The main purpose of this paper is to identify the novel type of Korean definiteness marker KU, which originated from the morphological demonstrative ‘that’. Traditionally, (in)definiteness is seen as a semantic relation between those NPs that introduce new referents and those that refer to familiar unique referents, whose grammatical category is known to be present in languages that employ overt markers. In this vein, the realization of definiteness in Korean nominal system has been characterized by the existence of bare nouns and the absence of morphological (in)definiteness marker. In order to shed light on the issue of definiteness in this paper, I show that Korean KU instantiates a solid pattern of distribution of definiteness marker. Mainly focusing on the semantico-pragmatic role of KU, the proposal comprises three main parts: (i) Given that Korean employs distinct devices teased apart into uniqueness (i.e., referential use) and familiarity (i.e., anaphoric use), I show that the effect of referential use in argument saturating function is achieved by the covert D in bare nouns, whereas anaphoric use in argument non-saturating function is achieved by the overt KU; (ii) The semantic contribution of KU is analyzed as a contextual domain restricting determiner (D_{DR}; Exteberria and Giannakidou 2010 et seq.). It is performed by the application of the type preserving function supplying a contextual anaphoric C variable. By supplying C, D_{DR} KU triggers an anaphoric presupposition that the common ground contains a property; (iii) I further show that the D_{DR} operator is present in the syntax, falling out from the standard D position as an adjunctive modifier in a lower DP layer. The contribution of my work is that the proposed account allows us to widen our view of cross-linguistic variation to cases where the prerequisite of definiteness is based on the dissociation of meaning (i.e., the semantic role of D as encoding familiarity by C-variable) and form (i.e., the syntactic role of D as an argument-building function).
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1. Introduction
The aim of the current paper is to provide a theoretical understanding of the phenomena of definiteness in Korean. In particular, I address the following questions: (i) what elements qualify as a definiteness marker in Korean? (ii) what type of definiteness is possible? (iii) what is the function of a Korean definiteness marker from a formal semantic as well as a typological perspective? These questions will be crucial guidelines in this paper, and the answers obtained will in turn be important contributions to a theory of definiteness in natural language. Traditionally, the morphological realization of determiner (D, henceforth) occurs in the two morphosyntactic paradigms, namely definite articles and demonstratives (Abney 1987; Longobardi 1994):

(1)  
```
    D
   / \  
definites demonstratives
```
Many Indo-European languages, including English, make a morpho-syntactic distinction between definite articles and demonstratives. Regarding the instantiation of definite determiners, a definite article *the* in (2) is brought up as the prototypical morphosyntactic instantiation that has received the most attention in the literature:

(2) The king of France is bald.

The felicitous use of the definite article *the* requires that the referent of *king of France* be either familiar within the discourse (Christophersen 1939; Prince 1981b, 1992; Heim 1982, a.o.), or uniquely identifiable to the hearer (Russell 1905; Hawkins 1978, Löbner 1985; Kadmon 1987, 1990; Gundel 1988; Heim 1990; Lyons 1999, a.o.).

In recent work, the property of definiteness induced by demonstratives has received much attention and there have been a lot of attempts to capture a unified semantics for definites and demonstratives (Hawkins 1991; King 2001; Roberts 2002; Wolter 2006; Elbourne 2005, 2008; Ionin et al. 2011, 2012, Oshihara and McCready 2017, Jenks 2018, a.o.). As shown below, the demonstrative *that* can be used interchangeably with *the* to encode familiarity and uniqueness/maximality:

(3) Familiarity uses
   a. Anaphoric: The curtain rose. A woman came onto the stage. Then *that/the* woman started singing and dancing. (Ionin et al. 2012: (8a))
   b. Co-varying anaphoric: Every dog in my neighborhood, even meanest, has an owner who thinks that *that/the* dog is a sweetie. (Roberts 2002: (11))
   c. Bridging: Gentian jerked the plug out of the drain and climbed out of the tube. The cat leapt into the sink and began biting at *that/the* plug. (Wolter 2006: (117))

(4) Uniqueness/maximality uses
   a. The pet shop had a dog for sale. I bought *that/the* dog.
   b. The pet shop had three dogs for sale. #I bought *that/the* dog.
   c. The pet shop had five dogs for sale. I bought *those/the* dogs. [=all five dogs] (Ionin et al. 2012: (7))

In (3) and (4), both *the* and *that* are used to pick up an anaphoric and a unique referent from the discourse. In (3), NPs marked by *the* and *that* denote a familiar referent to the interlocutors. In (4), NPs marked by *the* and *that* both denote a unique/maximal referent(s). In (4a), *that dog* refers back to the unique dog in the discourse; in (4b), the use of *that dog* is infelicitous since uniqueness has not been established; and in (4c), with a plural, *those dogs* must refer to the totality of dogs.

In contrast, Korean, which is well-known as one of the articleless languages, does not have a definite article corresponding to *the*, but still employs distinct ways of expressing definiteness. It typically employs two linguistic devices, each of which plays a different role: The first type of definiteness is yielded by bare nouns (C. Lee 1989, 1992; Kang 1994; Sohn 1994, 2001; Chang 2009; Ahn 2017; Cho 2017, a.o.). Depending on the context, which is presumably decided by default, the bare noun *uye* itself has four possible English translations: as a singular indefinite (5a), singular definite (5b), plural indefinite, (5c) or plural definite (5d):
(5) uyca-ka pang-ey iss-ta. [Korean]
    chair-Nom room-Loc exist-Decl
    a. ‘There is a chair in the room.’
    b. ‘The chair is in the room.’
    c. ‘There are chairs in the room.’
    d. ‘The chairs are in the room.’

In a given anaphoric context in (6A), however, where the question introduces uyca ‘chair’ as a salient antecedent in the discourse, the bare noun uyca ‘chair’ in (6B) can be interpreted as a definite only in (6Bb) and (6Bd):

(6) A: uyca-ka eti-ey iss-ni?
    chair-Nom where-Loc be-Q
    ‘Where is a chair?; where are chairs?’

B: uyca-nun pang-ey iss-e. [Korean]
    chair-Top room-Loc exist-Decl
    a. ‘There is a chair in the room.’
    b. **The chair** is in the room.’
    c. ‘There are chairs in the room.’
    d. ‘The chairs are in the room.’

For the second type of definiteness marker, Korean speakers use the overt ku, whose morphological form is equivalent to the demonstrative ku ‘that’ (C. Lee 1989, 1992; Kang 1994; Sohn 2001; Kang 2012, 2015, Ahn 2017; Cho 2017, a.o.). In Korean, as for the morphological realization of the demonstratives in the morphosyntactic paradigm, three types of demonstratives are employed: i ‘this,’ ce ‘that (over there),’ and ku ‘that.’ The proximity of the entity between the interlocutors plays a role in determining what demonstrative should be used. As shown below, in a situation where John is in the furniture store where the chairs are visually present, if John (i.e., an addresser) points to a chair near him, the demonstrative i should be used (7a). If John wants to refer to a chair near the clerk (i.e., an addressee), ku should be used (7b). Likewise, ce should be used to refer to the chair that is far from both (7c):

(7) **Context: John is talking to the clerk at the furniture store. Pointing at a certain chair,**
    John says:
    a. **i** uyca-ka maum-ey tul-eyo. [Korean]
       this chair-Nom mind-Loc have-Pol
       ‘(I) like this chair (near the clerk).’
    b. **ku** uyca-ka maum-ey tul-eyo.
       that chair-Nom mind-Loc have-Pol
       ‘(I) like that chair (near John).’
    c. **ce** uyca-ka maum-ey tul-eyo.
       that chair-Nom mind-Loc have-Pol
       ‘(I) like that chair (far from both the clerk and John).’

