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Abstract

On the syntax/semantics of Korean nominal particles

by

Han-byul Chung

Advisor: Professor Sam Al Khatib

In this dissertation, I investigate the structural positions of i/ka-marked DPs and un/nun-marked DPs in the light of Kratzer (1988; 1995) and Diesing (1990; 1992). In Korean, unlike German (and English in part), vP-external subjects and vP-internal subjects are not distinguishable at the surface. However, by adopting Kratzer (1988; 1995) and Diesing (1990; 1992), we are able to distinguish between vP-external DPs and vP-internal DPs in Korean.

According to Kratzer and Diesing, syntactic position of a DP has affect in the interpretation of the DP itself, as well as the interpretation of the sentence that contains the DP; only DPs interpreted within the vP will be given the existential reading, and only sentences with vP-external elements will be allowed the generic reading. That bare DPs and complex DPs marked by i/ka(L) are given the existential reading suggests that i/ka(L)-marked DPs are located within the vP. On the other hand, that simplest intransitive sentences with i/ka(H)-marked DP subjects are allowed the generic reading suggests that the DPs are interpreted outside of the vP.

Applying the same diagnostics to un/nun-marked DPs, that sentences with un/nun-marked subjects are allowed the generic reading suggests that the DPs are interpreted outside of the vP. The asymmetry in the linear word order confirms that un/nun-marked DPs are located above i/ka(H)-
marked DPs (outside of the vP).
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## Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>accusative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONT</td>
<td>contrastive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP</td>
<td>complementizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP</td>
<td>copula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>dative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECL</td>
<td>declarative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX</td>
<td>exhaustive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOC</td>
<td>focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT</td>
<td>future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>genitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HON</td>
<td>honorific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INF</td>
<td>infinitival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT</td>
<td>intransitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>negation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>nominative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAST</td>
<td>past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRG</td>
<td>progressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRT</td>
<td>particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRS</td>
<td>present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>interrogative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>relativizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOP</td>
<td>topic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Chapter 1

Introduction

In this thesis, I argue that i/ka-marked DPs are interpreted in two different syntactic positions; i/ka-marked DPs given the exhaustive reading (marked by i/ka(H)) are interpreted external to the vP, while non-exhaustive i/ka-marked DPs (marked by i/ka(L)) are interpreted vP internally. The argument is dependent on assumptions that I borrow from Diesing (1992), which is that the existential reading is only available to DPs located within the vP, while the generic reading is only available to sentences possessing vP-external material.

1.1. Background: semantic particles and Case particles

DPs in Korean generally appear with bound morphemes (nominal particles, hereafter). While DPs may appear without nominal particles in colloquial Korean, as in (1c), in most cases sentences are most natural when nominal particles are present. This is true for both proper nouns, as in (1a), and

(i) a. *Sacca-ka/l/nun*
   lion-NOM/ACC/TOP
b. *Kilin-i/ul/un*
giraffe-NOM/ACC/TOP

1 The alternation between i and ka, for i/ka is dependent on whether the host nominal preceding i/ka ends with a coda consonant or a vowel. The nominal host ending with a vowel is followed by ka, as in (ia), whereas the nominal host ending with a consonant is followed by i, as in (ib). Other nominal particles such as ul/lul and un/nun show similar alternation patterns.
common nouns, as in (1b).

(1) a. John-i/un talli-n-ta
    John-NOM/TOP run-PRS-DECL
    ‘John runs.’

b. Saca-ka/nun talli-n-ta
    lion-NOM/TOP run-PRS-DECL
    ‘A Lion runs.’

c. John/saca-ø talli-n-ta
    John/lion run-PRS-DECL
    ‘John/a lion runs.’

Nominal particles in Korean have been traditionally categorized into two types; semantic particles that add meaning to the host nominals (e.g. man and to in (2)), and case particles that reflect the grammatical function of the host nominal without adding any meaning (e.g. i/ka and ul/lul in (3)) (Choi 1937). With the introduction of the Generative Grammar framework, case particles were translated as Case particles that reflect the abstract structural Case assigned to the host DP (Case marker) (Lee & Ramsey 2000).4

---

2 Throughout the dissertation, Yale Romanization is used for Korean examples.
3 The particle i/ka will be glossed as NOM(inative Case marker), the particle ul/lul will be glossed as ACC(usative Case marker), and the particle un/nun will be glossed as Top(ic marker).
4 i/ka may also attach to non-arguments, such as ‘at all’ and ‘three-centimeters’ in (i). Since these non-arguments appear with the same particle marking the arguments adjacent to the non-argument, ‘word’ for ‘at all’, and ‘rain’ for ‘three-centimeters’, i/ka-marking on non-arguments were generally considered as duplicates or copies of the Case markers that appear with arguments adjacent to the adverbials.
(2) Special/Semantic Particles

a. \textit{John-man/to} \textit{Tom-ul} \textit{ttayly-ess-e}

\begin{tabular}{l}
John(NOM)-only/also & Tom(ACC)-ACC & hit-PST-DECL
\end{tabular}

‘Only John hit Tom/John also hit Tom.’

b. \textit{John-i} \textit{Tom-man/to} \textit{ttayly-ess-e}

\begin{tabular}{l}
John(NOM)-NOM & Tom(ACC)-only/also & hit-PST-DECL
\end{tabular}

‘John hit only Tom/John hit Tom also.’

(3) Case Particles; 	extit{i/ka} and 	extit{ul/lul}

a. \textit{John-i} \textit{Tom-ul} \textit{ttayly-ess-e}

\begin{tabular}{l}
John-NOM & Tom-ACC & hit-PST-DECL
\end{tabular}

‘John hit Tom.’

b. \textit{Tom-ul} \textit{John-i} \textit{ttayly-ess-e}

\begin{tabular}{l}
Tom-ACC & John-NOM & hit-PST-DECL
\end{tabular}

‘John hit Tom.’

\begin{enumerate}
\item Wechsler & Lee (1996) argued that 	extit{i/ka} that appear on adverbials, such as in (i), are results of Case domain extensions by the Case assigners. Cho (2000), on the other hand, argued that adverbials appearing with 	extit{i/ka} are assigned Cases by phonologically null preposition elements. The preposition element receives Case feature by incorporating into the adjacent Case assigning verbal head and copying the Case feature of the verbal head, which explains the appearance of multiple identical Case markers.
\end{enumerate}
c. #John-*ul* Tom-*i* ttaely-ess-*e*.

   John-ACC   Tom-NOM   hit-PST-DECL

   ‘John hit Tom.’

The status of *i/ka* as a semantically-empty Case marker has not gone undisputed, for two kinds of reasons. First, *i/ka* is not always required on Nominative DPs; DPs can host nominal particles without hosting *i/ka*, as in (1a), and DPs can even appear with no nominal morphology at all, as in (1c). Second, *i/ka*-marked DPs often - though not always - have readings that are not associated with Case-marking.

Taking the view that Case markers are morphological realizations of abstract Case, and assuming that Case does not possess any semantic features inherently (Chomsky 1995), the attachment of *i/ka* on a host DP was largely considered as a PF-operation that has no semantic consequences. That DPs marked by *i/ka* do not seem to appear with any consistent additional interpretation, as in (3), was generally considered to support the Case marker analysis of *i/ka*.

However, there are cases where attachment of *i/ka* seem to give rise to a difference in the interpretation. As noted in (1c), there are instances in Korean where nominative DPs may appear without any particles attached. And, at times, particle-less nominative DPs and DPs marked by *i/ka* are given different interpretations, as in (4); while the *i/ka*-marked DP in (4a) is ambiguous between the exhaustive reading and the neutral (non-exhaustive) reading, the nominative DP that appears without any Case particle in (4b) cannot be given the exhaustive reading.\(^5\)

\(^5\) Similarly, *i/ka* marking has been observed to provide the specific reading (H. Ahn 1988; Schütze 2001, among others). H. Ahn (1988) observes that while *i/ka*-marked DPs can be given the specific reading, as in (ia), particle-less DPs are not allowed the specific reading, as in (ib).
(4)  

a.  \textit{John-i paykophu-ta.}  

\begin{verbatim}
 John-NOM  hungry-DECL
\end{verbatim}

i. ‘John is the (only) one who is hungry.’ (Exhaustive reading)  

ii. ‘John is hungry.’ (Non-exhaustive reading)  

b.  \textit{John-φ paykophu-ta.}  

\begin{verbatim}
 John  hungry-DECL
\end{verbatim}

i. *‘John is the (only) one who is hungry.’ (Exhaustive reading)  

ii. ‘John is hungry.’ (Non-exhaustive reading)  

Based on the observation, it was argued that \textit{i/ka} may be responsible for the exhaustive reading given to \textit{i/ka}-marked DPs (Nam 1972; 1991; Shin 1975; Hong 1978; 1990; Schütze 1996; 2001, among others).  

\begin{verbatim}
6 Schütze (1996; 2001) uses the term contrastive focus to refer to the exhaustive interpretation given to \textit{i/ka}-marked DPs and argues that \textit{i/ka} in non-canonical positions are markers of focus. Shin (1975), and Hong (1978) uses the term exclusiveness and argues that \textit{i/ka} has the dual function of marking ‘subjects’ and ‘exclusiveness’.  

