

Bare vs. Demonstrative Anaphoric Definites in Korean and Their Cross- linguistic Implications

MIN-JOO KIM

Texas Tech University

EUNHEE LEE

University at Buffalo

1 Introduction

This paper aims to provide a new perspective on the typology of anaphoric definiteness marking—an actively debated topic in recent semantics literature—by presenting data from Korean.

Japanese/Korean Linguistics 30

Edited by Sara Williamson, Adeola Aminat Babayode-Lawal, Laurens Bosman,
Nicole Chan, Sylvia Cho, Ivan Fong, and Kaye Holubowsky.

Copyright © 2023, CSLI Publications.

English collapses *unique/weak* definites and *anaphoric/familiar/strong* definites by using the same definite article *the*, as exemplified in (1).

- (1) a. **The moon** has risen. (unique)
b. John bought a book. **The book** was expensive. (anaphoric)

In other languages, the two types of definites may be morphosyntactically distinguished by using strong definite articles or demonstratives (Dems) (e.g., German, Lakhota, Hausa, Icelandic) (Schwarz 2013 and references there).

Recent work on article-less languages has expanded the study of anaphoric definiteness marking across languages (e.g., Jenks 2018; Ahn 2019; Kang 2021; Moroney 2021; Park 2022; Simpson and Wu 2022; Dayal and Jiang 2023). The prevailing view is that, apart from occurring as unique/weak definites, bare nouns can occur in all anaphoric/familiar/strong definite environments. However, consensus is yet to be reached as to exactly when anaphoric bare nouns may be used, as opposed to Dem-modified NPs (Dem-NPs for short).

In this paper, we discuss the source of debate surrounding anaphoric definiteness marking in bare noun languages, identifying an outstanding problem. After this, we present a new analysis based on Mandarin Chinese (Mandarin) and Korean facts, showing that the choice between an anaphoric bare noun and a Dem-NP in article-less languages is not a matter of optionality or preference, contra authors like Ahn (2019), Park (2022), Simpson and Wu (2022), and Dayal and Jiang (2023). We suggest that, typically, bare nouns indicate what Kim (2021b) calls *situation-internal viewpoint* and Dem-NPs indicate what she calls *situation-external viewpoint*, but we propose more refined licensing conditions for anaphoric bare nouns and Dem-NPs than Kim does. In addition, we offer formal semantic treatments of anaphoric bare nouns and Dem-NPs in Korean, with implications for other (bare noun) languages (compare Kim to appear).

2 Source of the Debate and an Outstanding Problem

Jenks (2018) claims that in article-less, classifier languages like Mandarin, Japanese, and Korean (M/J/K), bare nouns function as unique/weak definites and Dem-NPs function as anaphoric/familiar/strong definites.

To illustrate, according to Jenks, in (2), a two-sentence narrative in Mandarin taken from his (15a,b), the Dem plus classifier sequence cannot be omitted from the second sentence because the definite individual at issue is an anaphoric definite.

- (2) a. Jiaoshi li zuo zhe yi ge nansheng he
 classroom inside sit PROG one CLF boy and
 yi ge nüsheng.
 one CLF girl
 ‘There are a boy and a girl sitting in the classroom.’
- b. Wo zuotian yudao #(na ge) nansheng.
 I yesterday meet that CLF boy
 ‘I met the boy yesterday.’

To capture the distribution of the two types of definites, Jenks (2018: (22)) offers what is given in (3) as the semantics of the iota operators that contribute definite meanings to bare nouns in M/J/K-type languages. Here and below, s_r represents a *resource situation* that serves as the domain restriction on the (null) definite article (Schwarz 2009; Jenks 2018).

- (3) a. Unique definite article: $[[\iota]] = \lambda s_r \lambda P: \exists! x[P(x)(s_r)]. \iota x[P(x)(s_r)]$
 b. Anaphoric definite article: $[[\iota^*]] = \lambda s_r \lambda P \lambda Q: \exists! x[P(x)(s_r) \& Q(x)]. \iota x[P(x)(s_r)]$

Additionally, to explain why ι does not occur in anaphoric environments, Jenks (2018: 524) proposes a principle called *Index!*, which says ‘Represent and bind all possible indices’.

Index! predicts that even in bare noun languages, only Dem-NPs will be able to mark anaphoric definiteness. However, the Mandarin data in (4) show that anaphoric bare nouns can occur in subject positions, posing a challenge to *Index!*.