Among the three demonstratives, only ku encodes definiteness in an anaphoric context in which
the referent is not visually present. As shown below, the bare noun uyca ‘chair’ combined with ku obligatorily gives rise to an anaphoric interpretation:

(8) Context: After looking around the furniture store, John decided to buy the most expensive chair. Before purchasing it, he wants to ask his wife, Mary, for her an opinion. He calls to Mary and says:

‘I like the most expensive chair here. I will buy the/that chair.’

The dual function of the deictic ku and the definite ku leads us to assume that it has a split use into the regular deictic demonstrative in (7b) and “definite” in (8). For the sake of making a clear distinction between deictic ku and definite ku, from now on I will gloss the definite ku as KU. Summing up, in Korean, there are two linguistic devices marking definiteness: bare nouns and overt KU. For reasons to be made clear soon, we posit the covert D operator in terms of bare nouns. The following represents the morphosyntactic paradigm of D in Korean:

(9) The morphosyntactic paradigms of D in Korean

An attempt to consider KU as the semantic equivalent of a definiteness marker is not new and has been reflected descriptively in recent literature, where it is termed as ‘definite determiner’ (C. Lee 1989, 1992; Kang 1994), ‘definite demonstrative’ (Sohn 2001), and ‘anaphoric demonstrative’ (Ahn 2017; Cho 2017). Although it has been noted that the interpretation of KU involves a definiteness marker in the literature, to my knowledge the precise nature of its formal semantico-syntactic function has not been discussed. In order to test the hypothesis that KU in Korean behaves like a definiteness marker, we need to show the following: First, KU has the semantico-pragmatic function of definiteness. Second, KU should differ from other non-definite (i.e., deictic) demonstratives. Third, the distinct property of definiteness induced by covert D in bare nouns and KU should be captured. In doing so, the investigation of the contrast among KU, ku/i/ce, and bare nouns will be considered, and the definite behavior of KU will be suggested.

Along the lines of Exteberria and Giannakidou (2010 et seq.), in this paper I argue that
the types of definiteness in Korean are distinguished into separate functions of *argument-saturating* (i.e., referential use of uniqueness/maximality) and *non-saturating* (i.e., anaphoric use of familiarity): semantically, the effect of argument-saturating function is achieved by the covert D in bare nouns, whereas the effect of type-preserving non-saturating function is achieved by overt marking of KU. The semantic contribution of KU is further analyzed as a *contextual domain restrictor* (D_{DR}, henceforth). Signaling that the property of NP exists in the common ground, the main effect of D_{DR} KU is to supply a contextual set C variable referring to a *discourse familiar set*. Furthermore, the way of marking definiteness by KU is also morphosyntactically real, which appears as an adjunctive modifier in a lower DP layer. It leads us to the fact that there is a mismatch between the semantics and syntax of D. The prerequisite of contextual domain restriction is based on the dissociation of meaning and form.

The remainder of this proposal is as follows: Section 2 deals with a number of theoretical issues discussed in the literature on definiteness, including familiarity, uniqueness/maximality, and contextual domain restriction. By looking at Korean data, Section 3 lays out the basic properties of KU to identify it as a definiteness marker. I suggest that its fundamental semantic/pragmatic property is contextual domain restriction. After an in-depth discussion of the major types of uses, Section 4 analyzes its semantic meaning. I will show how covert D and overt KU can be integrated into a unified syntactic structure. I conclude in Section 5 with some suggestions for further implications and the remaining questions of this study.

### 2 Theoretical background on definiteness

The first property of definiteness is familiarity. The main traditional approach of *familiarity* was pioneered by Christophersen (1939). In his view, the distinction between definite and indefinite description is determined by whether the referent of an NP is familiar to the hearer. The familiarity theory has been formalized as a Novelty-Familiarity condition by Heim (1982). According to Heim, the meaning of sentences is represented by their capacity to change the context, which is argued to include sets of assignment functions. This is the dynamic view of (in)definiteness that goes back to how information grows in discourse (Stalnaker 1978). The distinction between definite and indefinite DPs can be analyzed by means of the dynamic view of (in)definiteness. Simply put, the use of the indefinite DP introduces a new (novel) entity into the discourse, whereas the use of the definite DP indicates that the speaker presupposes the content of the DP. The formal conditions of a definite DP and indefinite DP are stated in (10):

\[\text{(10) The Extended Novelty-Familiarity Condition (Heim 1982: 369-370):}\]

For a δ to be felicitous w.r.t a context C it is required for every NP_i in that:

a. if NP_i is [- definite], then i \notin \text{Dom}(C); \quad \text{NOVELTY CONDITION}

b. if NP_i is [+ definite], then
   (i) i \in \text{Dom}(C), and
   (ii) if NP_i is a formula, C entails NP_i

\text{FAMILIARITY CONDITION}

(10) defines a logical form where \text{Dom} indicates a domain that maps from discourse context C to discourse referents NP_i. A discourse referent is not an actual thing in the world. Rather, it is a kind of mental entity represented by a natural number. When an NP_i is not entailed in the domain of the context in question, an NP_i gives novelty in (10a), whereas when an NP_i is entailed in the domain of the context in question, NP_i gives familiarity in (10b).
Second, *uniqueness* is based on the intuitive appreciation that a definite description refers to things of the singleton set in the context. Russell’s classic work analyzes the sentence in (11a) as having meaning in (11b) by positing that definite descriptions are referential NPs:

(11) a. The φ is ψ.
    b. ψ(ιx.φx)

The definite NPs presuppose the existence of the entities (Strawson 1950), where definite descriptions denote an individual of type \( e \). Thus, for instance, DP *the boy* is thought of as a referring expression of type \( e \):

(12) $\text{DP}_{<e>} : \lambda x. \text{boy}(x)$

\[ \text{D}_{<et,e>} \quad \text{NP}_{<et>} \]

the \hspace{1cm} \text{boy}: \lambda x. \text{boy}(x)

As shown above, *the* creates an *argument-saturating* constituent whose output is of type \( <e> \) in the referential use. Importantly, the \( \imath \) operator can also obtain a suitable interpretation for plural and mass nouns, termed “maximality” (i.e., \( \text{max} \)) (Link 1983), shown as follows:

(13) a. the boy = \( \imath(\lambda x. \text{boy}(x)) \)
    b. the boys = \( \text{max}(\lambda x. \text{boy}(x)) \)

In a lattice structure, a supremum operator \( \imath \) (or \( \text{max} \)) captures the meaning of the definite description. When the extension of the predicate is a singleton, \( \imath x.P(x) \) will pick out the unique individual in the extension of \( P \). When the extension of the predicate is plural, \( \text{max} x.P(x) \) will pick out the maximal individuals in the extension of \( *P \).

