

Point of View and the Behavior of Korean Demonstratives*

Min-Joo Kim

Texas Tech University

1. Introduction

Ever since Lakoff's (1974) seminal work, the fact that English demonstratives (DEMs) have so-called *affective* uses has been well established in the literature (see, a.o., Prince 1981, Wolter 2006, Liberman 2008, Potts & Schwarz 2010, Acton & Potts 2014). By way of illustration, in the sentences given in (1), *this* and *that* function as markers of solidarity in the sense of Lakoff (1974), indicating the speaker's desire to "involve the addressee more fully" (p. 347) and to "establish emotional closeness" with the addressee (p. 351).

- (1) a. There was **this** traveling salesman and he... (Lakoff 1974: (10))
b. How's **that** throat? (Lakoff 1974: (35))

According to Lakoff, such emotive uses of DEMs can be considered metaphorical extensions of the deictic meanings the lexemes have. That is, spatio-temporal proximity or distance is developed into cognitive proximity or distance. Since metaphor is presumably universal, the metaphorical aspect of affective uses of DEMs makes us wonder whether DEMs in all languages would exhibit a similar behavior to *this* and *that* in (1). Apart from this, authors like Potts and Schwarz (2010) have suggested that affectivity may be a universal property of DEMs although authors like Wolter (2006:85) would say otherwise.

Given this, the present paper looks at Korean DEMs from the vantage point of affectivity and shows that they lack certain affective functions. I account for this fact by invoking a set of binary features which I claim to constitute DEM meanings across languages. I also suggest that Korean

*First of all, I would like to thank Peggy Speas for her pioneering work in various areas in theoretical syntax, in particular her work on point of view and evidentiality, which has been an inspiring source for my recent work in related areas. Secondly, I'd like to thank Duk-Ho An, Hee-Rahk Chae, Heejeong Ko, and Sung-Won Lee for the grammaticality judgments on some of the Korean data presented here, and Angela Carpenter, Kyle B. Johnson, Keir Moulton, and Anne-Michelle Tessier for their assistance with and discussion on some of the English data included here. Finally, thanks are due to an anonymous reviewer for the helpful feedback. Needless to say, I am solely responsible for any remaining inadequacies.

and English proximal DEMs are subject to different licensing conditions and this is due in part to how readily they can take on diverse points of view during a conversation.

This paper is organized as follows: In section 2, I first introduce two puzzles presented by Korean DEMs which this paper seeks to solve. Section 3 presents a parameter-based analysis of DEMs and demonstrates how this analysis may account for the relevant data. Section 4 summarizes and concludes the paper, outlining some of the predictions and implications of the proposed analysis.

2. Two puzzles presented by Korean DEMs

Korean DEMs instantiate a *person-oriented system* in the sense of Anderson and Keenan (1985:280-288) in a manner similar to English but while English has just proximal and distal DEMs (i.e., *this/these* vs. *that/those*), Korean makes a three-way distinction for deictic DEMs, as outlined in (2).

(2) *DEMs in Korean:*

- a. *i* ‘this’: the proximal form; refers to an entity that is perceived to be proximal to the speaker (S).
- b. *ku* ‘that’: the neutral form; refers to an entity that is perceived to be distal from S but is proximal to the hearer (H).
- c. *ce* ‘that over there’: the distal form; refers to an entity that is perceived to be distal from both S and H.

(adapted from Sohn 1999:210)

About the three DEMs in Korean, the first thing to note is that *ce* never occurs anaphorically whereas both *i* can *ku* can. To see this, consider (3).¹ In this discourse, the bold-faced DP refers to an entity that was introduced in the preceding utterance and depending on how S perceives the problems at hand (e.g., whether she feels cognitively close to them or not), either *i* or *ku* may be used but *ce* cannot be.

- (3)
- | | | | | |
|----------|---------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|
| Minho-ka | na-eykey | myechkaci | mwunceycem-tul-ul _i | cicekhaycwu-ess-ta. |
| M.-Nom | I-Dat | several | problem-Pl-Acc | point.out-Pst-Decl |
| Kurentey | na-nun | i/ku/*ce_i | mwunceycem-tul-ul | |
| But | I-Top | this/that/that | problem-Pl-Acc | |
| ettehkey | haykeyl-hayyahal-ci | cal | morukess-ta. | |
| how | solve-must-Comp | well | not.know-Decl | |
- ‘Minho has pointed out several problems to me. But I don’t know how to solve **these/those** problems.’

¹ In transcribing the Korean data presented here, Yale Romanization (Martin 1992) has been adopted and the following abbreviations are used:

Acc: accusative; Adn: adnominal marker; Assr: assertive; Aux: auxiliary; Cl: classifier; Conn: connective; Cop: copula; Dat: dative; Decl: declarative sentence ending; Gen: genitive; Hon: honorific; Infrm: informal style; Imprf: imperfective; Loc: Locative; Nom: nominative; Nml: nominalizer; Pl: plural; Prm: promissive; Pst: past; Q: question; Quot: quotative; Top: topic.

