text{CP}_2 \left[ \text{TopP}[\text{NP}]_1 \ldots \text{VP} \right] \right] \right] \]

- Given this, ascribing a **property** \( P \) to an individual bearing POV index 1 and then ascribing a **property** \( Q \), which differs from \( P \), to an individual bearing the same index, induces some sort of contradiction, as given in (34).

  \[(34) P([\text{NP}_1]) \land \neg P([\text{NP}_1]) \]

- (Alternatively, we can assume that contrastive TopP does **not** host a POV-op.)
Argument for this analysis

Unlike in (32), DEM marking on the anaphoric nominals in (35) is possible because something like (36) holds.

(36) $P([\{NP_1\}]) \land P([\{NP_1\}])$

But because stating just this will be redundant, using the additive focus particle -to ‘also’ on the second anaphoric nominal is necessary.
Summary and conclusion

The question we started with:
In encoding anaphoric definiteness in Korean, **exactly when** is a bare noun form chosen over a DEM-modified nominal or vice versa?

My answer:
The choice results from an interplay of several factors. But using a **bare** form usually means the attitude holder is taking a **situation-internal** POV, and using a **DEM** means they are taking a **situation-external** POV.

Why so many factors play a role?
That’s because **cross-sentential anaphora** involves introducing a new discourse referent into the discourse, establishing it in the common ground, and then making sure its reference is **trackable**. In addition, there is **more than one** POV in telling a story which may correlate with the purpose of the discourse, etc.
Where does Korean fit in the typological picture?

- **My answer:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of definite use</th>
<th>German</th>
<th>Mandarin/Shan/Korean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immediate situation use</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Bare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger situation use</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Bare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaphoric use</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Bare/DEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridging: Product-Producer</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Bare/DEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridging: Part-Whole</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Bare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donkey anaphora</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Bare/DEM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- But the present analysis has shown that the choice between a bare noun and a DEM is **not** random in Korean.

- Given this, the **question** for the future is: Is that also the case in languages like Mandarin and Shan?
Extension to other languages

- Japanese also permits both bare and DEM marked anaphoric definites (e.g., Nemoto 2015), but from what I have learned, in Japanese, DEM marking is (almost) always required for NOM-marked subjects, but not for continuing topics, unlike the case in Korean.

- Even so, contrastive topics in Japanese are never DEM marked in environments like (32).

- Given this, we may capture the Japanese facts by assuming that UG also contains a violable constraint Index Subject! and in Japanese, this constraint is ranked higher than other relevant constraints including Index Continuing Topics!
Implications for nominal structure/typology

Jenks 2018:

- Mandarin **unique definites** are projections of **NP** which come with the ordinary iota operator $\iota$.
- Mandarin **anaphoric definites** in the form of **Dem-Clf-Ns** are projections of **DP** which come with $\iota^x$ in the sense of Schwarz (2009); it takes an index as its argument.

(36) a. Unique definite

```
  NP₁
   \---\-
      \-\-
       ives
        NP₂
```

b. Anaphoric Definite

```
  Pred(1)
   \---\-
      \-\-
       D
        \-\-
         zhe
          \-\-
           s'
             \-\-
              ClfP
                \-\-
                   ge
                     \-\-
                      NP
                        \-\-
                          xuesheng
```
My analysis for Korean type languages

(37) a. Truly bare nominal (e.g., (20))

b. Bare anaphoric definite (e.g., (24))

c. DEM-modified anaphoric definite (e.g., (24))
Implications for nominal structure/typology cont’d

- If correct, the present analysis suggests that even in article-less languages, some definite nominals have a structure that is **larger than an NP**, and while some bare nominals are truly bare, some are not; they contain an **FP** of some kind.

- This raises the question of how the **syntax-semantics mapping** may be done in interpreting various types of anaphoric definites in article-less languages.

- It also implicates that every language has **more than one** type of nominal structure, and the “**left periphery**” of some nominals may be as elaborate as the left periphery of clausal structure, possibly containing what Ritter and Wiltschko (2019) call **Speech Act structure**.
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