Third, although the central discussion of the definite D has been mainly focused on the vehicle of familiarity and uniqueness, recent works have laid out the basic framework for capturing the meaning of definiteness by implementing *contextual domain restriction* (Giannakidou 2004; Etzeberria 2005; Etzeberria and Giannakidou 2010 et seq.). This type of definiteness is crucially different from the traditional role of definite D (of type \( <et,e> \)), since its structure is based on the D co-occurring with quantifiers. Cross-linguistically, the domain of a quantifying NP is determined by the contextually restricted content of its NP because the NP cannot refer to all individuals in the world that match the NP description. Consider the following example:

(14) Many people came to the lecture yesterday; **every student** brought a laptop.

\[ \forall x[\text{student}(x) \cap C(x)] \rightarrow \text{brought a laptop}(x) \]

As shown above, the quantified by a universal quantifier *every student* does not denote the set of all the students in the universe. Rather, it refers to the set of *contextually salient* students, the set
of students who brought a laptop. In the syntax-semantics approach, the domain of Qs is considered contextually restricted by the covert domain restriction variable C at LF where C refers to the discourse familiar set (Westerstahl 1984; von Fintel 1994, 1998; Stanley and Szabó 2000; Stanley 2002; Martí 2003; Matthewson 2001; Gillon 2006, 2009). Simply put, C refers to the attendees at the lecture yesterday, and C makes reference to that set.

One important question regarding the C-variable is where the domain restriction variable is located and whether it is encoded overtly or covertly. Cross-linguistically, an overt strategy of C-variable incorporated in D with quantifiers has been documented in European languages such as Greek, Basque, Bulgarian, and Hungarian. As shown below, supplying C is a function that D in Greek and Basque directly composed with Q and restricts the contextual domain of NPs (Etcheberria and Giannakidou 2018: (8)-(11)):

(15) a. o kathe fititis
    D.sg every student
    ‘each student’
  b. *kathe o fititis
    every D.sg student

(16) a. mutil guzti-ak
    boy all-D.pl
    ‘all the boys’
  b. mutil bakoitz-a
    boy each-D.sg
    ‘each boy’
  c. *mutil guzti/bakoitz; *mutil-ak guzti; *mutil-a bakoitz

(17) a. az összes diáak
    the all student
    ‘all the students’
  b. *összes az diáak
    all the student

(18) vsjako-te momceta
    every-D.pl boy.pl

Etcheberria and Giannakidou term this type of D as a domain restrictor D, i.e., $D_{DR}$. In the standard analysis of Generalized Quantifiers theory, Q and D cannot be combined apparently because of the type mismatch (Barwise and Cooper 1981). It is due to this reason that the role of $D_{DR}$ involves a non-saturating function, unlike the traditional argument-saturating function of D. C in $D_{DR}$ refers to the discourse familiar set that is equivalent to a non-singleton set. At the outer layer of the QP, the role of overt $D_{DR}$ is to presuppose the contextual domain restriction, which signals such a property exists in the common ground. Thus the structure of QP with $D_{DR}$ results in a partitive-like interpretation (i.e., every one of the students).

Given this setup, the composition of the sentences in (15a) and (16b) turn out to be (19) and (20) respectively. In Greek and Basque, $D_{DR}$ operates on the quantificational argument. D in this configuration type-shifts to a modifier function, as in (20). By supplying the context set variable C, $D_{DR}$ plays a role as a function that triggers the anaphoric presupposition that the common ground contains a property that is a value for C, just like a property anaphor. Q is thus consequently anaphoric to a discourse familiar property (Etcheberria and Giannakidou 2014:
(8)(9):

(19) a. \([o_D + \text{kathe}_Q \text{fititis}_{NP}]_Q\)P  
    b. \(o \text{ kathe fititis} = \text{[kathe(C)](student)}\)  [Greek]

(20) a. \([\text{mutil}_{NP} + \text{bakoitz}_Q - \text{a}_D]_Q\)P  
    b. \(\text{mutil bakoitz-a} = \text{[mutil][bakoitz(C)]}\)  [Basque]

(21) D to D\(_D\)\(_R\) type-shifting:
   a. D\(_D\)\(_R\) rule: When D composes with Q, use D\(_D\)\(_R\)  
   b.  
   \[
   \begin{array}{c}
   \text{QP} \\
   \text{Q} \\
   \text{NP} \\
   \text{D} \\
   \text{Q} \\
   \text{fititis ‘student’} \\
   \text{o} \\
   \text{kathe} \\
   \text{the every} \\
   \text{[Q]} = \lambda P \lambda R. \forall x P(x) \rightarrow R(x) \\
   \text{[D\(_D\)\(_R\)]} = \lambda Z \text{et,ett} \lambda P \lambda R \text{et} \lambda Z \text{(P ∩ C)(R)}; Z \text{ is the relation denoted by Q} \\
   \text{[D\(_D\)\(_R\)(Q)]} = \lambda P \lambda R. \forall x (P(x) \cap C(x)) \rightarrow R(x)
   \end{array}
   \]

   In terms of cross-linguistic perspective, however, it does not seem that a morphological definite article guarantees manifestation of D\(_D\)\(_R\). This is attested in other languages as evidenced by cross-linguistic morphosyntactic variation in the type of D\(_D\)\(_R\). For example, in Salish, there is no article distinction between definite and indefinite, and the single available D is a deictic demonstrative.\(^{1}\) As shown below, when the morphological deictic i...a co-occurs with NP smelhmúlhats ‘woman(pl)’ and quantifier tákem ‘all’, it functions as a D\(_D\)\(_R\), which restricts the domain of NP (Exteberria and Giannakidou 2014: (23), adapted from Matthewson (1998, 2001)):

(22) a. léxlex tákem i smelhmúlhats-a [St’át’ímcets Salish]  
    intelligent all D.pl woman(pl)-D  
    ‘all of the women are intelligent.’  
    b. *léxlex [tákem smelhmúlhats]  
    intelligent all woman(pl)  

It signals that the property of women exists in the common ground. As revealed in the translation “all of the women” in QP, the structure is similar to partitive, since this is the typical structure where the NP domain is presupposed. In this sense, D\(_D\)\(_R\) functions as a type-preserving function

\(^{1}\) It is suggested that St’át’ímcets Salish D is a Kaplanian-style demonstrative, which behaves like a referentially rigid nature with the following empirical evidence: first, the St’át’ímcets DPs are always linked to the here and now of current discourse; Second, since the St’át’ímcets DPs are referentially rigid, they take only wide scope with negation; Third, the St’át’ímcets DP cannot be licensed with donkey full DPs and receive E-type interpretations (Demirdache 1997; Matthewson 1999, 2008).
that introduces the anaphoric variable C, yielding a contextually salient set of individuals characterized by the \([\text{NP} \cap C]\) property. The composition of the Salish definite demonstrative \(i\ldots a\) in (22a) turns out to be (24) under the \(D_{\text{DR}}\) type-shifting rule in (23) (adapted from Giannakidou 2004: (31), following Cheng and Ladusaw 2003):