- (4) a. Jiaoshi li zuo zhe yi ge nansheng he
 classroom inside sit PROG one CLF boy and
 yi ge nüsheng.
 one CLF girl
 ‘There are a boy and a girl sitting in the classroom.’
- b. (Na ge) nansheng kanqilai you er-shi sui zuoyou.
 that CLF boy look have two-ten year or so
 ‘The boy looks twenty-years old or so.’

(Jenks 2018: (15a,d))

To explain such ‘exceptional’ cases, Jenks (2018) appeals to the pragmatic notion of *topic-hood*. The idea is that the subject position of a sentence overrides *Index!* because subjects are ‘salient members of the question under discussion (QUD)’ (p. 525), thus introducing an index of their own.

Subsequent work such as Simpson and Wu 2022 and Dayal and Jiang 2023 has shown, however, that Mandarin bare nouns can occur not only in subject but also in non-subject positions, encoding anaphoric definiteness. This is exemplified in (5).

- (5) a. Jiaoshi li zuo zhe yi ge nansheng he
 classroom inside sit PROG one CLF boy and
 yi ge nüsheng.
 one CLF girl
 ‘A boy and a girl are sitting in the classroom.’
 b. **Nüsheng** zuo zai **nansheng** pangbian.
 girl sit DUR boy side
 ‘The girl is sitting next to the boy.’
 (Dayal and Jiang 2023: (11a,b))

Based on such observations, Dayal and Jiang (2023) claim that Jenks’ *Index!*, which leads to categorical distinctions in (un)acceptability, is not the right tool to explain the relevant data. More concretely, they assert that anaphoric bare nouns and Dem-NPs are *not* in complementary distribution, and the choice between them is a matter of ‘preference’. In addition, they suggest that the relation between the initial situation s and a subsequent situation s' determines the preference (p. 161).

As an alternative to Jenks’ analysis, Dayal and Jiang argue that Mandarin Dems are plain demonstratives whose semantics is no different from English demonstratives’, as given in (6a), and that the iota operator ι can be ambiguous between a strong definite article and a weak definite article, as given in (6b) and (6c).

- (6) a. $\llbracket \text{Dem} \rrbracket = \lambda s \lambda P: \exists s' s \leq s' |P_{s'}| > 1. \iota x [P_s(x) \ \& \ x = y]$
 b. $\llbracket \text{the}_{\text{STRONG}} \rrbracket / \llbracket \iota \rrbracket = \lambda s \lambda P: |P_s \cap \lambda x [x = y]| = 1. \iota x [P_s(x) \ \& \ x = y]$
 c. $\llbracket \text{the}_{\text{WEAK}} \rrbracket / \llbracket \iota \rrbracket = \lambda s \lambda P: |P_s| = 1. \iota x [P_s(x)]$
 (adapted from Dayal and Jiang 2023: (19))

According to Dayal and Jiang, in Mandarin-type languages, a Dem-NP is used instead of an anaphoric bare noun when it is presupposed that the situation under description, i.e., s , has an expanded situation s' such that there is more than one individual with the same property P denoted by the NP in s' . In addition, they explain the contrast between (2) and (5) as follows: In (5), anaphoric bare nouns are used because the situation described by (5a) is defined by two individuals, and the same two individuals define the situation in (5b). In contrast, the individuals in (2a) are a proper part of the individuals in (2b), so a Dem-marking is preferred in (2b).

Dayal and Jiang’s analysis improves Jenks’ analysis in certain respects. But under their analysis, some empirical facts do not receive proper treatments.

First, their anti-uniqueness presupposition of [[Dem]] given in (6a), between the colon and the dot, is not satisfied in (2b) (there is only one boy in the discourse context), and yet the Dem is necessary or strongly preferred.

Second, anaphoric bare nouns can occur even when the initial context is expanded to include additional participants, as shown in (7).

- (7) a. Jiaoshi li zuo zhe yi ge nanhai he
 classroom inside sit PROG one CLF boy and
 yi ge nühai.
 one CLF girl
 ‘A boy and a girl were sitting in the classroom.’
- b. Turan yi ge xiaohai pao jin jiaoshi jiao
 suddenly one CLF kid run in classroom ask
nanhai gen ta chuqu.
 boy with him go.out
 ‘Suddenly, a kid ran into the classroom and asked the boy to go out with him.’