7 Others have acknowledged that \textit{i/ka} may at times provide exhaustive reading but have argued that the exhaustive reading is not inherent to the particle and is derived from the original meaning/function of \textit{i/ka} (Im 1972; Sung 1994; Mok 1998; Ko 2000; 2002, among others).
\end{verbatim}
1.2. Previous analyses

The observation that there are instances in which i/ka marking seem to provide the exhaustive reading to the host DP is by no means novel. Many have noted that i/ka-marked DPs may appear with the exhaustive reading, most often in association with prosodic focus (Im 1972; Nam 1972; Shin 1975; Hong 1978; 1990; Sung 1994; Mok 1998; Ko 2000; 2002, among others). Since exhaustive i/ka-marked DPs have the tendency to appear with prosodic prominence (or prosodic focus), the exhaustive i/ka-marked DPs were often discussed as a part of ‘focused’ i/ka-marked DPs (Schütze 1996; 2001; Ko 2000; 2002; Kim 2011, among others).\(^8,9\)

The literature on i/ka has taken three distinct approaches in handling the particle on the exhaustive i/ka-marked DPs. Some approaches take i/ka to be ambiguous between two phonologically identical particles, one being a marker of exhaustivity, and another a Case marker. (I call these the homophonous-particle analyses). Other approaches treat the particle as a marker of exhaustivity (the semantic particle analyses), and yet others take it to unambiguously mark Case (the Case particle analyses). We discuss these in turn.

1.2.1. The homophonous-particle analyses

According to homophonous particles analyses, the particle that appears on exhaustive i/ka-marked

---

\(^8\) A DP is prosodically prominent when it stands out from its environment by virtue of its prosodic characteristics (Terken & Hermes 2000). The DPs that are considered to be prosodically prominent in this paper are DPs that are produced with relatively high pitch accent (Kim 2011; Kim 2013).

\(^9\) Many of the works on ‘focused’ i/ka-marked DPs do not provide clear definition of focus. ‘Focused’ DPs are often DPs that appear with prosodic prominence and are given the exhaustive reading.
DPs and neutral *i/ka*-marked DPs are two entirely different lexical items that have identical surface forms; *i/ka* that appears on exhaustive *i/ka*-marked DPs is a semantic particle, while *i/ka* that appears on neutral *i/ka*-marked DPs is a nominative Case particle (Im 1972; Shin 1975; Hong 1978; Hong 1990; Schütze 1996; 2001). While such analyses help maintain the notion that Case markers do not possess semantic properties inherently, they fail to explain why DPs marked by the semantic particle *i/ka* are always nominative, as in (3), when other semantic particles like *man* and *to* can appear with both nominative and accusative DPs, as in (2) (Yoon 2004; Choi 2005). Secondly, the analysis does not explain how the two particles possess the same allomorphs *i* and *ka*. While it may be possible for two lexical items to possess the same surface form by coincidence, it is very unlikely for two lexical items to possess *two* phonologically identical allomorphs.

1.2.2. The semantic particle analyses

According to the semantic particle analyses *i/ka* is always a semantic particle (Mok 1998; Ko 2000; 2002; Chung 2014a, among others). A constant obstacle for the semantic particle analyses is to find a semantic attribute that is universal to all *i/ka*-marked DPs. As shown in (4a), *i/ka*-marked DPs are ambiguous between the exhaustive reading and the non-exhaustive reading, which suggests that the exhaustive reading is not universal to all *i/ka*-marked DPs. These analyses are also met with the same problem the homophonous particle analyses face; they fail to explain why *i/ka*-marked DPs are always nominative. If *i/ka* is purely a semantic marker, it should appear with both accusative and nominative DPs like other semantic markers in (2a), but as I pointed out in the previous section, *i/ka* marked DPs are always nominative.
1.2.3. The Case marker analyses

According to Yoon (2004) and Choi (2005), *i/ka* is always a nominative Case particle. The exhaustive reading on *i/ka*-marked DPs is not provided by *i/ka* but is attained structurally via movement; the exhaustive reading is attained when *i/ka*-marked DPs move (string-vacuously) to a functional projection responsible for the exhaustive reading (FocP), as in (5b), while neutral *i/ka*-marked DPs appear in [Spec, IP], as in (5a).^10

(5)  
\[ \text{IP} \; \text{John}-i(L) \quad \text{mesiss-ta.} \]

John-NOM handsome-DECL

‘John is handsome.’ (Non-exhaustive reading)

\[ \text{FocP} \; \text{John}-i(H)_i \quad \text{IP}_i \; \text{mesiss-ta.} \]

John-NOM handsome-DECL

‘John is the one who is handsome.’ (Exhaustive reading)

While the Case marker analyses provide an explanation for the exhaustive reading on *i/ka*-marked DPs without sacrificing the connection between *i/ka* and nominative Case, they fail to provide empirical motivation to posit the movement in (5b) for *i/ka*-marked DPs. Case marker analyses generally focus on providing arguments against semantic particle analyses and homophonous particle analyses, rather than providing direct argument for movement of *i/ka*-marked DPs given

^10 To distinguish between the two types of *i/ka*-marked DPs, *i/ka(H)* will be used for *i/ka* that appears with prosodic prominence, while *i/ka(L)* will be used for *i/ka* that appears with neutral prosody. Since exhaustive *i/ka*-marked DPs are always prosodically prominent, while neutral *i/ka*-marked DPs are not, *i/ka(H)*-marked DP will refer to exhaustive *i/ka*-marked DPs, while *i/ka(L)*-marked DPs will refer to neutral *i/ka*-marked DPs.
the exhaustive reading.

1.3. The proposal

The proposal of this thesis is of the third category: In agreement with Yoon (2004) and Choi (2005), I take exhaustive *i/ka*-marked DPs to appear in different structural positions from non-exhaustive *i/ka*-marked DPs. But unlike Yoon (2004) and Choi (2005), I argue that non-exhaustive *i/ka* DPs appear vP internally rather than at [Spec, IP], while exhaustive *i/ka*-marked DPs appear external to the vP.

In addition to the prosodic difference between exhaustive and non-exhaustive *i/ka*-DPs, the DPs differ in the availability of the existential readings. When prosodic prominence accompanies a bare common noun DP is marked by *i/ka* (*i/ka(H)*), the DP requires a presuppositional reading; the speaker must be familiar with the referent of the DP. When it does not (*i/ka(L)*), the DP requires an existential reading.


bird-NOM  fly-PRG-DECL

i. *(Among the group of animals) what is flying is a bird.*

(Presuppositional reading)

ii. There is a bird flying. (The existential reading)
b. Say-ka(H)  nal-ko iss-ta.
   bird-NOM  fly-PRG-DECL

i. (Among the group of animals) what is flying is a bird.
   Inference: No other animal (within the group) is flying

ii. *There is a bird flying. (The existential reading)

/ka(H)-marked DPs and /ka(L)-marked DPs are also different in how simple intransitive sentences with the DPs as their subjects are interpreted. Simple intransitive sentences with exhaustive /ka(H)-marked DPs as their subjects are given the generic reading, as in (7b), while sentences with neutral /ka(L)-marked DPs are not given the generic reading, as in (7a).

(7)  a. *John-i(L)  hyungpwokha-ta
   John-NOM  ferocious-DECL
   Intended meaning: ‘John has the tendency to be ferocious.’

b. John-i(H)  hyungpwokha-ta
   John-NOM  ferocious-DECL
   ‘John is the one who has the tendency to be ferocious.’
   (The generic sentence)

I argue that the differences between the exhaustive /ka-marked DPs (that are marked by /ka(H)) and the neutral /ka-marked DPs (that are marked by /ka(L)) in (6) and (7) arise because exhaustive /ka(H)-marked DPs are located outside of the vP, while neutral /ka(L)-marked DPs are located within the vP.
Assuming that the existential reading is only available to bare common nouns interpreted within the vP (Diesing 1990), that i/ka(L)-marked bare common nouns are given the existential reading suggests that i/ka(L)-marked DPs are interpreted within the vP, as in (8a). Assuming that the generic reading is only given to sentences with vP-external elements, that simple intransitive sentences with i/ka(H)-marked DPs as their subjects are given the generic reading suggests that i/ka(H)-marked DPs are interpreted outside of the vP, as in (8b).

### 1.4. Organization

The remainder of the dissertation will be organized as follows;

In chapter 2, I show that i/ka(H) and i/ka(L) has an effect on the interpretation of their host DPs as well as the sentences containing the DPs.

In chapter 3, I argue that that i/ka(L)-marked DPs and i/ka(H)-marked DPs are interpreted at two different positions at LF, based on the observation that i/ka(H)-marked bare common nouns and that sentences with i/ka(H)-marked subjects are given the generic reading. The argument depends on assumptions that I borrow from Diesing (1990) and Kratzer (1995).