In light of (3), it can be said that for anaphoric uses, Korean also has a two-way DEM system in a manner similar to English. Therefore, I offer (4) as a first pass at the characteristic properties of anaphoric or non-physical DEMs in Korean, and since *ce* cannot be used anaphorically, in the interest of space, the remainder of this paper focuses on the behavior of *i* and *ku* in comparison to their English counterparts.

(4) *Anaphoric/non-physical DEMs in Korean (first pass):*

- a. *i*: proximal
- b. *ku*: distal/neutral

Comparing Korean DEMs more closely with their English counterparts leads us to see that what is given in (4) may work for English but not for Korean, and there are several reasons for it.

First of all, unlike English, Korean DEMs lack indefinite and specific meanings. To see this, consider (5). This data set shows that in so-called *presentative* sentences, proximal DEM *i* in Korean cannot occur even though its occurrence in such contexts will meet the characterization in (4a) since the referent of the DP containing the DEM is cognitively close to S or known to her; in such contexts, either the numeral *han* ‘one’ or the indeterminate adjectival N modifier *etten* ‘some/which’ would occur instead.

(5) *Indefinite and specific use: English this vs. Korean i*

Context: Speaker is talking to a friend about what happened to her recently.

- a. I went to the mall the other day and there was **this** strange man talking really loudly in the shoes section.
- b.

Ecey	—	mol-ey	ka-ss-nuntey	*i/han/etten/
yesterday	<i>pro</i>	mall-to	go-Pst-and	this/one/some
isangha-n	namca-ka		sinpal	kakey-eyse
strange-Adn	man-Nom		shoe	store-Loc
khun-sori-ro	malulha-ko		iss-ess-e.	
big-noise-with	talk-Conn		Cop-Pst-Decl.Infrml	

Intended: ‘I went to the mall yesterday and there was **this** strange man talking really loudly in the shoes store.’

Consider now (6). This paradigm shows that, unlike *that*, Korean *ku* cannot occur in out of the blue contexts even though the intended referent of the DP containing it is distal from S in accordance with (4b) and the entire utterance is made with an exclamation—a heightened emotion which is known to facilitate the occurrence of affective *this* in English (see Potts & Schwarz 2010 and the references there); in such contexts, Korean requires a bare DP, as indicated by the parentheses in (6b).

(6) *Indefinite and specific use: that vs. ku:*

Context: A radio program host is talking to the listeners during a fund-raising season.

- a. Please pick up **that** phone and call us right now!
- b.

Cikum	[(*ku) swuhwaki]-rul	tul-ko	cehuy
Now	[(that) phone-Acc]	lift-Conn	our.Hon

pansongkwuk-uro paro chenhwahay-cwusip-siyo!
 studio-to right.now call-give.Hon-Imp.Hon
 Intended: 'Please pick up **that** phone and call us right now!'

Even if we delimit our attention to anaphoric contexts, some additional differences between English and Korean still emerge, in particular with regard to the way in which the proximal DEMs behave. To see this, consider first (7a) and (7b). In these discourse contexts, DEMs are being used anaphorically, carrying definite and specific meanings, and while English speakers only allow for proximal *this* in such contexts, Korean speakers would only permit distal *ku*, despite the fact that the intended referent of the DP containing the DEM can be perceived as proximal to S.

(7) *Definite and specific use: English this vs. Korean i*

Context: S is taking to a colleague at work, away from home.

- a. I've got a new roommate. I'll ask $\sqrt{\text{this}}/\text{that}$ guy if he'd be interested in buying your iPad.

(adapted from Oshima & McCready 2017: (41))

- b. Na sayrowun rwummeythu sayngkiess-e.
 I new roommate got.to.have-Decl.Infrml
 'I've got a new roommate.'
 — \sqrt{i}/\sqrt{ku} saram-hanthey — ney aiphaytu
pro **this/that** person-Dat *pro* your iPad
 kwansimisnun-ci mwulepwacwu-l-key.
 be.interested-Comp ask-will-Prm.Infrml
 Intended: 'I'll ask \sqrt{i}/\sqrt{ku} guy if he'd be interested in (buying) your iPad.'

Consider now (8) and (9). The goodness of (8a) and (9a) shows that, in English, both *this* and *that* may be licensed in certain anaphoric contexts (although the use of *this* in contexts like (8a) will engender a more vivid narration of the story). Notably, in the same discourse contexts, Korean speakers would strongly prefer the distal DEM *ku*, as shown in (8b), or would only use *ku*, as shown in (9b).

(8) Context: S is taking to a colleague at work, away from home.

- a. My neighbor has a dog. {**This/that**} dog kept me awake last night.
 (Gundel et al. 1993: 279)
- b. Nay iwus-hanthey kay-ka han-mari iss-e.
 My neighbor-Dat dog-Nom one-Cl Cop-Decl.Infrml
 'My neighbor has a dog.'
 Kurentey \sqrt{i}/\sqrt{ku} kay-ka ecey-pam-ey keysokhayse
 And **this/that** dog-Nom last-night-Loc continuously
 na-rul kkaywu-ess-e.
 I-Acc awake-Pst-Decl.Infrml
 Intended: 'And **this/that** dog kept me awake last night.'

(9) Context: Two linguists are talking to each other.