(23) D to \(D_{\text{DR}}\) type-shifting:
   a. \(D_{\text{DR}}\) rule: When D composes with NP under Q, use \(D_{\text{DR}}\)
   b. \(\llbracket D_{\text{DR}} \rrbracket = \lambda P_\epsilon \lambda x \ (P(x) \cap C(x))\)

\[ i\ldots a \llbracket D_{\text{DR}} \rrbracket = \lambda P_\epsilon \lambda x \ (P(x) \cap C(x)) \]

The Salish type of demonstrative as a function of \(D_{\text{DR}}\) is observable in many languages. For instance, in Japanese, the demonstrative \(so\)-\(no\) ‘that’ has been argued to function as a domain restrictor (Kaneko 2012, 2014). Since \(so\)-\(no\) is morphologically demonstrative, one might expect that its role would be equivalent to Korean \(KU\). However, they sharply contrast in terms of uniqueness/maximality. I will come back to a more detailed discussion in Section 3.2.

Given this background, Etxeberria and Giannakidou (2010 et seq.) establishes a family of phenomena revealing cross-linguistically distinct functions of D. The saturating function of D is a traditional definite article in (25a), whereas the non-saturating function manifests definiteness by means of \(D_{\text{DR}}\) in (25b). \(D_{\text{DR}}\) further appears in two forms: as a Q modifier or as a predicate modifier, shown as follows (adapted from Etxeberria and Giannakidou (2018: (41)):

(25) Types for D:
   a. Saturating: \(et \rightarrow e\) (iota): e.g. English \(the\)
   b. Non-saturating: \(et,ett \rightarrow et,ett\) (\(D_{\text{DR}}\) on Q): e.g. Greek \(o\), Basque \(ak\)

In what follows, exploring the empirical dimension, I examine how the distinct morphological demonstrative forms in Salish and Korean relate to each other by showing that the notion of domain restriction is fruitful when applied to Korean \(KU\). The theoretical discussion to come will therefore include familiarity, uniqueness/maximality, and domain restriction.

3. Data: Core properties of definite \(KU\)

3.1 Familiarity

The condition of felicitous use of the definite \(KU\) requires familiarity, i.e., interlocutors presupposing a prominent antecedent in discourse. This is supported by the following empirical evidence. \(KU\) is not allowed to occur in the discourse in which an NP is introduced as a new (novel) entity. As shown in (26), \(KU\) denotes the novel entity \(wang\) ‘king’, and the sentence is ruled out:

(26) yeysnal etten nala-ey han/*\(KU\) wang-i
    Once.upon.a.time a.certain country-Loc one/KU king-Nom
    sal-ass-ta. live-Past-Decl

\[ \text{[Korean]} \]

\(^2\)Another example of morphologically non-article type \(D_{\text{DR}}\) comes from the Chinese maximal operator \(dou\) (Cheng 2009) used with free choice items (Giannakidou and Cheng 2006).
'Once upon a time, there lived a king in a country.'

The impossibility of KU with a newly introduced entity supports the claim that the occurrence of KU necessarily demands a familiar antecedent in a given context. KU is used when the interlocutors’ common knowledge of the discourse referents allows an implicature to be drawn about the antecedent. Another crucial property of KU is its optionality with anaphoric definite NPs, since the bare nouns are the default form to express definiteness (refer back to (6)):

\[(27)\] na-nun onul han ye haksayng-ul po-ass-ta.
I-Top today one female student-Acc see-Past-Decl
(ku/*i/*ce) ye haksayng-un hayngpokhay-poi-ess-ta. [Korean]
KU/this/that female student-Top happy-look-Past-Decl
‘Today I saw a female student. The/that female student looked happy.’

As shown above, the co-referent of a bare noun ye haksayng ‘female student’ is determined in context. It refers back to the contextually salient female student in the first sentence, a female student the speaker saw yesterday.

However, even in some anaphoric context in which an explicit antecedent is given, the referent of bare nouns can be ambiguously interpreted between definite and indefinite. In this case, the overt marking of KU is obligatorily used for disambiguation. For example, as illustrated in (28), the unmarked bare noun haksayng ‘student(s)’ (28a) in the second sentence has an ambiguous interpretation; the student John will meet today can be either the same student he met yesterday (i.e., definite) or a new student (i.e., indefinite). In contrast, KU unambiguously establishes co-referential interpretation, which is grounded to individual(s) salient in that context. As shown in (28b), when KU is marked, ku haksayng ‘KU student’ in the second sentence necessarily refers back to the student in the first sentence, the same student John met yesterday:

\[(28)\] a. Con-un ecey haksayng han-myeng-hako
John-Top yesterday student one-Cl-with
myentam-ul ha-ss-ta. onul-to haksayng-hako
meeting-Acc do-Past-Decl today-also student-with
myentam-ul ha-n-ta. [Korean]
meeting-Acc do-Pres-Decl
‘I had a meeting with a student yesterday. Today, I have another meeting with a/the student.’

b. Con-nun ecey haksayng han-myeng-hako
John-Top yesterday student one-Cl-with
myentam-ul ha-ss-ta. onul-to ku haksayng-hako
meeting-Acc do-Past-Decl today-also KU student-with
myentam-ul ha-n-ta. [Korean]
meeting-Acc do-Pres-Decl
‘John had a meeting with a student yesterday. Today, I have another meeting with the/that student.’

Simply put, the definites in KU are co-referential, and KU is necessarily used when it picks out
the exact antecedent, very much like an anaphor. What we see here is that the distribution of KU in the use of anaphoricity is exactly the same as the definite descriptions.

3.2 (Anti-)uniqueness/maximality
Before jumping into the main discussion of the Korean data, I briefly present the previous studies that suggest the unified role of definite and demonstrative descriptions in terms of uniqueness with the (non-)default situation constraint. Then we will look at whether this approach is applicable to Korean KU. The recent literature on definiteness in English has argued that the definite the and the demonstrative that have in common in that they both give rise to uniqueness/maximality. The crucial distinction follows from the constraint placed on the domain relative to which uniqueness/maximality is computed (Wolter 2006; Ionin et al. 2011, 2012, a.o.). As illustrated in (29), although definite and demonstrative description have in common denoting the unique x in a given situation, they differ in the sense that the uniqueness of definite description is defined relative to the default situation in (29a), whereas the uniqueness of demonstrative description is defined relative to the non-default situation in (29b):

(29) Semantic entries of the and that (Ionin et al. 2011: (6))
   a. A sentence of the form [theₐ A] B presupposes that there exists a unique individual
      which is A in sₐ and asserts that the unique individual which is A is also B in sₐ.
   b. A sentence of the form [thatₐ A] B presupposes that there exists a unique individual
      which is A in sₐ, where sₐ is non-default, and asserts that the unique individual
      which is A is also B in sₐ.