(Dayal and Jiang 2023: (26a,b))

Dayal and Jiang state that (7a) is ‘minimally’ expanded in (7b) via a ‘controlled’ introduction of an individual (p. 163). They do not explain, however, in what sense (7b) is a minimal and controlled expansion of (7a) and (2b) is *not* a minimal and controlled expansion of (2a).

Notably, the facts are parallel in Korean, as shown in (8)-(9) (Kim 2022). Given this, the pattern we see in Mandarin cannot be language-specific, and the question is: When are anaphoric bare nouns licensed in M/J/K-type languages?

- (8) a. Kyosil an-ey sonyen han-myeng-kwa
 classroom inside-LOC boy one-CLF-and
 sonye han-myeng-i ancaissta.
 girl one-CLF-NOM are.sitting
 ‘A boy and a girl are sitting in a/the classroom.’
- b. **Sonye-ka sonyen** yep-ey ancaissta.
 girl-NOM boy side-LOC are.sitting
 ‘The girl is sitting next to the boy.’

- (9) a. Kyosil an-ey sonyen han-myeng-kwa
classroom inside-LOC boy one-CLF-and
sonye han-myeng-i ancaissta.
girl one-CLF-NOM are.sitting
‘A boy and a girl are sitting in a/the classroom.’
b. Na-nun ecey **#(ku)** **sonyen-ul** mannassta.
I-TOP yesterday that boy-ACC met
‘I met the boy yesterday.’

3 A New Perspective and a New Analysis

In this section, drawing on previous research, as well as by adding some new observations, we identify in what contexts anaphoric bare nouns occur in Korean, as opposed to Dem-NPs. After this, we propose new semantics for anaphoric bare nouns and Dem-NPs. This will be followed by demonstrating how the proposed analysis captures some of the Korean and Mandarin facts in ways that improve existing analyses like Jenks 2018 and Dayal and Jiang 2023. We end this section by briefly discussing how our analysis captures so-called *anti-uniqueness effects* (Wolter 2006; Simonenko 2014) *without* making commitments that all occurrences of Dem-NPs in human language come with such a presupposition (compare Dayal and Jiang 2023). In this context, we also discuss some English data, along with Korean data.

3.1 When Are Anaphoric Bare Nouns Licensed in Korean?

As observed by authors like Kim (2021a,b) and Simpson and Wu (2022), in Korean, anaphoric bare nouns occur when the same spatiotemporal location is maintained in the narrative sequence, e.g., (8) and (10), and Dem-NPs occur when there is a *shift* in the spatiotemporal location, e.g., (9) and (11).

- (10) a. Ecey kay han mali-lul pwassta.
yesterday dog one CLF-ACC saw
‘Yesterday I saw a dog.’
b. **(?Ku)** **kay-ka** kwiyeuessta.
that dog-NOM was.cute
‘The dog was cute.’
- (11) a. Ecey kay han mali-lul pwassta.
yesterday dog one CLF-ACC saw
‘Yesterday I saw a dog.’
b. Onul **#(ku)** **kay-ka** cip-ey wassta.
today that dog-NOM house-to came
‘Today the/that dog came to my house.’

However, as Kim (2021b) notes, this is *not* a sufficient condition for licensing anaphoric bare nouns in Korean: Even if the same spatiotemporal location is maintained, an anaphoric bare noun may not be licensed if its referent is not the only *x* that has *P* in *s*. This can be seen by comparing (12) and (13): In (13), there is more than one *x* that has *P* in *s*, and a Dem is necessary.

- (12) a. Ecey nolay.calang-eyse yeca.ai namca.ai
 yesterday singing.contest-LOC girl boy
 kuliko elun han-myeng-ul pwassta.
 and adult one-CLF-ACC saw
 ‘Yesterday, in a singing contest, I saw a girl, a boy, and a grown-up person.’
 b. **(Ku) yeca.ai-ka** nolay-lul kacang cal hayssta.
 that girl-NOM singing-ACC most well did
 ‘The/that girl sang the best among them.’

- (13) a. Ecey thipi chwukkwu cwungkey-eyse
 yesterday television soccer broadcasting-LOC
 Son Ho-Min-ul pwassta.
 Ho-Min Son-ACC saw
 ‘Yesterday, on the soccer broadcast, I saw Ho-Min Son.’
 b. **#(Ku) senswu-ka** mom-nollim-i kacang ppallassta.
 that player-NOM body-movement-NOM most was.quick
 ‘That player exhibited the fastest performance of all.’
 (Kim 2021b: (34))

In addition, we should note that an anaphoric bare noun may be licensed even if the same spatiotemporal location is *not* maintained across the sentences if its referent is *familiar* to the *speaker* at the *text level* or if it acts like a *text-internally licensed quasi-name* (Kim 2021a,b). Such cases are exemplified in (14) and (15).