- a. A: Do you remember that you, I, and **a student of mine** had some discussion on null anaphora at the last conference?
 B: Sure.
 A: Well, {**this/that**} student is going to finish his thesis, and he is hoping to have you as an external committee member.
 (adapted from Oshima & McCready 2017: (49))
- b. A: Ne cinan hakhoeyeyse ne-rang, na-rang, kuriko
 You last conference-Loc you-with, I-with, and
nay haksayng han-myeng-irang kong taymyengsa-ey
 my student one-Cl-with null pronoun-Loc
 tayhay iyakiha-n kes sayngkakna-ni?
 about talked.about-Adn Nml remember-Q.Infrml
 ‘Do you remember that **a student of mine**, you, and I talked about null anaphora at the last conference?’
 B: Kurem.
 Sure
 ‘Sure.’
 A: ***I/ku** haksayng-i i pen-ey nonmwun-ul
 This/that student-Nom this time-Loc thesis-Acc
 simsa-pat-nuntey ne-rul oypwu wuywon-uro
 examination-receive-and you-Acc external member-as
 mosi-ko sip-tay.
 invite.Hon-Conn wish-Quot.Infrml
 Intended: ‘**This/that** student is defending his thesis soon and he says he wishes to have you as an external member (on his thesis committee).’

Taken together, this set of facts raises at least three interrelated questions: First, why Korean DEMs cannot carry indefinite and specific meanings? Secondly, why Korean proximal DEM *i* cannot (readily) occur in anaphoric contexts like (7), (8), and (9) although it **can** occur in contexts like (3)? Thirdly, what is the semantic property that is shared by all occurrences of DEMs in human language?

3. Capturing the facts

I suggest that all DEMs in human language exhibit indexicality or pointing, yet they exhibit different properties because pointing can be done in different domains, aiming at different entities that are located in different locations relative to the relevant point of view (POV) holder.

More specifically, the pointing domain can be either physical or non-physical and the target of the pointing can be specific or non-specific, discourse-old (DO) or discourse-new, and known to the relevant attitude holder (AH) and to H, or unknown to either or both of them. Furthermore, the target may be perceived as proximal to both AH and H, or not proximal to either or both of them.

Based on these ideas, I propose (10) as a source of parametric variation pertaining to DEMs across languages. I further posit that DEMs are typically phrasal elements which I call DemPs² and their head hosts relevant (un)interpretable features including those in (10).

(10) Parameters for DEM meanings:

- a. [+/_ Phys]: the entity the DEM at hand points to (henceforth entity) is presupposed to be present in the physical location of the discourse or not.
- b. [+/_ DO]: the entity is discourse-old or not.
- c. [+/_ KtAH]: the entity is presupposed to be known to AH or not.
- d. [+/_ KtH]: the entity is presupposed to be known to H or not.
- e. [+/_ PrxAH]: the entity is perceived to be proximal to AH or not.
- f. [+/_ PrxH]: the entity is perceived to be proximal to H or not.

I posit [+/_ Phys] as part of the core meanings of DEMs because not only in Korean but also in other languages, DEMs may behave differently depending on whether they are used in reference to an entity that is in a physically deictic space or not. For example, recall that Korean *ce* cannot be used when pointing at something that exists in a non-physical domain, as shown in (3). Similarly, when used purely deictically, the distal DEM *ano* in Japanese refers to an entity that is **far away** from both S and H, but when used anaphorically, its intended referent has to be known to and thus cognitively **proximal** to both S and H (for details, see Kuno 1973, Oshima & McCready 2017).

I posit [+/_ DO] next because doing so will help capture some of the differences between English-type DEM systems and Korean-type ones: if we assume that English DEMs may be either [+ DO] or [- DO] but Korean DEMs may only be [+ DO], then we can readily explain why English DEMs may introduce new discourse referents but their Korean counterparts cannot. Furthermore, [+/_ DO] subsumes [+/_ definite], so positing this pair of features as part of the core meanings of DEMs will let us treat [+/_ definite] differently from [+/_ unique] and thereby avoid the controversial question of whether, when it comes to DEM meanings, [+ definite] and [+ unique] are two faces of the same coin or not (for relevant discussion, see, a.o., Hawkins 1991, Roberts 2002, Wolter 2006); under the way we approach the matters here, they will not be two faces of the same coin since being discourse-old would not necessarily mean being unique or uniquely referring although it would mean being definite.

As for the other features listed in (10), similar ideas have been suggested in the literature (e.g., Oshima & McCready 2017 and the references there) but what is unique about the present analysis is that I am using AH rather than S as POV holder for a DEM, that is, as the individual who serves as the perspectival center in deciding whether some entity is being perceived as proximal or not.

I differentiate between AH and S here because when DEMs occur inside clausal complements of propositional attitude verbs, depending on whether the AH is construed as S or as the root clause subject, the felicity of the data containing them may vary, as observed by Elbourne (2008) for English. To see this, consider (11) and (12). These paradigms show that both in English and Korean, if the POV holder is construed as S, then the distal DEM is strongly preferred over the

² In languages like French, however, DEMs have been considered as heads. See Laenzlinger 2005.

proximal one, but if the POV holder is construed as the root clause's subject, then the proximal DEM is strongly preferred.³

- (11) a. Mary_i talked to no senator without **declaring afterwards** that **?this/√that** senator was the one who would cosponsor her_i bill.
 b. Mary_i talked to no senator without **thinking at the time** that **√this/?that** senator was the one who would cosponsor her_i bill.