In chapter 4, I add support to the argument that i/ka(L)-marked DPs and i/ka(H)-marked DPs are
interpreted at two different positions at LF based on the observation that \textit{i/ka}(L)-marked DPs are
given the existential reading, while \textit{i/ka}(H)-marked DPs are given the presuppositional reading.

In chapter 5, I extend the proposal to \textit{un/nun}-marked DPs. I argue that \textit{un/nun}-marked DPs are
located outside of the vP, based on the diagnostics used in chapter 3 and 4; bare common nouns
marked by \textit{un/nun} are not allowed the existential reading, and simple intransitive sentences with
\textit{un/nun}-marked subjects are given the generic reading.

In Chapter 6, I conclude my dissertation by presenting some of the remaining issues.
Chapter 2

Two types of *i*/*ka*-marked DPs

*i*/*ka*-marked DPs can be categorized into two types; *i*/*ka*-marked DPs that are given the exhaustive reading (exhaustive *i*/*ka*-marked DPs), and *i*/*ka*-marked DPs that are given the neutral (non-exhaustive) reading (neutral *i*/*ka*-marked DPs). What has been often noted about the two types of *i*/*ka*-marked DPs is that exhaustive *i*/*ka*-marked DPs have the tendency to appear with prosodic prominence, while neutral *i*/*ka*-marked DPs appear with neutral prosody.

In this chapter, I show that the two types of *i*/*ka*-marked DPs are also different in two other aspects as well. I show that neutral *i*/*ka*(L)-marked bare common nouns are given the existential reading, while exhaustive *i*/*ka*(H)-marked bare common nouns are given the presuppositional reading. I also show that simple intransitive sentences (sentences that consist of only a subject and a simple predicate) with exhaustive *i*/*ka*(H)-marked DPs as their subjects allow the generic reading, while simple intransitive sentences with neutral *i*/*ka*(L)-marked DPs as their subjects are not allowed the generic reading.

2.1. The exhaustive reading and prosodic prominence

The ambiguity in (4a) can be disambiguated by prosodic prominence; the exhaustive reading arises when the DP is given prosodic prominence. That *i*/*ka*-marked DPs are obligatorily given the exhaustive reading in environments where the DPs are obligatory given prosodic prominence
suggests that *i/ka*-marked DPs that appear with prosodic prominence are systematically given the exhaustive reading. However, that Case marker-less DPs and *un/nun*-marked DPs with prosodic prominence are not given the exhaustive reading suggests that prosodic prominence cannot be solely responsible for the exhaustive reading given to *i/ka*(H)-marked DPs.

### 2.1.1. The exhaustive DPs

A DP given the exhaustive reading (exhaustive DP, hereafter) is a DP whose referent is understood as the only entity (among a group of entities that are relevant) that possesses the property described by the predicate. The exhaustive reading is made most prominent, in English, with e.g. the use of ‘only’ and the use of ‘it’-clefts. For example, (9a) provides the inference that, according to the speaker’s knowledge, the person that hit Tom is only John, and that no other person relevant to this conversation hit Tom. Since (9a) and (9b) are given the exhaustive reading, the sentences cannot be followed by (9c), unless in a corrective context.

(9)  

a. It is John who hit Tom.

Inference: Other relevant individuals did not hit Tom.

b. Only John hit Tom.

c. Mary also hit Tom.

A characteristic of exhaustive DPs is that the speaker must be familiar with the referents of the DPs. (9a) and (9b) are awkward as discourse-initial utterances. The familiarity requirement may arise as exhaustive DPs involve selection from a pre-established set that includes the DPs. In other words, the utterance of (9a) and (9b) presupposes that there is a set of potential hitters (of Tom)
that includes John, and the speaker has exhaustively selected John as the hitter.

2.1.2. Prosodically prominent $i$/$ka$-marked DPs and the exhaustive reading

There are three environments in Korean in which $i$/$ka$-marked DPs are obligatorily given prosodic prominence; in answers to questions, in specificational copular sentences, and in kes-clefts. And in all three environments, $i$/$ka$-marked DPs are obligatorily given the exhaustive reading.

2.1.2.1. $I$/ka-marked DPs in answers to questions

When $i$/$ka$-marked DPs replace the wh-word in question-answer pairs, they must appear with prosodic prominence, as in (10a), (11a), and (12a). The sentences become ungrammatical, when the DPs are marked by $i/ka$(L), as in (10b), (11b), and (12b).

(10) Q:  *Nwukwu-ka*  Tom-ul  ttayly-ess-ni?
        who-NOM  Tom-ACC  hit-PST-Q
        ‘Who hit Tom?’

     John-NOM  Tom-ACC  hit-PST-DECL
     ‘John hit Tom.’

  b.  *#John-i*(L)  Tom-ul  ttayly-ess-e
      John-NOM  Tom-ACC  hit-PST-DECL

       John-NOM  Tom-ACC  hit-PST-Q  Mary-NOM  hit-PST-Q
       ‘Did John hit Tom or did Mary hit Tom?’
a. *John-i(H)  Tom-ul  ttayly-ess-e*
   
   John-NOM  Tom-ACC  hit-PST-DECL
   
   ‘John hit Tom.’

b. *#John-i(L)  Tom-ul  ttayly-ess-e*
   
   John-NOM  Tom-ACC  hit-PST-DECL

(12) Q: *Mary-ka  Tom-ul  ttayly-ess-ni?*
   
   Mary-NOM  Tom-ACC  hit-PAST-Q
   
   ‘Did Mary hit Tom?’

a. *Ani,  John-i(H)  Tom-ul  ttayly-ess-e*
   
   No  John-NOM  Tom-ACC  hit-PST-DECL
   
   ‘No, John hit Tom.’

b. *#Ani,  John-i(L)  Tom-ul  ttayly-ess-e*
   
   No  John-NOM  Tom-ACC  hit-PST-DECL

Generally, when one asks a question, the expectation is that the listener will try to be as informative as they possibly can.\textsuperscript{11} In other words, the answers are expected to be an exhaustive listing of possible answers (as thought by the listener). In that sense, *i/ka(H)-marked DPs that appear as answers in (10a), (11a), and (12a) are expected to be exhaustive DPs. As expected, in (10a), (11a), and (12a) *John* is understood to be the only person that hit *Tom*. Thus, given a context in which the speaker is aware that John is not the only person that hit Tom, the answers in (10a), (11a), and (12a) are all deemed inappropriate (or truth conditionally false). The sentence in (13) is awkward

\textsuperscript{11} The maxim of quantity: be as informative as you possibly can, and give as much information as is needed, and no more \cite{Grice1975}.
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when following the answers in (10a), (11a), and (12a). In sum, \( i/ka(H) \)-marked DPs (\( i/ka \)-marked DPs that are prosodically prominent) that appear in question-answer pairs are understood as exhaustive DPs.

\[
\begin{align*}
(13) & \quad Mary & -to & \quad Tom & -ul & \quad tta\text{ly-ess-e} \\
& \quad Mary & -also & \quad Tom & -ACC & \quad hit-PST-DECL \\
& \quad \text{Mary also hit Tom.}
\end{align*}
\]

2.1.2.2. \( i/ka \)-marked DPs in specificational copular sentences

\( i/ka \)-marked DPs that appear as the value of a specificational copular sentence must also appear with prosodic prominence. These prosodically prominent \( i/ka \)-marked DPs are also obligatorily given the exhaustive reading.

Two types of copular sentences

Copular sentences can be categorized into two types; predicational copular sentences and specificational copular sentences (Halliday 1967; Higgins 1979; Akmajian 1979). A predicational copular sentence ascribes a property to its subject, as in (14). On the other hand, a specificational copular sentence specifies the value of a variable. According to Higgins (1979), specificational copular sentences can be divided into two parts; variable and value. The subject introduces a variable (e.g. the \( x \) such that \( x \) is the best candidate), while the post-copular expression provides

\[\text{---------------------------}\]

\(^{12}\) (13) can be acceptable following (10a), (11a), and (12a) when it is interpreted as to be correcting the previous statement.
the value for the variable (John), as in (15).

(14) Predicational copular sentence
   a. The lead actress in that movie is terrible.
   b. John is a doctor.

(15) Specificalional copular sentence.
   a. The lead actress in that movie is Ingrid Bergman.
   b. The best candidate is John.

English specificational copular sentences can be distinguished from predicational copular sentences with respect to the possibility of word order alternation. A specificational copular sentence allows word order alternation between the value and the variable, as in (16b), while a predicational copular sentence does not allow the NP-predicate to appear in subject position, as in (16a).

(16) a. *A doctor is John.
   b. John is the best candidate.

A specificational copular sentence is also distinguished from a predicational copular sentence in that both pre-copular and post-copular elements may refer to an individual. According to Chierchia (1985), an NP that refers to a specific individual cannot be used as a predicate. Since the post-copular element in a predicational copular sentence is always interpreted as the predicate (does not allow word order alternation), a predicational copular sentence cannot have an NP that refers to an individual in the post-copular position. Following Chierchia, (17a)
can be understood as a predicational copular sentence as ‘a student’ in (17a) need not refer to a specific individual. On the other hand, (17b) cannot be understood as a predicational copular sentence, as ‘the student’ in (17b) may only refer to a specific individual.