- (14) a. Cinancwu-ey kangaci han mali-lul ipyanghayssta.
 last.week-LOC puppy one CLF-ACC adopted
 ‘Last week I adopted a puppy.’
 b. Onul **kangaci-ka** salaciessta.
 today puppy-NOM disappeared
 ‘Today the puppy disappeared.’
 (Kim to appear: (23))

- (15) a. Yes-nal enu swup-sok-ey thokki han mali-ka
 old-day some forest-inside-LOC rabbit one CLF-NOM
 sal-ko issesseyo.
 live-CONN existed
 ‘Once upon a time, in some forest, there lived a rabbit.’
- b. Enunal **thokki-nun** chinkwu cip-ey nolle
 one.day rabbit-TOP friend house-LOC play.CONN
 kasseyo.
 went
 ‘One day the rabbit went to a friend’s house to play.’

Based on these facts, we propose that in Korean, an anaphoric bare noun is used (i) when its referent is uniquely identifiable at the *situation level* or (ii) when its referent is uniquely identifiable at the *text level*. In the former cases, the perspective holder is an *event participant* of the situation in which the antecedent of the anaphoric definite is found; in the latter cases, the perspective holder is the *speaker/narrator*. As to the occurrence of an anaphoric Dem-NP, we submit that it is used when its referent bears a *discourse salient relation* to the perspective holder at the *cross-sentential level*.

3.2 Semantics of Anaphoric Bare Nouns and Anaphoric Dem-NPs

To provide a new formal semantic analysis of anaphoric bare nouns and anaphoric Dem-NPs in Korean-type languages, we make the following assumptions: First, anaphoric definites in Korean are individual-denoting. That is, they are of type *e*. Second, the existence and uniqueness presuppositions of anaphoric definites hold in what Schwarz (2009) and Jenks (2018) call a *resource situation* s_r . Third, anaphoric definites have antecedents in what Kim (to appear) calls a *source situation* s_s .

On these assumptions, we propose that an anaphoric bare noun in Korean is licensed in s_r when its referent is *familiar as P* to the perspective holder y of s_s in s_r and it is the *only x* that has *P* in s_r and that an anaphoric Dem-NP is licensed in s_r when its referent bears a *discourse salient relation R* to y in both s_s and s_r and it is the *only x* that has *P* in s_r , and bears *R* to y in both s_s and s_r (compare Kim to appear).

These ideas are more formally represented in (16) and (17), where F represents the phonologically null functional category that selects for an anaphoric bare noun (F_N) or an anaphoric Dem-NP (F_{Dem}) in Korean-type languages.¹ Below, presuppositions occur between the colon and the dot; numerals indicate indices; g indicates the assignment function; \subseteq indicates a

¹ F may be equated with what is referred to as *Index* in recent generative literature (e.g., Jenks 2018; Hanink 2018; Ahn 2019; Kim to appear), but we leave this issue open for now.

part-whole relation between individuals and situations; and the values of s_r and s_s are assumed to be contextually determined.

$$(16) \llbracket F_{N1} \rrbracket^g = \lambda P: \exists!x[P(x)(s_r) \ \& \ \exists y \subseteq s_s[\text{Familiar-as-}P(x)(y)(s_r)]] \\ \iota x[P(x)(s_r) \ \& \ \exists y \subseteq s_s[\text{Familiar-as-}P(x)(y)(s_r) \ \& \ x = g(1)]]$$

$$(17) \llbracket F_{Dem1} \rrbracket^g = \lambda P: \exists!x[P(x)(s_r) \ \& \ R(x)(y)(s_s)]. \\ \iota x[P(x)(s_r) \ \& \ R(x)(y)(s_r) \ \& \ x = g(1)]$$

Notably, in (16), y is bound, and it is also part of s_s . Hence, using an anaphoric bare noun requires maintaining the *same* perspective between s_s and s_r *unless* it is overridden at the text level. On the other hand, in (17), y is free, and R holds both in s_s and s_r . Hence, using an anaphoric Dem-NP may indicate a *perspectival shift* or taking a *situation-external perspective* in s_r , as suggested by authors like Simpson and Wu (2022) and Kim (2021a,b).