The examples are illustrated in (30). (30a) is a non-salient, default situation in which the sentence contains only one woman. Therefore, the use of the demonstrative that is infelicitous. On the other hand, the situation in (30b) contains two women, so it is salient and non-default. In the non-default situation, the definite article the cannot pick out a unique referent, but a referent of that woman can be made salient through prior mention. They must denote the woman who entered from stage right, the one in the immediately salient context:

(30) a. The curtain rose. A woman and a man came onto the stage. Then #that/the woman
     started singing and dancing. (Ionin et al. 2012: (8b))
     b. A woman entered from stage left. Another woman entered from stage right.
        That/#the woman was carrying a basket of flowers. (Wolter 2006: 4)

Given the assumption that the morphological form of KU corresponds to the demonstrative ku, at first glance one might expect that its pragmatic constraint on uniqueness/maximality would be the same as for the English that, which is not clearly true. In fact, as observed in previous literature (Chang 2009; Ahn 2017; Cho 2017, a.o.), the role of KU involves only anaphoric reading. It lacks uniqueness/maximality. It is bare nouns that induce the property of uniqueness (i.e. argument-saturating) to create a referential expression of type e (adapted from Cho 2017, pp. 373 following Chang 2009):
As shown in the above table, whereas Korean bare nouns can form anaphoric definite and non-anaphoric definite NPs, KU does not make non-anaphoric definite NPs, which only gives rise to uniqueness/maximality. It leads us to assume that uniqueness/maximality is not lexically encoded in Korean KU. The following examples provide crucial empirical support for the current proposal: First, KU does not give arise to uniqueness in situational use (Hawkins 1978; Lyons 1999; Swarts 2009). As illustrated below, unlike English definite description, which refers to a unique referent associated with the situation mentioned in (31) and (33), the use of KU is redundant and unacceptable in the immediate situation in (32) and the larger situation in (34):

**Immediate situation (out of context):**

(31) **The** moon was very bright last night.  
(32) eceyspm (*ku) tal-un acwu palk-ass-ta.  
   Last.night KU moon-Top very bright-Past-Decl  
   ‘The/*that moon was very bright last night.’

**Larger situation:**

(33) **The** President of the United States came to the State of Ohio.  
(34) (*ku) mikuk taythonglyeng-i ohaiocu-ey o-ass-ta.  
   KU US president-Nom the.state.of.Ohio come-Past-Decl  
   ‘The/*that President of the United States came to the State of Ohio.’

Further, as shown below, in a default situation that corresponds to the English example in (30a), the occurrence of KU is felicitous. As shown below, in a context where a default situation contains only one woman (35), the optional use of KU is felicitous. ‘(KU) women’ can felicitously refer back the discourse referent mentioned in the first sentence. If we assume that its function is the same as the English demonstrative as revealed in the translation, and the occurrence of KU is not allowed in a default situation, its occurrence in (35) should be strictly prohibited, which it clearly is not:

(35) khethun-i ollaka-ss-ta. han namca-wa yeca-ka mwutay-lo  
   curtain-Nom rise-Past-Decl one man-Conn woman-Nom stage-Loc  
   nawa-ss-ta. kapcaki (ku) yeca-ka chwumchwu-ko  
   come-Past-Decl suddenly KU woman-Nom dance-Conn  
   nolaypwulu-ki sicakhay-ss-ta.  
   come-Conn suddenly woman-Nom sing-Nomz start-Past-Decl  
   ‘The curtain rose. A woman and a man came onto the stage. Suddenly #that/the

---

3 I thank Klaus von Heusinger and Junko Shimoyama (personal communication) for bringing this important point to my attention.
woman started singing and dancing.’

The use of KU is felicitous in a default situation because it can be used in contexts where familiarity is established in the (immediately) prior discourse. The implication of the above empirical examples reveals that a constraint on the domain of KU is not sensitive to (non-)default situations, and such a generalization to a traditional type-saturating function fails to capture the true spectrum of definiteness in Korean. Hence the analysis loses its basis.

Rather, I argue that what is common to both KU and typical demonstratives is that they both convey *contrastivity* (i.e., partitivity or anti-uniqueness (Barker 1998)). It is in line with the cross-linguistic tendency that marking contrasted referents is a typical function of anaphoric demonstratives (Diessel 1999). In Korean, when KU is used anaphorically, it tends to place emphasis or contrastive focus on the NP (Chang 1984; Ionin et al. 2012, a.o.). The occurrence of KU presupposes the existence of (implicitly) contrasting with another entity of the NP arguments to which it is attached. As illustrated in (36), which is the corresponding English non-default situation in (30b), the referent of ‘KU women’ is made salient through prior mention (i.e., the woman entered from stage right). In this case, the overt making of KU is strongly preferred. The occurrence of KU is felicitous not because of the non-default situation, but because of contrastivity, which reveals that the woman (who entered from stage right) is being contrasted with another woman (who entered from stage left).

(36) han ye-ca-ka mwutay oynccok-eyse tuleo-ass-ta.
    one woman-Nom stage left-from enter-Past-Decl

talun ye-ca-ka mwutay olunccok-eyse tuleo-ass-ta.
another woman-Nom stage right-from enter-Past-Decl

(?'?ku) ye-ca-nun kko-chpakwuni-lul tul-ko.iss-ess-ta. [Korean]
KU woman-Top basket.of.flowers.Acc carry-Asp/Prog-Past-Decl

‘A woman entered from stage left. Another woman entered from stage right. That/#the woman was carrying a basket of flowers.’

The property of contrastivity, which is deeply connected with the notion of partitivity, is crucial characteristic of KU. I will come back to more discussion of partitivity in Section 3.3.

More importantly, although the property of uniqueness/maximality is present in KU, the interpretation of uniqueness/maximality is necessarily yielded in KU-marked definite NPs in a given salient context. As shown below, KU can be felicitously interpreted as being exhaustive where *KU sonnim* ‘KU guest(s)’ refers back to the maximal antecedent, John, Peter, and Mary in (38a). Its felicitous use is guaranteed by the fact that the sum of John, Peter, and Mary is considered to be maximal individuals that the hearer can single out by means of KU:

*Context: John, Peter and Mary are known as notorious guests to their friends. Three days ago, Jack threw a party and John, Peter, and Mary were invited. Today, Ann asks Jack what John and Mary were like:*

(37) Con-kwa Phethe-wa Meyli-ka etteha-(e)ss-ni? [Korean]
    John-and Peter-and Mary-Nom how.about-Past-Q

‘How did John, Peter, and Mary behave?’
Context: Jack answers that he actually liked them as guests. But there were other guests that he did not like. The answer would be:

(38) a. ku/*i/*ce sonnim-tul-un kwaynchanh-ass-e.
   KU guest-pl.-Top good-Past-Decl
   ‘The guests (denoting John, Peter, and Mary) behaved well.’

b. ku/*i/*ce sonnim-tul-un kwaynchanh-ass-e.
   KU guest-pl.-Top good-Past-Decl
   #haciman meyli-ka com isangha-ess-e.
   but Mary-Nom a.bit bizarre-Past-Decl
   ‘The guests (denoting John, Peter, and Mary) behaved well. #But Mary was a bit bizarre.’

c. sonnim-tul-un kwaynchanh-ass-e. [Korean]
   guest-pl.-Top good-Past-Decl
   ‘The guests behaved well.’