(17)  a. John is a student.
     b. John is the student.

**Specificational copular sentences in Korean**

The division between the two types of copular sentences is applicable to Korean as well. Copular sentences in Korean can be categorized into predicational copular sentences, such as (18a), and specificational copular sentences, such as (18b).\textsuperscript{13} That (18b) is a specificational copular sentence is supported by the observation that (18b) allows word order alternation, as in (20b), and that both NPs in (18b) denote individuals.\textsuperscript{14}

(18)  a. \textit{John-un(L) uysa-i-ta.}  
     John-TOP doctor-COP-DECL  
     ‘John is a doctor.’ (Predicational)

\textsuperscript{13} The specificational copular sentences in Korean have been also called equative copular constructions or identificational copular constructions (Jo 2007).

\textsuperscript{14} Detailed discussion on the meaning provided by \textit{un/nun} will follow in chapter 5. For now, it is enough for the readers to understand \textit{un/nun(L)} as a topic marker.

culprit-TOP  John-COP-DECL

‘The culprit is John.’ (Specificational)

Since Korean is a head-final language, the copula is located at the far right of the linear string. Therefore, copular sentences in Korean cannot be divided into pre-copular and post-copular elements, as shown in (19a).

\[(19)\]

\[\text{a. } \begin{array}{c}
\text{RP}^{15} \\
\text{John-un(L)} \\
\text{DP} \\
\text{uysa} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[\text{R'}
\]

\[\begin{array}{c}
\text{R} \\
\text{i-}
\end{array}
\]

\[\text{b. } \begin{array}{c}
\text{RP} \\
\text{John} \\
\text{R'}
\end{array}
\]

\[\begin{array}{c}
\text{R} \\
\text{DP} \\
\text{is} \\
\text{a doctor}
\end{array}
\]

However, we are able to identify word order alternation by adjacency to the copula. In (20b) we see that the word order alternation is possible between the value DP and the variable as the value DP may appear adjacent to the copula, as in (18b), or it may appear sentence-initially, as in (20b). On the other hand, the NP predicate of a predicational copular sentence in (18a) cannot appear sentence-initially, as shown by the ungrammaticality in (20a). In sum, that (18b) allows word order alternation, while (18a) does not, suggests that (18b)/(20b) is a specificational copular sentence.

\[\text{RP}^{15}\text{ stands for the relator phrase (den Dikken 2006). The copula is the relator head in both (19a) and (19b).}\]
(20) a. *uysa-nun/ka  

   doctor-TOP/NOM  John-COP-DECL
   ‘A doctor is John.’ (Predicational)

b.  John-i(H)  pemin-i-ta.

   John-NOM  culprit-COP-DECL
   ‘The culprit is John.’ (Specificational)

That (18b) is a specificational copular sentence is also supported by the fact that both NPs in (18b) denote individuals. Korean noun *pemin* is only understood as a specific individual related to some specific crime/event.16 Because of this, *pemin* may not appear as an NP predicate, as identified by the ungrammaticality of predicational copular sentence reading in (21a). On the other hand, (21b) can be given both the predicational copular sentence reading and the specificational copular sentence reading, as *haksayng* ‘student’ can be used as an NP-predicate.


   John-NOM  culprit-COP-DECL
   i.  *‘John is a culprit.’ (Predicational)
   ii. John is the culprit.’ (Specificational)

16 Similarly, in English the word ‘culprit’ is said to always denote specific individuals. The word ‘culprit’ is generally not allowed with an indefiniteness marker, as in (ia). In Google ‘a culprit of the crime’ and ‘a culprit of a crime’ had 4 results and 10 results respectively, while ‘the culprit of the crime’ and ‘the culprit of a crime’ had 37,500 results and 21,900 results respectively. Kandybowicz (p.c.) notes that there are exceptions to the generalization, as in (ii).

(i)  a. *John is a culprit.
   b. John is the culprit.
(ii) a. A culprit always has a guilty conscience
   b. Culprits are always brought to justice.
b.  *John-i  haksayng-i-ta.*

John-TOP   student-COP-DECL

i. ‘John is a student.’ (Predicational)

ii. ‘John is the student.’ (Specificational)

**Prosody of *i/ka*-marked value**

As previously illustrated, specificalional copular sentences allow word order alternation. The value may appear to the immediate left of the copula, as in (18b)/(22a), or it may appear sentence-initially, as in (20b)/(22b). When the value appears to the immediate left of the copula, the value NP does not appear with any nominal particle, as in (22a). On the other hand, when the value appears sentence-initially, it may be marked by *i/ka*, as in (22b).

(22)  a.  *pemin-un* (L)  *John-i-ta.*

culprit-TOP   John-COP-DECL

‘The culprit is John.’ (Specificational)

b.  *John-i(H)  pemin-i-ta.*

John-NOM   culprit-COP-DECL

‘John is the culprit.’ (Specificational)

When the value is marked by *i/ka*, it is always given prosodic prominence, as shown in (23). The sentence becomes ungrammatical when the *i/ka*-marked value appears without prosodic prominence, as in (23a).
This is quite different from predicational copular sentences. Subjects of predicational copular sentences may appear with prosodic prominence or without prosodic prominence, as in (24).\(^\text{17}\)

\begin{align}
\text{(24) a. } & \text{John-}i(L) \quad \text{uysa-i-}ta. \\
& \text{John-NOM} \quad \text{doctor-COP-DECL} \\
& \text{‘John is a doctor.’ (Non-exhaustive)}
\end{align}

\begin{align}
\text{b. } & \text{John-}i(H) \quad \text{uysa-i-}ta. \\
& \text{John-NOM} \quad \text{doctor-COP-DECL} \\
& \text{‘Only John is a doctor.’ (Exhaustive)}
\end{align}

In sum, when the value of a specificational copular sentence is marked by \textit{i/ka}, it must appear with prosodic prominence.

**The exhaustive reading of \textit{i/ka}-marked value**

An \textit{i/ka}-marked value of a specificational copular sentence in Korean is also given the exhaustive
reading obligatorily (Jo 2007). Given a context in which the speaker is aware that both John and Mary are the culprits, (25a) is deemed infelicitous as the value of a specificational copular sentence is given the exhaustive reading. In other words, John in (25a) is understood as the only culprit of the crime in question. The exhaustive reading is maintained when the value appears sentence-initially with the nominal particle i/ka(H), as shown by the infelicitous reading of (25b). Sentences are felicitous if both John and Mary are included in the i/ka(H)-marked phrase, as in (25c). Since i/ka(H)-marked are given the exhaustive reading, i/ka(H) can only attached to the entire conjunct phrase and not on the parts of the conjunct, as in (25d).

(25) Context: The speaker is aware that Mary and John are the culprits of the crime in question.

Q: *Nwukwu-ka pemin-i-ni?*

Who-NOM culprit-COP-Q?

‘Who are the culprits?’

a. *#pemin-un John-i-ta.*

culprit-TOP John-COP-DECL

‘The culprit (of the specific crime in discussion) is John.’

---

18 The equative reading, or the identificational reading in Jo’s (2007) terminology.

19 Note that not all i/ka-marked subject of copular constructions are obligatorily given the exhaustive reading. When i/ka-marked DPs appear as subjects of predicational copular sentences, they are ambiguous between the exhaustive reading and the non-exhaustive reading, as shown in (24a). However, here again, the ambiguity can be disambiguated by prosodic prominence.
b. \#John-i(H) pemin-i-ta.

John-NOM culprit-COP-DECL

‘John is the culprit (of the specific crime in discussion).’

c. John-kwa Mary-ka(H) pemin-i-ta.

John-and Mary-NOM culprit-COP-DECL

‘John and Mary are the culprits (of the specific crime in discussion).’

d. *John-i(H) kuliko Mary-ka(H) pemin-i-ta.

John-NOM and Mary-NOM culprit-COP-DECL

2.1.2.3. \textit{i/ka}-marked DPs in \textit{kes}-clefts

\textit{i/ka}-marked DPs in \textit{kes}-clefts are also given prosodic prominence obligatorily. Constructions involving \textit{kes} phrases, such as in (26), have been analyzed as cleft constructions that consist of a \textit{kes}-phrase, a pivot XP and a copular verb (Jhang 1994; Sohn 2004; Kim & Sells 2013, among others). Among \textit{kes}-clefts, there are some that allow word order alternation; the pivot may appear sentence-initially, as in (26a), or it may appear adjacent to the copula, as in (26b). When the pivot DP appears sentence-initially, it may be marked by the nominal particle \textit{i/ka}, as in (26a).\footnote{The sentence-initial pivot DP may also appear with \textit{un/nun}, as in (i) (Kim & Sells 2013). The exhaustive reading is not given when pivot DP appears with \textit{un/nun}.}

(i) \texttt{[pivot i ckay-un] [kes-phrase John-i sa-n kes]-i-ta}

\hspace{1cm} this book-TOP John-NOM buy-REL thing-COP-DECL

‘As for this book, John bought it.’
(26) a. \([\text{pivot} \, \text{panana-}k\hat{a}(H)] \, [\text{kes-phrase} \, \text{John-i} \, \text{mek-un} \, \text{kes-i-ta}]\]
   \begin{align*}
   &\text{banana-NOM} & \text{John-NOM} & \text{eat-REL} & \text{thing-COP-DECL} \\
   \end{align*}
\[ \text{‘Bananas are what John ate.’} \]

When the pivot DP is marked by \(i/ka\), the pivot DP must appear with prosodic prominence, as in (27a). The sentence becomes ungrammatical when the \(i/ka\)-marked pivot XP is not given prosodic prominence, as in (27b).