3.3 Explaining the Facts

When we apply the proposed analysis to the anaphoric definites in (10b) and (11b), we obtain what is given in (18a) and (18b) as two possibilities for their form and meaning.

$$(18) \text{ a. } \llbracket \mathbf{kay}_i \rrbracket^g = \iota x[\text{dog}(x)(s_r) \ \& \ \exists y \subseteq s_s[\text{Familiar-as-dog}(x)(y)(s_r) \ \& \\ x = g(1)]] \\ \text{ b. } \llbracket \mathbf{ku}_i \ \mathbf{kay} \rrbracket^g = \iota x[\text{dog}(x)(s_r) \ \& \ R(x)(y)(s_r) \ \& \ x = g(1)]$$

In the case of (10b), an anaphoric bare noun is used because the presupposition of (18a) is satisfied. That is, there is exactly one x such that x is a dog in s_r and for some y that is an event participant of s_s , x is familiar as a dog to y in s_r . In this discourse, the event participant y that functions as the perspective holder can ‘access’ the dog x which is in s_r when y itself is in s_s because s_s and s_r share the spatiotemporal location, so are part of the same larger situation. Consequently, the viewpoint in narrating the story can stay *within* the *same* situation, and this gives rise to an impression that the speaker is taking a *situation-internal perspective* in the sense of Kim (2021b). For these reasons, using an anaphoric Dem-NP in (10b) would be judged less felicitous by Korean speakers. However, if the larger discourse context satisfies the presupposition of (18b), i.e., if it turns out that the dog at issue bears a discourse salient relation to the perspective holder at the cross-sentential level, then using a Dem-NP will be fine.

In the case of (11b), we obtain what appears to be the opposite picture of (10b). Here, a bare noun is not used because s_s and s_r do not share the

spatiotemporal location, and as a result, the dog in s_r cannot be familiar as a dog to the event participant y which is in s_s . Using a Dem-NP is fine, though, because the presupposition of (18b) is satisfied. That is, there is exactly one x such that x is a dog in s_r and x bears a discourse salient relation R to the perspective holder y in s_s . Consequently, a Korean speaker may intuit that a *situation-external perspective* in the sense of Kim (2021b) is taken in narrating the story.

When we apply the proposed analysis to the anaphoric bare nouns in (8b), we obtain (19a) and (19b) as their semantics. And this explains why in this discourse, anaphoric bare nouns are used. The reason is that here too, s_s and s_r share the spatiotemporal location, so the presuppositions of (19a) and (19b) are satisfied: The girl and the boy who are in s_r are uniquely familiar as a girl/boy to an event participant y which is in s_s because s_s and s_r are part of the same larger situation due to their spatiotemporal location sharing. Relatedly, in this discourse, a situation-internal perspective is taken in narrating the story, and doing so does not create a situating-internal identifiability issue in referring to the anaphoric definites' intended referents. Finally, there is no pragmatically felicitous reason to take a situation-external perspective in narrating the story. Hence, in this two-sentence narrative, using anaphoric bare nouns is not only licensed but also necessary.

- (19) a. $[[\text{sonye}_1]]^g = \iota x[\text{girl}(x)(s_r) \ \& \ \exists y \subseteq s_s[\text{Familiar-as-girl}(x)(y)(s_r) \ \& \ x = g(1)]]$
 b. $[[\text{sonyen}_2]]^g = \iota x[\text{boy}(x)(s_r) \ \& \ \exists y \subseteq s_s[\text{Familiar-as-boy}(x)(y)(s_r) \ \& \ x = g(2)]]$

We can apply essentially the same logic to the Mandarin data in (4), (5), and (7), and account for the occurrences of the anaphoric bare nouns in their second sentences: What licenses bare nouns in such data is that the sentences forming the narrative sequences share the spatiotemporal location and the speaker has no intention to take a situation-external perspective in narrating the story as doing so is not needed for the purpose of the discourse at hand.

In contexts like (9), a Dem-NP is used for the same reason why it is used in (11b). Here, s_s and s_r do not share the spatiotemporal location, so the presupposition of (20a) is not satisfied. On the other hand, the presupposition of (20b) is satisfied. As a result, it may seem that in narrating the story, the speaker is taking a situation-external perspective in the sense of Kim (2021b).