(adapted from Elbourne 2008: (86))

- (12) a. Mary_i-nun etten sangwonuywon-to **manna-ko nase ?i/√ku**
 M.-Top every senator-also **meet-Conn after this/that**
 sangwonuywon-i casin_i-uy pepan-ul cicihaycwu-l-ke-rako
 senator-Nom self-Gen bill-Acc support-will-Nml-Comp
 palphyoha-ci-ahn-un saram-i ep-ta.
 declare-Comp-Aux.not-Adn person-Nom not.exist-Decl
 'There is no senator Mary_i talked to without **declaring afterwards** that **?this/√that** senator was the one who would cosponsor her_i bill.'
 b. Mary_i-nun etten sangwonuywon-to **mithing-cwung-ey**
 M.-Top every senator-also **meeting-in.the.middle-Loc**
√i/??ku sangwonuywon-i casin_i-uy pepan-ul
this/that senator-Nom self-Gen bill-Acc
 cicihaycwul-ke-rako mit-ci-ahn-un saram-i
 support-will-Nml-Comp believe-Comp-Aux.not-Adn person-Nom
 ep-ta.
 not.exist-Decl
 'There is no senator Mary_i talked to without **believing at the time** that **√this/?that** senator was the one who would cosponsor her_i bill.'

Differentiating between AH and S is further motivated by the fact that both in English and Korean, proximal DEMs may be licensed even if the POV holder is not construed as S. By way of illustration, in (13) and (14), the AH is construed as Cinderella who is the protagonist of the story being told, and the choice of *this* over *that* and *i* over *ku* encodes how the intended referent of the DP is considered as cognitively proximal to her, not to S.⁴

³ Paradigms (11) and (12) also show that both in English and Korean, DEMs can have bound variable interpretations.

⁴ An anonymous reviewer points out that *this* may occur even in contexts where S does not believe in Prince Charming, as shown in (i). The reviewer suggests that the occurrence of *this* in contexts like (i) may in fact indicate that the intended referent of the DP at hand is cognitively distal from the POV holder.

- (i) So, where is **this** Prince Charming?

This is an interesting point but I believe that when occurring in contexts like (i), *this* actually reflects the **hearer's** POV, and for him/her, Prince Charming **does** exist, but S is trying to dispute such a belief by using the proximal DEM sarcastically.

- (13) Cinderella_i's godmother told her_i that someday her_i Prince Charming will come and rescue her_i and she_i wonders when $\sqrt{\text{this/?that}}$ Prince Charming will come.

- (14) Sinteyreylra-uy taylor-nim-un — kot mesci-n
 Cinderella-Gen godmother-Hon-Top *pro* soon handsome-Adn
 wangca-nim-i Sinteyreylra-rul kwuha-re o-l-kerako
 prince-Hon-Nom Cinderella-Acc rescue-to come-will-Comp
 malhay-ess-ta. Kurentey Sinteyreylra-nun $\sqrt{i/?ku}$
 say-Pst-Decl But Cinderella-Top **this/that**
 wangca-nim-i encey o-l-ci kwungkumha-ta.
 prince-Hon-Nom when come-will-Comp wonder-Decl
 Intended: 'Cinderella_i's godmother told her_i that a handsome prince will come and rescue her_i soon and she_i wonders when $\sqrt{\text{this/?that}}$ prince will come.'

On the basis of these observations, I propose that English and Korean DEMs have the feature specifications given in (15) and (16). Comparing (15A) and (16A) leads us to see that when it comes to physically deictic DEMs, the only difference between the two languages is that what would be expressed by *that* in English is expressed by two different DEMs in Korean, namely, *ku* and *ce*. When it comes to non-physical/anaphoric DEMs, English and Korean are identical except that in English, DEMs may be [+/_ DO] but in Korean, they can only be [+ DO].

- (15) *English DEMs and their feature specifications:*

A. *Physically deictic*

	Phys	DO	KtAH	KtH	PrxAH	PrxH
<i>This</i>	+	N/A	+	+	+	—
<i>That</i>	+	N/A	+	+	—	+/_

B. *Non-physically deictic: Anaphoric or presentative*

	Phys	DO	KtAH	KtH	PrxAH	PrxH
<i>This</i>	—	+/_	+/_	+/_	+	—
<i>That</i>	—	+/_	+/_	+/_	—	+/_

- (16) *Korean DEMs and their feature specifications:*

A. *Physically deictic*

	Phys	DO	KtAH	KtH	PrxAH	PrxH
<i>i</i>	+	N/A	+	+	+	—
<i>ku</i>	+	N/A	+	+	—	+
<i>ce</i>	+	N/A	+	+	—	—

B. *Non-physically deictic: Anaphoric only*

	Phys	DO	KtAH	KtH	PrxAH	PrxH
<i>i</i>	—	+	+/_	+/_	+	—
<i>ku</i>	—	+	+/_	+/_	—	+/_

In view of what is given in (15)-(16), the meanings of the indefinite and specific DEMs *this* and *that* in (5a) and (6a) (and those in (1a, b)) can be represented as follows, where AH is construed as S:

(17) *Meanings of indefinite and specific this and that in (5a) and (6a):*

Non-physically deictic: Presentative or out of the blue

AH = S

	Phys	DO	KtAH	KtH	PrxAH	PrxH
<i>This</i>	—	—	+	—	+	—
<i>That</i>	—	—	—	+	—	+

This way of looking at things lets us explain why *i* and *ku* cannot occur in contexts like (5b) and (6b). The reason is that their features are set to be [+ DO] but their intended referents are discourse-new, as shown in (18), so in the absence of overt (in)definite articles, Korean expresses the intended determiner meanings by employing the numeral *han* ‘one’ or the indeterminate adjective *etten* ‘some/which’ for (5b), and the null morpheme for (6b).⁵

(18) *Intended meanings of indefinite and specific i and ku in (5b) and (6b):*

Non-physically deictic: Presentative or out of the blue

AH = S

	Phys	DO	KtAH	KtH	PrxAH	PrxH
* <i>i</i>	—	—	+	—	+	—
* <i>ku</i>	—	—	—	+	—	+

In contexts like (3), we expect both *i* and *ku* to occur, however, because such environments are [+ DO], and this agrees with the possible meanings Korean DEMs can carry, as shown in (19).

(19) *Meanings of definite and specific i and ku in (3):*

Non-physically deictic: Anaphoric

AH = S

	Phys	DO	KtAH	KtH	PrxAH	PrxH
<i>i</i>	—	+	+	—	+	—
<i>ku</i>	—	+	+	—	—	—

⁵ In the literature, the prevailing view is that definite meaning in Korean is expressed by a null morpheme. See, a.o., Simpson 1998, Jo 2000, and Suh 2005.

Notably, the feature specifications given in (19) let us capture the subtle meaning differences associated with the choice between *i* and *ku* in (3): the choice of *i* indicates that S perceives the problems introduced in the preceding sentence as cognitively close to her, and for this reason, it can also implicate that S has been struggling to solve the problems for a while, so they are felt to be “right with her” (so to speak). The choice of *ku*, on the other hand, indicates that she has not done anything to actually try to resolve these problems, and this agrees with Korean native speakers’ intuitions about the meaning of (3) when it contains *ku* as opposed to *i*.

The analysis put forth here provides a natural account of the distribution of the DEMs in data like (11) and (12). In (11a) and (12a), the non-proximal DEM is better suited because here, the AH is construed as S and from her POV, the senators Mary talked to are distal rather than proximal entities, as shown in (20) for (12a); if the AH is construed as Mary, then *this* or *i* may be used, but because of the presence of the temporal adverbial *mannako nase* ‘after meeting them’ in the sentence, such an interpretation is hard to come by. In contrast, in (11b) and (12b), the AH is readily construed as Mary and from her POV, each senator she is having a meeting with is perceived as close to her, so in this discourse, a proximal DEM is judged more felicitous than a distal one, as shown in (21) for (12b).

(20) *Meanings of bound DEMs i and ku in (12a):*

Anaphoric

AH = S

	Phys	DO	KtAH	KtH	PrxAH	PrxH
<i>*i/√ku</i>	–	+	+	–	–	–

(21) *Meanings of bound DEMs i and ku in (12b):*

Anaphoric

AH = Mary

	Phys	DO	KtAH	KtH	PrxAH	PrxH
<i>√i/*ku</i>	–	+	+	–	+	–

In a similar vein, the distribution of the DEMs in narrative contexts like (13) and (14) can be explained as follows: in (13), *this* is preferred over *that* because S is telling a story from Cinderella’s POV, and since her godmother told her that her Prince Charming will appear sometime soon, she can perceive him as a cognitively proximal entity. If, on the other hand, she believes that there are slim chances for him to come and rescue her, then *that* can be deemed more felicitous.

In light of these results, the analysis I have presented seems to have a positive outlook. We do not as yet have a straightforward account of the contrast between the English and Korean data in (7), (8), and (9), however. In fact, as things currently stand, the present analysis will wrongly predict that Korean *i* should be able to occur in (7)-(9), just like *this*, because, in all these cases, the intended referent of the DP containing the DEM can be analyzed as proximal to S, i.e., the AH, as indicated in the following tables. That is, the problem is that while the present analysis seems to make correct predictions for English, it makes incorrect predictions for Korean.

(22) Meanings of definite and specific DEMs in (8):

Anaphoric

AH = S

	Phys	DO	KtAH	KtH	PrxAH	PrxH
<i>this/i</i>	—	+	+	—	+	—
<i>that/ku</i>	—	+	+	—	—	—

(23) Meanings of definite and specific DEMs in (9):

Anaphoric

AH = S

	Phys	DO	KtAH	KtH	PrxAH	PrxH
<i>this/i</i>	—	+	+	+	+	—
<i>that/ku</i>	—	+	+	+	—	—

So why is it that Korean proximal DEM *i* cannot occur in certain anaphoric contexts where English *this/these* can?

At the moment, I do not have a satisfactory answer to this question, but I would like to point out two notable differences between Korean and English to prompt research.