The question in (37) sets up an antecedent of John, Peter, and Mary like a discourse topic; the set of John, Peter, and Mary creates a domain of contextually salient subset, which is characterized as being given in a discourse. When KU combines with sonnim ‘guest(s)’ in (38a), it refers back to the maximally salient entities as its antecedent, the set of John, Peter, and Mary. KU-marked NP should include all members of the given set exhaustively. Maximality is further evidenced by (38b). If one assumes that the referent of KU sonnim ‘the guest(s)’ in the first sentence denotes John and Peter but not Mary, rather than maximal members given in a discourse, she violates the maximality and the sentence becomes infelicitous.

How can the interpretation of (38c) be captured? In (38c), the bare plural noun sonnim-tul ‘the guests’ is also a felicitous answer. If we drop KU, as I mentioned above, the domain of the bare nominal sonnim-tul ‘the guests’ would be pragmatically determined; thus, it does not have to pick up the exact antecedent. Rather, it would pick up the guests other than them, and the implication arises that Peter, John, and Mary did not behave well. If the speaker wants to avoid implicature, she will attach KU because it necessarily picks out the explicit anaphoric antecedent given in the discourse.

I close this subsection by showing the contrast between Japanese so-no and Korean KU. As mentioned in Section 2, although the semantic contribution of Japanese adnominal demonstrative so-no is analyzed as a domain restrictor, it is not exactly equivalent to Korean KU. According to Kaneko (2014), so-no lacks a uniqueness or maximality presupposition in all its uses. As shown below, the referents of so-no koinu ‘so-no puppy’ may be not maximally identified with the seven puppies introduced in the preceding sentence, which is confirmed by B’s question of ‘How many puppies?’ (Kaneko 2014: (13):

(39) A: pet shop-ni totemo kawai koinu-ga nana-hiko imasita.
PIt-shop-Loc very pretty puppy-Nom seven-CL were
watasi-wa so-no koinu-o kaimasita.
I-Top SO-NO puppy-Acc bought
‘The pet shop has seven very pretty puppies. I bought (one, some or all) of those puppies.’

B: nan-biki katta-no desu-ka?
What-CL bought-Comp Cop-Q
‘How many (puppies) did you buy?’

In contrast, in the same context, the following question in (40B) is not allowed since it violates maximality:

(40) A: phey syop-ey kwieywun kangaci ilkop-mali-ka iss-ess-e.
   pet shop-Loc pretty puppy seven-CL-Nom exist-Past-Dec
   na-nun ku #kangaci-lul/kangaci-tul-ul sa-ss-e.
   I-Top KU puppy-Acc/puppy-Pl-Acc buy-Past-Dec
‘The pet shop has seven pretty puppies. I bought all of those/the puppies.’

B: #myes-mali sa-ss-e?
What-CL buy-Past-Q
‘How many (puppies) did you buy?’

This empirical contrast leads us to lead that the behavior of Japanese so-no is not exactly equivalent to that of Korean KU. While the discussion is worth pursuing in detail, it is beyond the scope of this paper, and I skip further discussion for reasons of space.

3.3 Domain restriction
The third core property of definiteness in Koran KU is domain restriction. In this subsection, we see the case of D_{DR} KU functioning as a Q modifier. It is supported by the following empirical evidence in which KU is compatible with quantified nouns such as free choice items. Traditionally, there are two types of FCI in Korean, i.e., nwukwu-na and amwu-na, as shown below:

(41) a. nwukwu-na ‘everyone/anyone’
    b. amwu-na ‘anyone’

It has been argued that wh-indeterminates are ‘contextually specific’ in that they involve a discourse-given (i.e., salient) set. In this regard, nwukwu-na is domain-determined, whereas amwu-na is domain-undetermined (i.e. domain-widening) (Choi 2007, a.o.). As shown in the gloss below, nwukwu-na denotes the contextually specified set ‘everyone from a contextually specified set’, whereas amwu-na is interpreted as ‘anyone’:

(42) a. haksayng-tul nwukwu-na i il-ul ha-lswuiss-ta.
    student-Pl who-or this job-Acc do-possible-Decl
    ‘Everyone/all of the students (from a contextually specified set) can do this job.’
    b. haksayng-tul amwu-na i il-ul ha-lswuiss-ta. [Korean]
    students any-or this job-Acc do-possible-Decl

---

4 Korean FCIs are composed of an indefinite and a particle. Basically, there are two indefinites (i.e., nwukwu- and amwu- ‘who’) and one particle (i.e., –na ‘or’) that can combine (Lee et al. 2000; Choi 2007; Park 2009, a.o.).
‘Any student can do this job.’

Among those two indefinites, KU is compatible only with *nwukwu-na* and denotes a *contextually restricted subset*.

Crucially, just like bare nouns, since the domain of bare FCI is determined depending on the context, its interpretation can be ambiguous. For example, in (43), we notice two different resources of domain restrictions of bare FCI: *nwukwu-na* ‘everyone’ conveys a contextually specified domain ranging over individuals in the semantics class (44a) or every individual first-year student in the semantics class (44b). Although the FCI *nwukwu-na* allows both interpretations, the interpretation of *nwukwu-na* by itself prefers to pick out the set of everyone in the semantics class:

*Scenario:* An advisor, Susan, heard that the students of semantics I class plan to go to the pub tonight. Susan was worried if the first-year students are all over 21 years old and if they are allowed to enter the pub. Susan asks another professor, Bill, of semantics I:

(43) il-haknyen haksayng-tul-i phep-ey ka-lswuiss-eyo? [Korean]
    first-year student-PL-Nom pub-Loc go-possible-Q
    ‘Are first-years allowed to go to the pub?’

*And Bill answers:*

(44) *nwukwu-na* phep-ey ka-lswuiss-eyo.
    who-or pub-Loc go-possible-Decl
    a. ‘Everyone/all of the students (in semantics class) is allowed to go to the pub.’
    b. ‘Everyone/all of the students (in the first year) is allowed to go to the pub.’

(45) ku/*i/*ce (cung) *nwukwu-na* phep-ey ka-lswuiss-eyo. [Korean]
    KU among/of who-or pub-Loc go-possible-Decl
    a. #Everyone/all of the students (in semantics class) is allowed to go to the pub.’
    b. ‘Everyone/all of the students (in the first year) is allowed to go to the pub.’