- (20) a. $[[\text{sonyen}_1]]^g = \iota x[\text{boy}(x)(s_r) \ \& \ \exists y \subseteq s_s[\text{Familiar-as-boy}(x)(y)(s_r) \ \& \ x = g(1)]]$
 b. $[[\text{ku}_1 \ \text{sonyen}]]^g = \iota x[\text{boy}(x)(s_r) \ \& \ R(x)(y)(s_r) \ \& \ x = g(1)]$

Again, we can apply the same logic to (2) and explain the need for using an anaphoric Dem-NP in such Mandarin data. And this shows that our analysis improves both Jenks' (2018) and Dayal and Jiang's (2023) analyses in dealing with data like (2), (4), (5), and (7) *without* resorting to notions like topic-hood (compare Jenks 2018) or by defining situations based on the number of event participants (compare Dayal and Jiang 2023).

Since our analysis relies on spatiotemporal sharing between events in accounting for the distribution of anaphoric bare nouns, it may seem that we would have difficulty dealing with data like (14) and (15). However, our analysis can handle such cases as well. To take (14) for example, in our analysis, this discourse permits an anaphoric bare noun despite the spatiotemporal shift between the two sentences, because, in this discourse, the referent of the anaphoric definite is uniquely identifiable at the text level. That is, in this narrative sequence, the speaker is construed as the text-level perspective holder, so the presupposition of (21a) can be satisfied *beyond* s_r . That said, if the puppy at issue bears a discourse salient relation to the perspective holder and thus the presupposition of (21b) is satisfied, then a Dem-NP can be used, modulo the slightly different pragmatic meaning it conveys than using an anaphoric bare noun would.

- (21) a. $[[\text{kangaci}]^g]^g = \iota x[\text{puppy}(x)(s_r) \ \& \ \exists y \subseteq s_s[\text{Familiar-as-puppy}(x)(y)(s_r) \ \& \ x = g(1)]]$
 b. $[[\text{ku}_1 \text{kangaci}]^g]^g = \iota x[\text{puppy}(x)(s_r) \ \& \ R(x)(y)(s_r) \ \& \ x = g(1)]$

Turning now to accounting for the difference between data like (12) and (13): in (12b), an anaphoric bare noun can be used because s_s and s_r share the spatiotemporal location, so a situation-internal perspective can be taken, and the presupposition of (22a) is satisfied. In this discourse, a Dem-NP can be used, too, because the superlative meaning of the second sentence makes its referent bear a discourse salient relation R to the perspective holder not only in s_s but also in s_r , so the presupposition of (22b) is satisfied.

- (22) a. $[[\text{yecaai}]^g]^g = \iota x[\text{girl}(x)(s_r) \ \& \ \exists y \subseteq s_s[\text{Familiar-as-girl}(x)(y)(s_r) \ \& \ x = g(1)]]$
 b. $[[\text{ku}_1 \text{yecaai}]^g]^g = \iota x[\text{girl}(x)(s_r) \ \& \ R(x)(y)(s_r) \ \& \ x = g(1)]$

In contrast, in (13), even though s_s and s_r share the spatiotemporal location, an anaphoric bare noun does not occur because the uniqueness presupposition of (23a) is not met. That is, there is more than one x such that x is a player in s_r and x is familiar as a player to the perspective holder y in s_s . On the other hand, using a Dem-NP in (13) is fine because the presupposition of (23b) is

met. That is, there is just one x such that x is a player in s_r and x bears a discourse salient relation R to the perspective holder in s_s .

- (23) a. $[[\text{senswu}_1]]^g = \lambda x[\text{player}(x)(s_r) \ \& \ \exists y \subseteq s_s[\text{Familiar-as-player}(x)(y)(s_r) \ \& \ x = g(1)]]$
 b. $[[\text{ku}_1 \text{ senswu}]]^g = \lambda x[\text{player}(x)(s_r) \ \& \ R(x)(y)(s_r) \ \& \ x = g(1)]$

As mentioned above, our analysis captures so-called anti-uniqueness effects induced by Dems but without presupposing that there are other individuals with P in an extended situation of the current situation s , unlike what authors like Dayal and Jiang (2023) claim. To see this, consider (24) and (25), which show that when two individuals with the same property P are introduced into the discourse, one cannot use a weak definite to refer to them. That is, using a Dem-NP is obligatory regardless of whether the language used has a definite article (e.g., English) or not (e.g., Korean).