First, Korean proximal DEM *i* seems to require some sort of overt formal link between itself and its referent whereas its English counterpart does not. That is, in order for *i* to be licensed, some linguistic device has to indicate that its referent is proximal to the relevant POV holder but such a device may not be necessary for *this/these*.

Support for this idea comes from the fact that even in discourses like (24), *this* can be licensed, despite the fact that its intended referent is absent in the discourse context and it is also contextually obvious that S is not well acquainted with him, so its intended referent is not cognitively proximal to the relevant POV holder either.⁶

(24) A: Do you remember that you, I, and a student of yours had some discussion on null anaphora at the last conference?

B: Sure.

A: Is **this** student still around? Our project team needs some help from a native speaker of Japanese.

(adapted from Oshima & McCready 2017: (48))

Notice now that, in Korean, an overt proximal indicator is necessary for *i* to be licensed. To see this, consider (25), a variant of (7b). In this discourse, the highlighted part indicates that the antecedent of the DemP is within a perceptual domain of S and it is also close to her, and this explains why *i* is licensed in this discourse, in contrast to (7b).

⁶ What is also worth noting here is that possibly because the intended referent of *this student* in (24) is indisputably non-proximal to S, such uses of the proximal DEM may foster an **even greater** sense of closeness between S and H than in cases like (1a)/(5a) and (1b)/(6b).

- (25) Na sayrowun rwummeythu sayngkiess-e.
 I new roommate got.to.have-Decl.Infrml
 ‘I’ve got a new roommate.’
Cikum **thonghwaha-ko** **iss-nuntay**
 Now pro talk.on.the.phone-Conn Cop-and
 i saram-hanthey ney aiphaytu
pro this person-Dat pro your iPad
 kwansimissnun-ci mwulepwacwu-l-key.
 be.interested-Comp ask-will-Prm.Infrml
 ‘I’m **talking to him on the phone right now**. I’ll ask **this** guy if he’d be interested in
 (buying) your iPad.’

Consider now (26) in comparison to (8b). Unlike in (8b), the second utterance in (26) has a vivid live report style and here, S is telling a story about what happened to her last night in an extremely heightened tone of voice as if she is re-experiencing it by placing her POV in the middle of that eventuality. Consequently, the dog under description can be perceived as cognitively proximal to S who serves as AH and this, I argue, licenses *i*, letting it carry some sort of emotive meaning or mark *noteworthiness* in the sense of Ionin (2006), resembling the behavior of affective *this* discussed in Potts and Schwarz 2010.⁷

- (26) Context: S is taking to a colleague at work, away from home.

Nay iwus-hanthey kay-ka han-mari iss-e.
 My neighbor-Dat dog-Nom one-Cl Cop-Decl.Infrml
 ‘My neighbor has a dog.’
 Kurentay **i** (**nom-uy**⁸) kay-ka ecey-pam-ey keysokhayse
 And this (guy-Gen) dog-Nom last-night-Loc continuously
 mak **cise-tay-nun-ke-ya!**
 relentlessly bark-Aux-Imprf-Adn-Nml-Cop.Assr.Infrml
 ‘And **I’m telling you this (awful)** dog was constantly barking all night last night!’

Comparing (27) with (9b) points to essentially the same phenomenon. In (27) too, the second utterance made by A contains an overt remark which indicates that the antecedent of the DP containing *i* is within a perceptually proximal space of S even though he is absent in the discourse context; the student at issue has been in contact with S, and therefore the eventuality described by the 1st utterance made by S is temporally linked to the eventuality described by the 2nd utterance made by her and this brings the intended referent of the DP within a proximal distance from her.

⁷ Potts and Schwarz (2010:6) note that many of the utterances containing affective *this* that have been documented in the literature are exclamatives or contain exclamative markers (e.g., *really*), as shown in (i).

- (i) a. This Henry Kissinger is really something! (Lakoff 1974)
 b. [In front of a computer] These IBM ThinkPads are amazing! (Bowdle & Ward 1995)

⁸ The adnominal expression *nom-uy* is comprised of a defective noun meaning ‘guy’ and the genitive case marker *-uy* but it is more like an epithet which carries a pejorative meaning, and whenever it is used appositively as is the case in (26), it conveys a conventional implicature that S has a negative attitude toward its referent. Therefore, I have translated it as ‘awful’ in (26).

Furthermore, the second conjunct of the sentence contains the adverb *kapcaki* which marks mirativity, and this helps license *i* in this discourse, letting it carry some sort of affective meaning in a manner similar to (26).

- (27) A: Ne cinan hakhoy-eyse ne-rang, na-rang, kuriko
 You last conference-Loc you-with, I-with, and
nay haksayng han-myeng-irang kong taymyengsa-ey
 my student one-Cl-with null pronoun-Loc
 tayhay iyakiha-n kes sayngkakna-ni?
 about talked.about-Adn Nml remember-Q.Infrml
 ‘Do you remember that you, I, and **a student of mine** talked about null anaphora at the last conference?’
- B: Kurem.
 Sure
 ‘Sure.’
- A: **Ku ihwu-ey ku haksayng-hako il-cwuil-ey**
 That after-Loc that student-with one-week-Loc
han-pen-ssik myentam-ul hay-o-ko iss-nuntay kapcaki
 one-Cl-each meeting-Acc do-com-Conn Cop-and suddenly
i haksayng_i-i ne-rul caki_i nonmwun oypwu
 this student-Nom you-Acc self thesis external
 simsa-wuywon-uro mosi-ko sip-tay!
 examination-member-as invite.Hon-Conn wish-Quot.Infrml
 ‘**Since then, he and I have been having weekly meetings and suddenly, this** student_i is wanting to invite you as an external member of his_i thesis committee!’