(27) a. \([\text{nameu-}k\hat{a}(H)] \, \text{Chelswu-ka} \, \text{cal-un} \, \text{kes-i-ta}\]
   \begin{align*}
   &\text{tree-NOM} & \text{Chelswu-NOM} & \text{cut-REL} & \text{thing-COP-DECL} \\
   \end{align*}
\[ \text{‘A tree is what Chelswu cut.’} \]

Pivot DPs that are marked by \(i/ka(H)\) have been observed to be given the exhaustive reading obligatorily (Jhang 1994; Kim & Yang 2009; Kim & Sells 2013; Chung 2014b).\(^{21}\) Given the context in which the speaker is aware that John ate not just bananas but also apples, (28a) is considered infelicitous (or truth conditionally false) as \(i/ka\)-marked pivot DPs are understood as the only thing that John ate. (28b) is felicitous as the exhaustive reading is not forced.

\(^{21}\) In Kim & Sells (2013), \(kes\)-clefts with \(i/ka(H)\)-marked pivot DPs appearing in sentence initial positions are categorized as a different type of cleft constructions, identificational \(kes\)-clefts, due to their obligatory exhaustive reading.
(28) Context: The speaker is aware that John ate apples and bananas.

a. #panana-ka(H)  John-i  mek-un  kes-i-ta
   banana-NOM  John-NOM  eat-REL  thing-COP-DECL
   ‘Bananas are what John ate.’

b. John-i  panana-lul(L)  mek-ess-ta
   John-NOM  banana-ACC  eat-PST-DECL
   ‘John ate bananas.’

2.1.2.4. Summary

In all three environments in which i/ka-marked DPs must appear with prosodic prominence, i/ka-marked DPs are obligatorily given the exhaustive reading. This suggests that i/ka-marked DPs given the exhaustive reading must appear with prosodic prominence.

We have seen that all exhaustive i/ka marked DPs require prosodic prominence. But are all prominent i/ka marked DPs interpreted exhaustively? Judgements indicate that the answer is yes. (29a) and (29b) are deemed infelicitous as John cannot be the only member of the Korean National Assembly nor the only starting member of a soccer team (based on our world knowledge). (29c) is felicitous as it is natural for there to be only one president of Korea. Sentences in (30) with

22 (29) may be deemed felicitous if the listener assumes that John is selected from a restrictive set, such as in (i). However, even in (i), i/ka(H)-marked DP is given the exhaustive reading as it is exhaustively selected from the given set.

(i) John-i(H)  (uli-cwungey-nun) yuilhan  cwukkwu-thim-uy  cwucen-senswu-i-ya.
   John-NOM  us-among-TOP  only  soccer team-GEN  starting-member-COP-DECL
   ‘John is the only starting member of the soccer team among us.’
prosodically neutral /ka/-marked DP is felicitous as the exhaustive reading is not forced.

(29) a. \#John-i(H) hankwuk-uy kwukhoyuywon-i-ta.
    John-NOM Korea-GEN assembly.member-COP-DECL
    ‘It is John who is the (only) member of the Korean National Assembly.’
    Inference: No one else is a member of the Korean National Assembly.

b. \#John-i(H) cuukwu-thim-uy cuucn-senswu-i-ya.
    John-NOM soccer team-GEN starting-member-COP-DECL
    ‘It is John who is the (only) starting member of the soccer team.’
    Inference: No one else is a starting member of the soccer team.

c. John-i(H) hankwuk-uy taythonglyeng-i-ta.
    John-NOM Korea-GEN president-COP-DECL
    ‘It is John who is the (only) president of Korea.’
    Inference: No one else is the president of Korea.

    John-NOM Korea-GEN assembly.member-COP-DECL
    ‘John is a member of the Korean National Assembly.’

    John-NOM soccer team-GEN starting-member-COP-DECL
    ‘John is a starting member of the soccer team.’

In sum, it seems that /ka(H)-marked DPs appear systematically with exhaustive DPs, while /ka(L)-marked DPs appear systematically with non-exhaustive DPs.
2.1.3. *i/ka*-marked DPs in negated and embedded clauses

The exhaustive reading is given to *i/ka*(H)-marked DPs under the scope of negation and in embedded clauses as well.

2.1.3.1. *i/ka*-marked DPs under negation

Korean has two types of negation construction; long negation with the negative morpheme *an* appearing between the verb and the declarative ending, as in (31a), and short negation with the negative morphology *an* appearing to the left of the verb, as in (31b). In both long negations and short negations, negative sentences with *i/ka*(H)-marked subjects are interpreted with the exhaustive reading; *i/ka*(H)-marked subjects are understood as the only entity (among a group of entities that are relevant) that possesses the property described by the negative predication.

(31) a. *John-i*(H)  *sakwa-lul*  *mek-ci*  *an-h-ass-ta*.
   John-NOM  apple-ACC  eat-ci  NEG-do-PST-DECL
   ‘The person who did not eat an apple is John.’
   Inference: No one else did not eat an apple.

b. *John-i*(H)  *sakwa-lul*  *an*  *mek-ess-ta*.
   John-NOM  apple-ACC  NEG  eat-PST-DECL
   ‘The person who did not eat an apple is John.’
   Inference: No one else did not eat an apple.

---

23 Long negations also appear with particle *ci* that attaches to the verb. The attachment of *ci* is generally considered as a morphological requirement.
Since *i*/*ka*(H)-marked DPs in negations are given the exhaustive reading, *i*/*ka*(H)-marked DPs are infelicitous in contexts where the exhaustive reading is inappropriate. Given the context in which the speaker is aware that both John and Mary did not come, (32A1) and (32A2) are truth conditionally false. However, if John is the only person that did not come, the sentence becomes truth conditionally true, as in (33A1) and (33A2). This suggests that *i*/*ka*-marked DPs are given the exhaustive reading under negation as well.

(32) Context: The speaker is aware that neither John nor Mary came.

Q:  *Nwukwu-ka an wa-ss-ni?*
    
    Who-NOM NEG come-PST-Q?
    
    ‘Who did not come?’

A1:*John-i*(H)  an  wa-ss-e.
    
    John-NOM NEG come-PST-DECL
    
    ‘John is the one who did not come.’

    
    John-NOM come-ci NEG-do-PST-DECL
    
    ‘John is the one who did not come.’

(33) Context: The speaker is aware that only John did not come.

Q:  *Nwukwu-ka an wa-ss-ni?*
    
    Who-NOM NEG come-PST-Q?
    
    ‘Who did not come?’
A1: John-i(H) an wa-ss-e.

John-NOM NEG come-PST-DECL

‘John is the one who did not come.’

A2: John-i(H) o-ci an-h-ss-ta.

John-NOM come-ci NEG-do-PST-DECL

‘John is the one who did not come.’

That i/ka(H)-marked DPs provide the inference that the negated predicate holds exhaustively of
the subject has been previously observed by Choi (2000). According to Choi (2000), there are two
types of negations in Korean; one that provides the exhaustive reading, and one that does not.24

According to Choi (2000), the two types of negations are distinguished by the marking on the
subjects; the subjects of the ‘exhaustive’ negations are marked by i/ka(H), as in (34a), while the
subjects of the ‘non-exhaustive’ negations are marked by un/nun(H), as in (34b). While it is not
mentioned in Choi (2000), i/ka(L)-marked DPs do not provide the exhaustive reading either. The
same is true for long negations, as in (35).

24 Choi (2000) uses the term ‘predicate denial’ and ‘predicate term negation’ to distinguish
between the two types of negations. According to Choi, predicate denial is a relation in which the
entire predicate is denied of the subject, as in (ib). On the other hand, predicate term negation is a
relation in which a negative predicate term is affirmed of a subject, as in (ic). According to Choi
(2000), predicate term negation sentences provide the inference that the negated predicate holds
exhaustively of the subject, while predicate denial sentences do not.

(i) a. Predicate affirmation: A is B.
b. Predicate denial: A is not B. (Non-Exhaustive)
c. Predicate term negation: A is not-B. (Exhaustive)
    John-NOM  apple-ACC  NEG  eat-PST-DECL
    ‘The person who did not eat an apple is John.’
    Inference: No one else did not eat an apple.

    John-TOP  apple-ACC  NEG  eat-PST-DECL
    ‘As for John, he did not eat an apple.’
    Inference: There are others who may not have eaten an apple.

    John-NOM  apple-ACC  NEG  eat-PST-DECL
    ‘John did not eat an apple.’