(24) A dog₁ barked. Another dog₂ barked, too. **That₂/#the₂ dog** bit me.

- (25) Kay₁-ka cicessta. Talun kay₂-to cicessta.
 dog-NOM barked different dog-also barked
 *(**Ku₂**) **kay-ka** na-lul mwulessta.
 that dog-NOM I-ACC bit
 ‘A dog₁ barked. Another dog₂ barked, too. That₂ dog bit me.’

Under our analysis, an anaphoric bare noun is not licensed in (25) because there is more than one x such that x is a dog in s_r , so the uniqueness presupposition of (26a) is not satisfied. In contrast, a Dem-NP is licensed because the presupposition of (26b) is satisfied. The same reasoning accounts for the use of the Dem *that*, as opposed to the definite article *the*, in (24). That said, (26b) does *not* come with an anti-uniqueness presupposition, and this lets us handle data like (2b)/(9b) and (11b), where an anti-uniqueness presupposition does not hold but using a Dem-NP is necessary, posing a challenge to analyses like Dayal and Jiang 2023.

- (26) a. $[[\text{kay}_2]]^g = \lambda x[\text{dog}(x)(s_r) \ \& \ \exists y \subseteq s_s[\text{Familiar-as-dog}(x)(y)(s_r) \ \& \ x = g(2)]]$
 b. $[[\text{ku}_2 \text{ kay}]]^g = \lambda x[\text{dog}(x)(s_r) \ \& \ R(x)(y)(s_r) \ \& \ x = g(2)]$

4 Conclusion

The present paper has sought to show that in Korean, the choice between an anaphoric bare noun and a Dem-NP is not a matter of optionality or

preference (compare Ahn 2019; Park 2022; Simpson and Wu 2022) and the same may hold for other bare noun languages (compare Moroney 2021; Simpson and Wu 2022; Dayal and Jiang 2023).

Under our analysis, what licenses an anaphoric bare noun in Korean-type languages is familiarity-based, situation- or text-internal unique identifiability of the intended referent in s_r , and what licenses an anaphoric Dem-NP is salience-based unique identifiability of the intended referent in s_r (compare Park 2022; Kim to appear).

We have also shown that anaphoric Dem-NPs do not come with anti-uniqueness presuppositions; anti-uniqueness effects associated with their use are likely to stem from other sources such as discourse structure (see also Kim to appear; compare Simonenko 2014; Dayal and Jiang 2023).

Another important point we have made in this paper is that in some contexts, an anaphoric bare noun and a Dem-NP may appear to occur in free variation, but the choice between them is not exactly ‘free’ because each expression carries different meanings (see also Kim 2021a,b, 2022, to appear).

If the present analysis is correct, then inter-speaker variation in anaphoric bare noun use in Korean-type languages may obtain because some speakers may construe its referent as uniquely identifiable at the situation level, but some may construe it as uniquely identifiable at the text level.

Yet another notable implication of the proposed analysis is that article-less languages may employ bare nouns to encode unique/weak definite meanings, as exemplified in (27), because situationally used unique definites have similar presuppositions to anaphoric bare nouns: Their referents are presupposed to be uniquely identifiable at the situation level or at the text level due to their *familiarity as P* to the relevant *perspective holder* in s_r .

(27) Onul **taythonglyeng-i** kicahoykyen-ul hanta.
 today president-NOM press.conference-ACC do
 ‘The President is having a press conference today.’

There are several issues we could not address in this paper. To single out just a few interrelated issues in the interest of space: as Kim (2021b, to appear) observes, in Korean, anaphoric marking on subjects varies depending on whether the anaphoric definite at issue bears the topic marker *nun* or the nominative marker *ilka*, and what type of topic or focus meaning it carries. On the other hand, in Japanese, there is a strong tendency for nominative (*ga*)-marked anaphoric definites to have a Dem and topic (*wa*)-marked ones to not (Kim 2022). That said, while Korean speakers prefer to use an anaphoric bare noun in contexts like (28), Japanese speakers prefer to use a Dem-NP in the corresponding environment, as shown in (29), even though, in both (28) and (29), the anaphoric definite at issue has a nominative-case marking.