Finally, notice that *i* can be licensed even in (28), a Korean counterpart of English data in (24), despite the fact that here, the intended referent of the DP containing it is a student of H’s rather than S’s, unlike the case with (27). This occurrence of *i* is judged fine because here too, S overtly remarks that the eventualities described by her 1st and 2nd utterances are temporally linked and as a result, the intended referent of the DP containing *i* is within a close distance from her in the relevant cognitive domain. Besides, the mirative marker *kapcaki* ‘suddenly’ occurs in the same clause as the DemP. Consequently, a proximal DEM is licensed here, again carrying some sort of affective meaning, despite the fact that its referent is absent in the discourse context.

- (28) A: Ne cinan hakhoy-eyse ne-rang, na-rang,
 You last conference-Loc you-with, I-with,
 kuriko **ney haksayng han-myeng**-irang
 and your student one-Cl-with
 kong taymyengsa-ey tayhay iyakiha-n kes
 null pronoun-Loc about talked.about-Adn Nml
 sayngkakna-ni?
 remember-Q.Infrml
 ‘Do you remember that **a student of yours**, you, and I talked about null anaphora at the last conference?’

B: Kurem.
Sure
'Sure.'

A: **Ku** **haksayng-i** **ku** **ihwu-ro** **cacwu** **yenrak-ul**
That student-Nom that after-since often contact-Acc
hay-oa-se **kyoryu-ka** **com** **iss-ess-nuntey**
make-come-Conn communication-Nom a.little exist-Pst-and
i **pen-ey** **i** **haksayng_i-i** **kapcaki** **na-rul**
this time-Loc this student-Nom suddenly I-Acc
caki_i **nonmwun** **oypwu** **simsa-wuywon-uro**
self thesis external examination-member-as
mosi-ko **sip-ta-nun-ke-ya!**
invite.Hon-Conn wish-Decl-Adn-Nml-Cop.Assr.Infrml
Lit.: 'After that time, that student contacted me a few times, so there has been
some contact between us, and recently, all of a sudden, this student_i said he
would like to have me on his_i thesis committee as an external member!'

Turning now to the second difference between Korean DEMs and English DEMs, I would like to point out that while English DEMs can readily have H as their POV holder, their Korean counterparts cannot. This is evidenced by the fact that the AH of the proximal DEM *this* in (24) is H, and even though with some revision, the proximal DEM *i* in Korean seems to be licensed in a similar context as shown in (28), what *i* actually refers to is the DemP headed by the distal DEM *ku*, and the AH of this DEM is in fact S, not H. In other words, *i* cannot have H as its AH.

Let me also point out at this juncture that a similar difference between English *this* and Korean *i* is observed between English 1st person plural pronoun *we* and its Korean counterpart *wuri* 'we'. To see this, consider (29): *we* is used in (29a) but it is in fact referring to H, excluding S. In addition, while (29a) is judged to be felicitous, its Korean counterpart in (29b) is not, suggesting that 1st person plural pronouns in Korean cannot take on H's POV.

(29) Context: A pediatrician asking a child whether she flosses her teeth every day.

- a. Are **we** flossing teeth?
b. #**Wuri**-nun chisil-ul mayil sayongha-nayo?
We-Top floss-Acc every.day use-Q.Hon
Intended: 'Are we (i.e., you) flossing every day?'

Taken together, then, the contrast between (29a) and (29b) and the contrasts between English *this* and Korean *i* shown above suggest that the DEMs and pronouns in English may be used to **accommodate** H but their counterparts in Korean may not be.

If the analysis presented here is correct, then, the difference between English and Korean with regard to their DEM systems stems from three factors: (i) Korean DEMs' inability to carry discourse-new meaning, (ii) the extra formal licensing condition that Korean proximal DEM *i* is subject to, which English *this* is not, and (iii) Korean DEMs' inability to have H as their POV holder in contrast to English DEMs' ability to do so.

4. Summary and conclusion

This paper has shown that Korean DEMs exhibit rather different behaviors than their English counterparts. I first pointed out that Korean DEMs cannot carry indefinite and specific meanings and Korean proximal DEM *i* cannot occur in certain anaphoric contexts in which English *this* or *these* can occur. In an attempt to account for these facts, I proposed a partial set of binary features which I claim to constitute part of DEM meanings in human language. Additionally, I have suggested that the differences between English and Korean may boil down to three factors: first, Korean DEMs cannot refer to an entity that has not been introduced to discourse. Secondly, Korean proximal DEM requires an overt temporal link between itself and its intended referent. Thirdly, Korean DEMs cannot have H as their POV holder. Given these findings, we can state that while Korean DEMs may also take on certain affective meanings, their affectivity does not seem to be of the same kind as their English counterparts.