    John-NOM  apple-ACC  eat-ci  NEG-do-PST-DECL
    ‘The person who did not eat an apple is John.’
    Inference: No one else did not eat an apple.

    John-TOP  apple-ACC  eat-ci  NEG-do-PST-DECL
    ‘As for John, he did not eat an apple.’
    Inference: There are others who may not have eaten an apple.

    John-NOM  apple-ACC  eat-ci  NEG-do-PST-DECL
    ‘John did not eat an apple.’
2.1.3.2. *i*/*ka*(H)-marked DPs in embedded clauses

*i*/*ka*(H)-marked DPs are understood with the exhaustive reading when they appear within embedded clauses as well. Given the context in which Tom thinks that both John and Mary came, (36A) with *John* marked by *i*/*ka*(H) is considered infelicitous. On the other hand, the sentence with *i*/*ka*(H)-marked embedded subject in (37A) is felicitous when the exhaustive reading is deemed appropriate by the context. This suggests, that *i*/*ka*(H)-marked DPs are given the exhaustive reading in embedded clauses as well.

(36) Context: Tom thinks that both John and Mary came.

Q: *Tom-un nwukwu-ka wa-ss-tako saynkakha-yss-ni?*

Tom-TOP Who-NOM come-PST-COMP think-PST-Q?

‘Who did Tom think came?’


Tom-TOP John-NOM come-PST-COMP think-PST-DECL

‘Tom thought John was the one who came.’

(37) Context: Tom thinks that only John came.

Q: *Tom-un nwukwu-ka wa-ss-tako saynkakha-yss-ni?*

Tom-TOP Who-NOM come-PST-COMP think-PST-Q?

‘Who did Tom think came?’


Tom-TOP John-NOM come-PST-COMP think-PST-DECL

i. ‘Tom only thinks that John came.’

ii. ‘Tom thinks that only John came.’
(37A) is ambiguous between the reading in which the exhaustive reading is given to the matrix clause, as in (37Ai), and the reading in which the exhaustive reading is given to the embedded clause, as in (37Aii). However, in (37A), (37Ai) entails (37Aii). Thus, we may question whether i/ka(H)-marking is still available to the embedded subject when only the matrix clause is understood with the exhaustive reading but not the embedded clause.

Given a context in which the only person that the speaker is certain about coming to the party is John, but not certain about whether John is the only person coming to the party, (38a) with the embedded subject marked by i/ka(H) is infelicitous. This suggests that John cannot be marked by i/ka(H) when the embedded clause is not given the exhaustive reading.

25 Such predicates have been termed Neg-raising predicates. Neg-raising predicates are a class of predicates in which a sentence with a negative item at the matrix clause imply a corresponding sentence in which negation takes scope in the embedded clause. For example, (ia) entails (ib). Normally, external negation does not entail internal negation, as shown in (ii).

(i) a. Bill does not think that Mary is here.
   b. Bill thinks that [ Mary is not here ].

(ii) a. Bill is not certain that Mary is here.
   b. Bill is certain that [ Mary is not here ].

The Neg-raising predicates are also different from other predicates in how adverb ‘only’ is interpreted. When ‘only’, an adverb that expresses exhaustivity, appears at the matrix clause with a Neg-raising predicate ‘think’, as in (iii), it implies (iiiib). However, that is not the case when the matrix predicate is not a Neg-raising predicate, as in (iv). (ivb) does not imply (ivb).

(iii)a. Tom only thinks that [John will come to the party].
   b. Tom thinks that [only John will come to the party].

(iv)a. Tom is only certain that [John will come to the party].
   b. Tom is certain that [only John will come to the party].
(38) Context: Tom is only certain that John is coming, but is not certain that only
John is coming.

a. #Tom-un [John-i(H) on-tako] hwaksinha-n-ta.
   Tom-TOP John-NOM come-COMP certain-PRS-DECL
   ‘Tom is certain that only John is coming.’

   Tom-TOP John-TOP come-COMP certain-PRS-DECL
   ‘Tom is only certain that John is coming.’

2.1.4. Prosodic prominence and the exhaustive reading

The most striking difference between the exhaustive i/ka-marked DPs and the neutral i/ka-marked
DPs at the surface is the difference in prosodic prominence; one is prosodically prominent, while
the other is not. Therefore, it seems fair to wonder whether prosodic prominence is responsible for
the interpretive differences observed above.\(^{26}\) In this section, I argue that prosodic prominence
cannot be solely responsible for the interpretive differences as not all prosodically prominent DPs
are given the exhaustive reading. I will first look at prosodically prominent un/nun-marked phrases,
then turn to particle-less DPs.

2.1.4.1. un/nun-marked DPs with prosodic prominence

The nominal particle un/nun is generally analyzed as a semantic particle marking the topicality of

\(^{26}\) As Kandybowicz (p.c.) rightfully pointed out, given the separation between PF and LF, it is not
likely that the difference in the interpretation is directly caused by prosodic prominence.
a DP (Park 1999; Kim 2005; Nam 2005; Jo & Yoon 2006; Oh 2007, among others). Un/nun is different from other semantic particles in that un/nun and i/ka cannot attach to the same DP, as in (39b) and (39c), while other semantic particles are generally allowed to co-occur with i/ka, as in (39a). In other words, un/nun-marked DPs are in complementary distribution with i/ka-marked DPs.

   John-only-NOM  Tom-ACC  hit-PST-DECL
   ‘Only John hit Tom.’

   John-TOP-NOM  Tom-ACC  hit-PST-DECL
   ‘John hit Tom.’

  c. *John-i-un  Tom-ul  ttayly-ess-e
   John-NOM-TOP  Tom-ACC  hit-PST-DECL
   ‘John hit Tom.’

Like i/ka-marked DPs, un/nun-marked DPs may appear with prosodic prominence. According to Kim (2010), her experimental study reveals that there is no difference in the prosody between prosodically prominent un/nun-marked DPs and i/ka-marked DPs. However, unlike i/ka(H)-marked DPs, un/nun-marked DPs that appear with prosodic prominence (un/nun(H)-marked DPs)

27 Others have argued that not all un/nun-marked DPs are understood as the topic or that the topicality is not the main characteristic of un/nun-marked DPs (Choi 1997; Lee & Im 1983; Jung 2001; Lim 2012, Kim 2013, among others). Detailed discussion on the topicality of un/nun-marked DPs will follow in chapter 5.
are not given the exhaustive reading. Given the context in (40), in which the speaker is aware that John is not the only one who came, (40a) is infelicitous as i/ka(H)-marked DP ‘John’ is given the exhaustive reading. On the other hand, (40b) is considered felicitous despite the fact that the un/nun-marked DP is given prosodic prominence. That (40b) is considered felicitous (despite the prosodically prominent DP) suggests that prosodic prominence alone does not induce the exhaustive reading of a DP.

(40) Context: The speaker is aware that John is not the only person that came.

a. \#John-i(H) wa-s-s-e.
   John-NOM come-PST-DECL
   ‘John is the one who came.’
   Inference: no one else came.

b. John-un(H) wa-s-s-e.
   John-TOP come-PST-DECL
   ‘As for John, he came.’
   Inference: There are others who may have come.

That (41b) may easily follow (41a) also suggests that un/nun(H)-marked DPs are not given the exhaustive reading. (41b) is generally considered awkward when it appears after (41c) with an

\[\]

28 Generally, un/nun(H)-marked DPs, such as in (40b), are said to be given the contrastive reading. The un/nun(H)-marked DP in (40b) provides inference that there may be others who may or may not have come. Clearly, (40b) does not provide the inference that John is the only person that came. Detailed discussion on un/nun(H)-marked DPs and the contrastive reading will follow in chapter 5.
exhaustive \textit{i/ka}(H)-marked DP.

(41) a. \textit{John-un}(H) \textit{sakwa-lul} \textit{mek-ess-e}.

\begin{tabular}{ll}
John-\textsc{top} & apple-\textsc{acc} & eat-PST-\textsc{DECL} \\
\end{tabular}

‘As for John, he ate an apple.’

Inference: there are others who may have eaten an apple.

b. \textit{kuliko Mary-to} \textit{sakwa-lul} \textit{mek-ess-e}.

and Mary-\textsc{also} apple-\textsc{acc} eat-PST-\textsc{DECL}

‘And Mary also ate an apple.

c. \textit{John-i}(H) \textit{sakwa-lul} \textit{mek-ess-e}.

\begin{tabular}{ll}
John-\textsc{nomin} & apple-\textsc{acc} & eat-PST-\textsc{DECL} \\
\end{tabular}

‘It is John who ate an apple.’

Inference: no one else ate an apple.