Another notable difference between Japanese and Korean is that while the Japanese counterpart to (10b) has a topic-marked Dem-NP occurring in the subject position, as shown in (30), the Korean counterpart to (30) is judged less felicitous than (10), as shown in (31).²

- (28) a. Na-nun phathi-cyese etten chengnyen
 I-TOP party-LOC some young.man
 han myeng-ul mannassta.
 one CLF-ACC met
 ‘I met a young man at a/the party.’
 b. (?/#Ku) **chengnyen-i** maywu chincelhayssta.
 that young.man-NOM very was.kind
 Intended: ‘The young man was very kind.’
- (29) a. Watasi-wa paatii-de hitori no seinen-to deatta.
 I-TOP party-at one no young.man-with met
 ‘I met a young man at a/the party.’
 b. ??(Sono) **seinen-ga** totemo yasakiatta.
 that young.man-NOM very was.gentle
 Intended: ‘The young man was very gentle.’
- (30) a. Kinoo watasi-wa inu-o mimasita.
 yesterday I-TOP dog-ACC saw
 ‘Yesterday I saw a dog.’
 b. ??(Sono) **inu-wa** kawaikatta desu.
 that dog-TOP cute was
 Intended: ‘The/that dog was cute.’
- (31) a. Ecey kay han mali-lul pwassta.
 yesterday dog one CLF-ACC saw
 ‘Yesterday I saw a dog.’
 b. (?/#Ku) **kay-nun** kwiwewuessta.
 that dog-TOP was.cute
 Intended: ‘The/that dog was cute.’

We suspect that such (cross-linguistic) variation arises due in part to the semantics/pragmatics of the relevant discourse particles. However, we must leave further investigating these and other issues, such as the role that numeral classifiers play in definiteness meaning building in bare noun languages, to future research.

² We are grateful to the late Chisato Kitagawa and Asako Higurashi for providing the Japanese data given in (29) and (30) and discussing their acceptability with the first author.

References

- Ahn, D. 2019. THAT Thesis: A Competition Mechanism for Anaphoric Expressions. Doctoral dissertation, Harvard University.
- Dayal, V. and L. J. Jiang. 2023. The Puzzle of Anaphoric Bare Nouns in Mandarin: A Counterpoint to *Index!* *Linguistic Inquiry* 54(1): 147–167.
- Hanink, E. A. 2018. Structural Sources of Anaphora and Sameness. Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago.
- Jenks, P. 2018. Articulated Definiteness without Articles. *Linguistic Inquiry* 49: 501–536.
- Kang, A. 2021. Marking Definiteness in an Articleless Language: The Role of the Domain Restrictor KU in Korean. *Language and Linguistics* 22(2): 301–336.
- Kim, M.-J. 2021a. Apparent Optionality in Marking Anaphoric Definites in Korean. Paper presented at the Korean Linguistics in Crosslinguistic Context (KLCC) 2021. Department of Linguistics, Cornell University. June 4–6.
- Kim, M.-J. 2021b. Anaphoric Definiteness in Korean: Situation-Internal/-External Reference. Paper presented at the Korean Linguistics Workshop. Department of Linguistics, University at Buffalo. October 15.
- Kim, M.-J. 2022. Anaphoric Definiteness Marking in Article-less Languages. Paper presented at the 2022 Alumni College. Texas Tech University. October 19.
- Kim, M.-J. to appear. Anaphoric Definiteness Marking in Korean: Focusing on Subject Definites. *The Journal of East Asian Linguistics*.
- Moroney, M. 2021. Updating the Typology of Definiteness: Evidence from Bare Nouns in Shan. *Glossa: A Journal of General Linguistics* 6(1): 56. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5334/gjgl.1221>.
- Park, M.-K. 2022. On How to Use Anaphoric Definites in Korean. *Linguistic Research* 39(1): 25–54.
- Schwarz, F. 2009. Two Types of Definites in Natural Language. Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Schwarz, F. 2013. Two Kinds of Definites Cross-Linguistically. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 7: 534–559.
- Simonenko, A. 2014. Grammatical Ingredients of Definiteness. Doctoral dissertation, McGill University.
- Simpson, A. and Z. Wu. 2022. Constraints on the Representation of Anaphoric Definiteness in Mandarin Chinese: A Reassessment. In *New Explorations in Chinese Theoretical Syntax: Studies in Honor of Yen-Hui Audrey Li*, ed. Andrew Simpson, 301–330. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Wolter, L. K. 2006. That's That: The Semantics and Pragmatics of Demonstrative Noun Phrases. Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Santa Cruz.