When KU is attached to the *na*-indeterminate in (45), the domain of FCI is contextually more restricted; thus, *KU (haksayng-tul) (cung) nwukwu-na* can be interpreted as the set of ‘every first-year student in the semantics class’. Given that KU needs some strict linguistic antecedents, KU combines with *wh*-indefinite based quantifiers to yield a domain that is characterized as being given in a discourse contrasted with another (larger) domain. KU triggers the anaphoric presupposition that the common ground contains a contextually salient set of individuals, a set of first-year students. It needs to pick out the exact antecedent, very much like a property anaphor. KU quantifies over a subset of the students in the semantics class by contrasting two contextual sets (i.e. the students in the semantics class vs. the students in the first year). When the antecedent of KU has an antecedent of quantified set, the domain of KU creates a subset of the contextually salient larger domain in discourse. Hence we get the partitivity.

KU cannot co-occur with QPs whose domain is unrestricted. As illustrated below, *amwu* is a domain-undetermined indefinite (i.e., domain widener in Choi (2007)) and it is NOT compatible with KU, since there is no domain to be referred back anaphorically.
The above data provides crucial evidence that the domain-restricting condition is a precondition for the felicitous use of KU. Given the consistent parallels between the KU and domain restrictor we have observed so far, it is plausible to treat KU in Korean as a D_{DR}:

(47) KU = contextual domain restrictor = D_{DR}

As a D_{DR}, KU comes to create an anaphoric domain which presupposes a discourse familiar property to be anchored to. The semantic function of KU is not relevant to the argument-saturating, but non-saturating. Thus, the main role of definiteness markers in Korean is split into the saturating and non-saturating as follows:

(48) Types for definiteness marking in Korean:
   a. Saturating: covert D
   b. Non-saturating: D_{DR} KU
      i. D_{DR} on Q: e.g. (45)
      ii. D_{DR} on NP

The first type of D is a typical argument-saturating in bare nouns, which produces a unique or maximal argument of type e; the other is D_{DR} KU, which gives rise to the contextual presupposition indicated by anaphoric variable C.

4. Analysis: KU as a contextual domain restrictor

In this section, we introduce the formal mechanisms that underlie the key assumption that two distinct types of definiteness markers can be syntactically integrated into DP. For the syntactic configuration, building on Universal structure hypothesis (Abney 1987; Szabolcsi 1987; Longobardi 1994), I follow previous studies that Korean employs nominal phrases that are projected by a determiner head (Jo 2000; Suh 2005; Chang 2009, a.o.).

(49)

```
    D
   /\  
  /   
D    N
```

Pronounced or salient

In the sense of Universal structure hypothesis, all nominal arguments must be DPs in which null determiners are posited. In this vein, nouns are predicates denoting properties, and the determiner is always present in the structure serving as a type-shifter (i.e., argument-saturating function) turning nouns into arguments:
The definite D has two grammatical functions: semantic D and syntactic D. Given that the syntactic head D has been generally treated as the locus of the semantic feature of uniqueness and maximality (Lyons 1999, a.o.), we can assume that the covert D in referential use is in the canonical position of D-head. In this vein, in the grammar of Korean domain restriction, $D_{\text{DR}}$ should have different syntactic positions and semantic meanings from the traditional definite D. As shown in (49a), unlike, English where the position of the determiner should be obligatorily filled, the head of D in Korean is filled by the referential Covert D (i.e., left vacant), which is a default in forming DP. It is a syntactic D that takes a predicate and makes an argument of type $e$. On the other hand, the operation of $D_{\text{DR}}KU$ over the NP does not affect the grammaticality of DP (Choi 2017). It makes KU appear optionally for the manifestation of contextual domain restriction in an attachment site for an adjunct modifier. As a result, we come to have the following syntactic structure of DP in (51):

(51) a. bare DP structure  

(52) b. KU-marked DP structure

Here I provide a detailed explanation of the strategy for obtaining $e$-type denotation in KU marked structure: As a domain restrictor, $D_{\text{DR}}KU$ can operate either on the noun phrase or on the quantificational argument, since $D_{\text{DR}}$ is a function that introduce the context set variable C. When KU undergoes $D_{\text{DR}}$, it actually has a C-variable in it, and this C-variable makes KU anaphoric. By supplying C, KU triggers the presupposition that the common ground contains a property that can function as the antecedent for C. The NP and QP are consequently anaphoric to a discourse familiar property. In this regard, KU’s contribution is really this domain restriction, which refers back to the contextually familiar set. It draws values from the intersection of the set C with the NP. Given that the NP intersection with C will be a subset of that NP, KU creates partitivity. Since $D_{\text{DR}}KU$ is a type-preserving function, the top (default) D necessarily comes to saturate the predicate. Then the covert D starts out with a denotation that produces something of another type, and then shifts it into a function of type $<e>$. In this regard, the contribution of KU in DP is really a domain restriction, as follows:
The \( \text{D}_{\text{DR}} \) \( \text{KU} \) takes NP or QP argument and gives back a discourse familiar property while allowing the phrase to have the converter D for the final saturation. I will term this discrepancy a *dissociation between meaning* (i.e., the function of D encoding definiteness) and *form* (i.e., D as an argument saturating function) in the DP structure. This type of mismatch is strongly evidenced in Korean.

Thus far, we have observed that the semantic function of the domain restrictor \( \text{KU} \) is to anaphorically denote the maximally salient set of property in context. Given the close connection between \( \text{D}_{\text{DR}} \) \( \text{KU} \) and familiarity, I close my discussion by showing how \( \text{KU} \) is explained under the framework of Roberts’s theory. Building on Heim’s (1982) system, Roberts (2002, 2003) refines the framework on definiteness, suggesting two types of familiarity, which are classified as weak familiarity and strong familiarity and shown as follows:

(54) Taxonomy of familiarity (Roberts 2002: (46)):
   a. Strong familiarity: the NP has as antecedent a discourse referent introduced via the utterance of a (usually) preceding NP.
   b. Weak familiarity:
      i. the entity referred to is globally familiar in the general culture or at least among the participants in the discourse (e.g., through perceptual acquaintance), although not mentioned in the immediate discourse (see (54a) below).
      ii. introduction of the NP’s discourse referent is licensed by contextual existence entailments alone (see (54b) below).
      iii. weak familiarity is guaranteed by giving a functional interpretation to the definite description (which function may have to be accommodated) (see (54c-d) below).