Similarly in negations, \textit{un/nun}(H)-marked DPs are not given the exhaustive reading, as previously pointed out by Choi (2000). While (42a) with the \textit{i/ka}(H)-marked DP states that the referent of the \textit{i/ka}(H)-marked DP is the only person who did not eat an apple (the exhaustive reading), (42b) merely denies that the referent of the \textit{un/nun}(H)-marked DP ate an apple (the non-exhaustive reading) (Choi 2000). In other words, in (42b), \textit{John} is not understood as the only person who did not eat an apple. In sum, unlike \textit{i/ka}(H)-marked DPs, \textit{un/nun}(H)-marked DPs are not given the exhaustive reading.
(42) a. \textit{John-i(H) sakwa-lul mek-ci an-h-ass-ta.}\hfill
\begin{tabular}{llll}
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{l}
‘The person who did not eat apples is John.’ (Exhaustive) \\
\end{tabular}

b. \textit{John-un(H) sakwa-lul mek-ci an-h-ass-ta.}\hfill
\begin{tabular}{llll}
John-TOP & apple-ACC & eat-ci & NEG-do-PST-DECL \\
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{l}
‘John did not eat an apple.’ (Non-exhaustive) \\
\end{tabular}

\section*{2.1.4.2. Particle-less DPs with prosodic prominence}

Nominative DPs may appear without any particles attached, as in (1c) and (4b) (repeated below as (43a) and (43b)).

(43) a. \textit{John/saca-\textempty{} talli-n-ta}
\begin{tabular}{ll}
John/lion & run-PRS-DECL \\
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{l}
‘John/a lion runs.’ \\
\end{tabular}

b. \textit{John-\textempty{} paykophu-ta.}
\begin{tabular}{ll}
John & hungry-DECL \\
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{l}
‘John is hungry.’ (Non-exhaustive reading) \\
\end{tabular}

However, particle-less DPs cannot appear in situations where \textit{i/ka}-marked DPs are obligatorily given prosodic prominence, as in (44) and (45). They cannot replace the \textit{wh}-word in a question-answer pair, as in (44A), they cannot appear as the value of a specificational copular sentence, as in (45a), and they cannot appear as the pivot DP of a \textit{kes}-cleft, as in (45b).
(44) Q: *Nwukwu-ka Tom-ul ttały-ess-ni?
    who-NOM Tom-ACC hit-PST-Q
    ‘Who hit Tom?’
A: *John-Ø Tom-ul ttały-ess-e
    John Tom-ACC hit-PST-DECL
    ‘John hit Tom.’

    John culprit-DECL
    ‘John is the culprit.’ (Specificational)

b. *namwu Chelswu-ka call-un kes-i-ta
    tree-Ø Chelswu-NOM cut-REL thing-DECL
    ‘What Chelswu cut is a tree.’

As prosodic prominence is obligatory in (44) and (45), the unacceptability of particle-less DPs in
(44) may be due to the fact that particle-less DPs are generally awkward with prosodic prominence.
However, when prosodic prominence is forced, the exhaustive reading is still not attained. While
(46b) is awkward with prosodic prominence, the sentence is not understood to be truth
conditionally false. In other words, it still does not provide the reading in which John is
exhaustively selected as the only person who came.

(46) Context: The speaker is aware that both John and Mary came.

a. #John-i(H) wa-sse.
    John-NOM come-PST-DECL
    ‘John is the one who came.’
b. ‘John(W) wa-ss-e.\(^{29}\)  
John come-PST-DECL  
‘As for John, he came.’

That there are prosodically prominent DPs that are not given the exhaustive reading, such as *un/nun*\(^{(H)}\)-marked DPs and particle-less DPs, suggests that prosodic prominence cannot be solely responsible for the exhaustive reading of *i/ka*-marked DPs.

### 2.1.5. Summary

The relationship between *i/ka*\(^{(H)}\)-marked DPs and exhaustive readings seems more systematic than previously thought, as *i/ka*-marked DPs that are given the exhaustive reading must appear with prosodic prominence. However, prosodic prominence cannot be solely responsible for the exhaustive reading given to prosodically prominent *i/ka*-marked DPs. In this thesis, *i/ka*\(^{(H)}\)-marked DPs will be treated as DPs that are given the exhaustive reading and *i/ka*\(^{(L)}\)-marked DPs as DPs that are not given the exhaustive reading.

### 2.2. *I/ka*-marked DPs and genericity

In this section, I show that *i/ka*\(^{(H)}\)-marked DPs and *i/ka*\(^{(L)}\)-marked DPs differ with respect to the generic reading. While the generic reading is available to *i/ka*\(^{(H)}\)-marked DPs, *i/ka*\(^{(L)}\)-marked DPs are not allowed the generic reading. Also, while *i/ka*\(^{(H)}\)-marked DPs may appear as subjects

\(^{29}\) The sentence is judged marginal as particle-less DPs are generally awkward with prosodic prominence.
of generic sentences, that is not the case with sentences with $i/ka(L)$-marked DPs.\textsuperscript{30}

2.2.1. Generic DPs and generic sentences

Before entering the main discussion, I will define what generic DPs and generic sentences are. The sentence in (47a) is unlike the sentence in (47b) in that, while (47b) is a description of a particular situation, (47a) states that there is a strong tendency for this type of situation to recur, without direct reference to any particular such situation. Sentences such as (47a), that generalize over situations will be termed generic sentences or sentences given the generic reading (Carlson 2011).

(47)  

a. Dogs bark.  

b. Dogs are barking.  

c. Every dog barks.

There is also an intuition that generic sentence in (47a) is also generalizing over dogs as well. Dogs in (47a) are different from dogs in (47b) in that it does not refer to any particular individual or sets of individuals but refers to dogs as “a class” or “a kind” (Carlson 1977; Krifka 1987; Gerstner & Krifka 1993). These DPs that do not refer to any particular dogs are generic DPs. The exact meaning provided by the generic reading is debated. The meaning of the sentence in (47a) is said to be similar to a quantificational sentence quantified by a universal quantifier, such as in (47c). Likewise, the meaning of the generic DP in (47a) is said to be similar to every dog in (47c). However, the generic sentence and the generic DP in (47a) are different from (47c) in that they allow exceptions. In other words, (47a) is still true if there are some dogs that do not bark.

\textsuperscript{30} In section 3.4.2.4. I will show that there are exceptions to this generalization.
For our discussion, I will informally define generic sentences as sentences that state that there is a strong tendency for this type of situation to recur, and generic DPs as DPs that refer to “a kind” or “a class” (cf. Carlson 2011). While the subject DP of a generic sentence in (47a) is given the generic reading, not all DPs within a generic sentence are generic DPs. While both the DP lions and the sentence are given the generic reading in (48a), the sentence (48b) is given the reading without a generic DP. The sentence in (48b) clearly a generic sentence as it states a tendential property of John. However, John in (48b) is not a generic DP as John refers to a specific individual.

(48) a. Lions are ferocious.
    b. John smokes.

A generic DP may appear with a non-generic predicate as well, as in (49). (49a) is an example of an “avant-garde” reading of generic DP’s (Krifka et al. 1995). (49a) is about potatoes in general, and not about any particular potato or potatoes. And as Carson (2011) points out, similar examples can be about particular individuals, such as “Einstein first visited Princeton in 1953.” (49b) is also about buffaloes as a kind involving episodic predicates. In sum, both sentences/predicates and DPs can be generic, and their genericity is independent of each other.

31 While identifying the exact meaning of generic sentences is an interesting subject to pursue, it is beyond the scope of this thesis.

32 Sentences such as in (48b) that ascribe habitual property to the subject has been termed habitual sentences. Habitual sentences are generally analyzed as generic sentences (Krifka 1987; Gerstner & Krifka 1993; Krifka et al. 1995; Carlson 2011).

33 The genericity involving situations has been termed I-genericity, while the genericity involving individuals has been termed D-genericity (Krifka 1987).
(49)  a. Potatoes were first cultivated in South America. (Krifka et al. 1995)

b. Buffalos were hunted to near extinction in the 60s.

2.2.2. The generic reading of bare common nouns marked by i/ka

Bare common nouns are common nouns that do not appear with any overt quantifiers, as in (50a). Korean bare common nouns can be interpreted as both singular and plural.34

(50)  a. Sakwa

apple

‘an apple/apples’

b. ku/han/motun/etten sakwa

that/one/all/some apple

‘The/one/all/some apple(s)’

Bare common nouns in Korean can be given the generic reading or the non-generic reading. The bare common noun in (51a) is given the generic reading; chamsay ‘sparrow’ is understood to refer to sparrows as a class. On the other hand, the bare common noun in (51b) is non-generic as it refers to an individual sparrow or a group sparrows.

34 Korean also has an overt plural marker ‘tul’. When the plural marker is used, the common noun is obligatorily given the plural reading. However, the absence of the plural marker does not force the singular reading.

(i) salam/sakwa-tul

man/apple-PL

‘men/apples’
(51)  a.  \textit{Chamsay-nun}(L)  \textit{na-n-ta.}  \\
\quad \text{Sparrow-TOP}  \quad \text{fly-PRS-DECL}  \\
\quad \text{‘Sparrows in general have the tendency to fly.’ (Generic reading)}

b.  \textit{Chamsay-ka}(L)  \textit{nal-ko iss-ta.}^{35}  \\
\quad \text{Sparrow-NOM}  \quad \text{fly-PRG-DECL}  \\
\quad \text{‘There is a sparrow flying.’}^{36}  \text{ (Non-generc reading)}

When bare common nouns are marked by \textit{i/ka}(H), both the generic reading and the non-generic reading is available to the \textit{i/ka}-marked DP, as in (52i) and (52ii).