The analysis presented here suggests that pointing is the single most important semantic ingredient of DEMs across languages but depending on the domain in which pointing is done, seemingly identical DEMs may exhibit different behaviors (e.g., Korean *ku*, Japanese *ano*).

The present analysis also makes interesting and testable predictions about the typology of DEMs and their cross-linguistic variation. In particular, it predicts that languages will fall into two types depending on whether their DEMs carry only [+ DO] or they may carry both [+ DO] and [– DO].

Given what is stated in Oshima and McCready (2017), one can gather that Japanese DEMs may not occur in presentative sentences, carrying indefinite and specific meanings. On the other hand, German has indefinite DEMs which can take on similar affective meanings to English *this*, namely, *dies* ‘this’ and *so’n* ‘such-a’ (von Heusinger 2011). Given this, I conjecture that all article-less languages may lack indefinite, specific DEMs whereas all article-possessing languages may have them.

If such a correlation indeed exists, then it may help answer the outstanding question of which between referentiality and discourse prominence is the more basic or primary function of DEMs—a question authors like Wright and Givón (1987) and von Heusinger (2011) have attempted to answer but have not succeeded in doing so as yet.

As far as I can see, this question will receive a different answer depending on which language is being looked at: in languages like Korean, DEMs are frequently used for anaphoric purposes but this may have to do with the fact that such languages lack definite articles. In languages like English, the more primary function of DEMs seems to mark discourse prominence but this is probably because English already has a definite article, which languages like Korean and Japanese do not.

References

- Acton, Eric K. and Christopher Potts. 2014. That straight talk: Sarah Palin and the sociolinguistics of demonstratives. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 18(1):3-31.
- Anderson, Stephen R., and Edward L. Keenan. 1985. Deixis. In *Language Typology and Syntactic Description, Vol. 3: Grammatical categories and the lexicon*, ed. Timothy Shopen, 259-308. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Cambridge University Press.
- Bowdle, Brian F. and Gregory Ward. 1995. Generic demonstratives. In *Proceedings of the 21st*

- Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, ed. J. Ahlers, L. Bilmes, J. S. Guenter, B. A. Kaiser, and J. Namkung, 32-43. Berkeley, California: Berkeley Linguistics Society.
- Elbourne, Paul. 2008. Demonstratives as individual concepts. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 31(4): 409-466.
- von Heusinger, Klaus. 2011. Specificity, referentiality, discourse prominence: German indefinite demonstratives. In *Proceedings of Sinn Und Bedeutung* 15, ed., Reich, et al., 9-30. Saarbrücken, Germany: Saarland University Press.
- Ionin, Tania. 2006. This is definitely specific: specificity and definiteness in article systems. *Natural Language Semantics* 14:175-234.
- Jo, Mi-Jeung. 2000. Nominal Functional Categories in Korean: A Comparative Study with Languages with DP. *Studies in Generative Grammar* 10:427-451.
- Kuno, Susumu. 1973. *The Structure of the Japanese Language*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Laenzlinger, Christopher. 2005. French adjective ordering: Perspectives on DP-internal movement types. *Lingua* 115:645-689.
- Lakoff, Robin. 1974. Remarks on 'this' and 'that'. In *Proceedings of the Chicago Linguistics Society* 10, 345-356. Chicago, Illinois: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Lieberman, Mark. 2008. Affective demonstratives. *Language Log*, <http://languagelog.ldc.upenn.edu/nll/?p=674>. Accessed September 9 2017.
- Martin, Samuel E. 1992. *A Reference Grammar of Korean*. Tokyo, Japan: The Charles E. Tuttle Company.
- Oshima and McCready. 2017. Anaphoric demonstratives and mutual knowledge: The cases of Japanese and English. *Natural Language and Linguist Theory* 35:801-837.
- Potts, Christopher, and Florian Schwarz. 2010. Affective 'this'. *Linguistic Issues in Language Technology* 5:1-29.
- Prince, Ellen. 1981a. On the inferencing of indefinite 'this' NPs. In *Elements of Discourse Understanding*, ed., B. L. Webber, I. Sag, and A. Joshi, 231-250. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Roberts, Craige. 2002. Demonstratives as definites. In *Information sharing: Reference and presupposition in language generation and interpretation*, ed. Kees van Deemter and Roger Kibble, 89-196. Stanford, California: CSLI.
- Simpson, Andrew. 1998. Empty determiners and nominalisation in Chinese, Korean and Japanese. paper presented at the USC Symposium on E. Asian languages, Nov. 1998.
- Sohn, Ho-Min. 1999. *The Korean Language*. Cambridge University Press.
- Suh, Eugenina. 2005. The nominal phrase in Korean: the role of D in a "determiner-less" language. In *Toronto Working Papers in Linguistics* 25:10-19. Toronto, Canada: Department of Linguistics, University of Toronto.
- Wolter, Lynsey Kay. 2006. That's That: The Semantics and Pragmatics of Demonstrative Noun Phrases. Ph.D. thesis, University of California-Santa Cruz.
- Wright, Susan and Talmy Givón. 1987. The pragmatics of indefinite reference: Quantified text-based studies. *Studies in Language* 11:1-33.