(55) a. One stranger to another: the sun is especially hot today.
   b. I dropped ten marbles and found only nine of them. The missing marble is probably under the sofa.
   c. John read a book about Schubert and wrote to the author.
   d. (To a European friend who knows nothing about West Virginia:)
      Last weekend we climbed the biggest mountain in West Virginia. (Roberts 2002: (47)-
The use of definites having strong familiarity is only licensed by prior mention and is anaphoric to a preceding linguistic expression. This is exactly what definite KU does in the discourse, in which its antecedent should be explicitly mentioned in prior discourse. To wit, the prerequisite of the definite KU is strong familiarity, in which the interlocutors share knowledge and the antecedent should be explicitly mentioned in prior discourse.\(^5\)

Notably, I subsume expended uses of KU under the more general analysis of Roberts’s framework. The dichotomy of strong and weak familiarity can be conceptually linked to the distinct realm of D\(_{DR}\) KU and its stretched use of emphasis marking mirativity. As shown below, when the spoken KU receives high prosodic prominences co-occurs with gradable NPs (just like Focus), the utterance expresses speaker’s strong surprise, and the emphatic status is overtly indicated by KU. For this reason, it seems appropriate to treat KU as an emphatic marker (adapted from Kang 2018: (1)):

(56) **Context:** Yesterday, Mary was invited to Kim’s place. Kim made dinner with tofu. Today, Ann asks Mary how the dish tasted. Mary tells Ann that the cooking was bad. Mary was surprised at the fact that a dish made with tofu could be unsavory because she likes tofu and tofu is delicious. Mary says:

```
yoli-nun masep-ess-e. (kim-i) KU_{H\%} masiss-nun
dish-Top unsavory-Past-Decl Kim-Nom KU_{emphatic} delicious-Adnz
twupwu-lo kulen masep-nun yoli-lul mantul-ess-e.
tofu-with such.a unsavory-Adnz dish-Acc cook-Past-Decl
```

‘Kim cooked an unsavory dish with that/the delicious tofu.’

‘The dish was unsavory. (It is unbelievable that) Kim cooked such an unsavory dish with that much delicious tofu!’

The emphatic KU raises an unexpectedness effect (i.e., mirativity): it encodes the speaker’s strong surprise at the unexpected situation in which Kim cooked an unsavory dish with delicious tofu. On its semantico-pragmatic effect for the felicitous use of the emphatic KU, Kang (2015, 2018) suggests that the following two conditions should be met: First, there are (at least two) alternative individuals restricted in the context. Second, the implicature triggered by

\(^5\) Although the use of D\(_{DR}\) KU appears quietly equivalent to the strong article in the sense that is used when the noun phrase refers to the maximally exhausted anaphoric referent, I argue, Korean definiteness system exhibits the strict contrast from the strong vs. weak D system in German (Schwartz 2009). The notable difference comes from the function of covert D in bare nouns since it encodes not only uniqueness, but also pragmatical anaphoricity.

\(^6\) One might suggest the use of recollective KU as the counterexample against the strong familiarity use of D\(_{DR}\). For example, KU in (i) denotes a coffee shop from prior experience of the interlocutors’ (Cho 1999 (6), adapted from Ionin et al. (2012), (12)):

(i) **KU** coffee shop-ey semannaca.

```
KU coffee shop-Loc see
```

‘See you at the coffee shop.’

Although the referent does not present explicitly in previous sentence, I consider the use of recollective KU as a subtype of D\(_{DR}\) in a broad sense of strong familiarity, given that the referent of coffee shop in past experience must have been introduced as an antecedent via the utterance of a preceding NP at some point.
the emphatic KU contributes to scalarity by presupposing that the alternatives are ranked on a scale. In this vein, the emphatic KU plays a role as a scalar intensifier that contributes a scalar implicature associated with the least likely end of the likelihood scale. Since the proposition with a low likelihood was out of the subject’s expectation, the speaker’s strong surprise arises. In other words, Mary was very surprised because she expects the likelihood of cooking a poor dish with delicious tofu to be extremely low. The use of emphatic KU originates from D_{DR} given that the first feature of the prerequisite (i.e., the assertion of the existence of contextually restricted alternative individuals) comes from the contextual restrictor variable C that, I argue, is lexically encoded in the D_{DR} KU.\(^7\)

Furthermore, the use of empathic KU is deeply related to the notion of familiarity in light of bridging (Hawkins 1978).\(^8\) As shown in (52bii) and (53c), bridging is related to weak familiarity in the sense that the mention of a previous NP triggers the identifiability of all the things typically associated with it. Unlike strong familiarity, the antecedent of weak familiarity does not need to be previously mentioned. Hence the emphatic KU in (54) induces the weak familiarity of bridging, since interlocutors must share the common knowledge that the tofu dish Kim cooked should contain an ingredient corresponding to the discourse referent of tofu. In light of this observation, we can conclude that the behavior of empathic KU as a scalar intensifier provides a crucial implication for the extended role of domain restriction. Much more needs to be said to gain a full understanding of the link between the emphatic KU and D_{DR}, which remains on my future agenda.

5. Conclusions
Recent studies of definiteness in DPs have yielded several theoretical analyses of their semantics and pragmatics, which have different implications for cross-linguistic variation. The aim of this paper was to contribute to this debate by offering a novel semantic analysis of Korean D. Its original motivation was that the traditional analysis of definiteness, which relies on the definite article attributed to their morphosyntactic properties, is not satisfactory. From a cross-linguistic perspective, languages exhibit a range of morphological overt marking that are linked to the notion of domain restriction. I showed that in Korean, the morphological demonstrative element

\(^7\) Kang suggests the semantic representation of emphatic KU as follows (Kang 2018: (10)):

(i) a. \[\text{KU}_{\text{emphatic}}(x)(P) = 1 \text{ iff } P(x) = 1;\]
\[\exists y[y \neq x \land C(y) \land P(y)] \land \forall y[y \neq x \to \text{likelihood}(P(y)) > \text{likelihood}(P(x))],\]
where \(P\) is the denotation of VP. (presupposition)

b. \[\text{KU}_{\text{emphatic}} = \lambda P \alpha \lambda x. \exists y[y \neq x \land C(y) \land P(y)] \land \forall y[y \neq x \to \text{likelihood}(P(y)) > \text{likelihood}(P(x))],\]
where \(P\) is the denotation of VP.

For a detailed discussion of the emphatic KU, see Kang (2018).

\(^8\) Note that KU freely gives rise to bridging interpretation. As shown below, on the basis of the general knowledge that books have authors, novel has the corresponding discourse referents with author, thus facilitating the bridging interpretation:

(i) nay-ka onul sosel-ul han-kwen sa-ss-nuntay,
I-Nom today novel-Acc one-CL buy-Past-Cons
(ku/*i/*ce) ceca-nun phulangsuin-i-ta.
KU/this/that author-Top French-be-Decl
I bought a novel today. The author is French.'
KU is adopted for the legitimate function of D_{DR} in natural languages.

Although D_{DR} KU is fully qualified as a definiteness marker, it has not yet fully taken over the syntactico-semantic role of the definite article. This is evidenced by the Korean D system split into the dichotomy of argument-saturating and non-saturating. The effect of the argument-saturating function is performed by the existence of covert D, whereas D_{DR} KU is a type-preserving non-saturating function. Semantically, the application of D_{DR} creates an anaphoric domain of NP to which a discourse familiar property is anchored. Syntactically, KU appears as an adjunctive in a lower DP layer. In this vein, we could get the dissociation in the grammar in terms of D_{DR} meaning and argument-building function. Developing such an account will afford us more detailed insight into the wide-ranging spectrum of domain restriction. Given the lexically encoded C-variable meaning, I showed how a conceptual connection between the D_{DR} KU and emphatic KU can be properly captured under the framework of strong/weak familiarity. In order to see the full picture of the role of domain restrictor, future studies should conduct an investigation that will provide an account of the landscape of KU in Korean.
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