(52)  \textit{Say-ka}(H)  \textit{na-n-ta.}  \\
\quad \text{bird-NOM}  \quad \text{fly-PRS-DECL}  \\
\quad i. \text{What has the tendency to fly are birds. (Generic reading)}  \\
\quad \quad \text{Inference: No other kind of animals has the tendency to fly.}
\quad ii. \text{What is flying is a bird. (Non-generic reading)}  \\
\quad \quad \text{Inference: No other animal is flying.}

When bare common nouns are marked by \textit{i/ka}(L), they are given not allowed the generic reading, as in (53i). Bare common nouns marked by \textit{i/ka}(L) are only allowed the non-generic reading, as

\footnote{Progressive tense is realized by two morphemes \textit{ko} and \textit{iss} in Korean.}

\footnote{As noted previously, bare common nouns in Korean can be either singular or plural. To lessen the confusion that may be caused by the ambiguity, bare common nouns will be translated as either singular or plural, whichever is the more salient reading within the context. Plural reading of the bare common noun in (51b) will still be given the non-generic reading as it will refer to some group of sparrows.}
In sum, bare common nouns marked by $i/ka$(L) is not allowed the generic reading, while bare common nouns marked by $i/ka$(H) is allowed the generic reading.

(53) \textbf{Say-}ka(L) \textbf{ na-n-ta.}  
\textit{bird-NOM fly-PRS-DECL}  
i. *Birds in general have the tendency to fly.  
ii. There is a bird flying.

\textbf{2.2.3. The generic reading of sentences with $i/ka$-marked subjects}

\textbf{2.2.3.1. Two types of generic sentences}

Sentences containing individual-level predicates (individual-level sentences), and sentences that provide the habitual reading have been generally considered as generic sentences (Carlson 1977; 1989; 2011; 1992; Gerstner & Krifka 1993; Ladusaw 1994; Chierchia 1995; Krifka et al. 1995, among others).

Predicates in English have been categorized into two types; stage-level predicates that express temporary properties and events, as in (54), and individual-level predicates that express more permanent properties and characteristics, as in (55) (Milsark 1974; 1977; Carlson 1977; Kratzer 1988; 1995; Diesing 1990; 1992; Ladusaw 1994, among others).

\underline{37} The non-exhaustive generic reading of a bare common noun is achieved by $un/nun$-marking, as in (51a).
(54) a. Firemen are running.
   b. John is walking.

(55) a. Firemen are tall.
   b. John is intelligent.

Sentences containing individual-level predicates, as in (55), have been argued to be inherently generic (Chierchia 1995). The argument is based on the observation that individual level predicates, as in (55), generally ascribe tendencies to their subjects; (55a) is generally interpreted as a statement about Mary having the tendency to be tall and (55b) as a statement about John having the tendency to be intelligent.

On the other hand, sentences containing stage-level predicates, as in (54), do not readily provide the generic reading. (54a) is a description of an event in which Mary is participating in and it is not a statement about a tendential property of Mary in general. (54b) also does not ascribe any tendential property to John; it does not state that John has the tendency to walk. However, sentences containing predicates that are normally categorized as stage-level predicates can be given the generic reading when the predicates are given the habitual reading (Carlson 1977; Gerstner & Krifka 1993; Krifka et al. 1995). The sentence in (56) is ambiguous between two readings. It can be used to describe the action the subjects are performing now, as in (56ai) and (56bi), or it could be used to describe habitual tendencies of the subjects, as in (56aii) and (56bii). When the sentence is given the latter reading (the habitual reading), the sentence is a generic

[38] For Chierchia (1995), individual-level predicates that do not seem to involve abstraction of particular events such as in (55b) are also inherently generic. According to him, (55b) can be paraphrases as ‘Generally for a situation s, if s involves John, s is a situation in which John is intelligent.’
sentence.

(56) a. John smokes.
   i. ‘John is smoking now.’ (Episodic reading)
   ii. ‘John has the tendency to smoke habitually.’ (Habitual/Generic reading)

b. Firemen lift weights.
   i. ‘Firemen in general have the tendency to lift weights habitually.’
      (Habitual/Generic reading)
   ii. ‘There are some firemen that are lifting weights now.’ (Episodic reading)

In sum, there are two types of generic sentences; individual-level sentences, as in (55), and habitual sentences, as in (56). In the following sections we will examine whether i/ka(H)-marked DPs and i/ka(L)-marked DPs are compatible with the two types of generic sentences.

2.2.3.2. Neutral i/ka(L)-marked DPs in generic sentences

Neutral i/ka(L)-marked DPs generally cannot appear as subjects of generic sentences; they cannot appear as subjects of individual-level sentences, nor as subjects of habitual sentences. Individual-level sentences become ungrammatical when the subject is marked by i/ka(L), as in (57a). They are most salient when the subject is marked by un/nun(L), as in (57b) (Lee 1993;

39 While i/ka(L)-marked DPs are generally ungrammatical as subjects of individual-level predicates, as in (57a) and (58a) is grammatical when i/ka-marked DP appears as verbatim repetition, as in (ib).
1995; H. Lee 1995). The grammaticality does not change with Chinese loanword predicates, as in (58a).

(i) a. Saca-ka(L) etteni?
    lion-NOM how-Q?
    ‘What are lions like?’
  
b. Saca-ka(L) hyungphokha-y.
    lion-NOM ferocious-DECL
    ‘Lions are ferocious.’
(ii) a. Saca-nun etteni?
    lion-TOP how-Q?
    ‘What are lions like?’
  
b.*Saca-ka(L) hyungphokha-y.
    lion-NOM ferocious-DECL
    ‘Lions are ferocious.’

However, i/ka-marked DPs that appear as verbatim repetition behave quite differently from canonical i/ka-marked DPs in other aspects as well. While i/ka-marked DPs are generally ungrammatical when the referent of the DPs is already given in the discourse, as in (ib), i/ka-marked DPs are grammatical as discourse old DPs when they appear as verbatim repetition, as in (iib). In this thesis, discussion on i/ka-marked DPs will not consider i/ka-marked DPs that appear as verbatim repetitions.

(i) a. Catongcha-nun cwuchacang-ey iss-ni?
    Car-TOP parking lot-at is-Q?
    ‘Is the car in the parking lot?’
  
b.*Catongcha-ka cwuchacang-ey iss-e?
    Car-NOM parking lot-at is-DECL
    ‘The car is in the parking lot.’
  
c. Catongcha-nun cwuchacang-ey iss-e?
    Car-NOM parking lot-at is-DECL
    ‘The car is in the parking lot.’
(ii) a. Ppapang-i kocangna-ss-ni?
    Car-NOM breakdown-PST-Q?
  
b. Ppapang-i koncangna-ss-e.
    Car-NOM breakdown-PST-DECL
  
(iii)a. Catongcha-ka kocangna-ss-ni?
    Car-NOM breakdown-PST-Q?
  
b.*Ppapang-i koncangna-ss-e.
    Car-NOM breakdown-PST-DECL
(57) a. *saca-ka(L) khu-ta.
   lion-NOM big-DECL

   b. saca-nun(L) khu-ta.
   lion-TOP big-DECL

   ‘Lions are big.’ (Non-exhaustive generic reading)

(58) a. *saca-ka(L) hyungphokha-ta.
   lion-NOM ferocious-DECL

   b. saca-nun(L) hyungphokha-ta.
   lion-TOP ferocious-DECL

   ‘Lions are ferocious.’ (Non-exhaustive generic reading)

Neutral i/ka(L)-marked DPs cannot appear as subjects of habitual sentences either. While, the predicate in (59a) can be used to describe habitual action, as in (59b), no such reading is available when the subject of the predicate is marked by i/ka(L), as in (59a). The grammaticality does not change with Chinese loanword predicates, as in (60), or with intransitive predicates, as in (61).

   John-NOM cigarette-ACC smoke-PRS-DECL

   i. *‘John smokes habitually.’ (Non exhaustive-habitual reading)

   ii. ‘John is smoking now.’ (Episodic reading)

b. John-un(L) tampay-lul phi-n-ta.
   John-TOP cigarette-ACC smoke-PRS-DECL

   i. ‘John smokes habitually.’ (Habitual reading)

   ii. ‘John is smoking now.’ (Episodic reading)
(60) a. *John-i(L) yenge-lul kongpwuha-n-ta.
   John-NOM English-ACC study-PRS-DECL
   i. ‘John studies English habitually.’ (Non exhaustive-habitual reading)
   ii. ‘John is studying English now.’ (Episodic reading)

b. John-un(L) yenge-lul kongpwuha-n-ta.
   John-NOM English-ACC study-PRS-DECL
   i. ‘John studies English habitually.’ (Non exhaustive-habitual reading)
   ii. ‘John is studying English now.’ (Episodic reading)

(61) a. John-i(L) ttwi-n-ta.
   John-NOM run-PRS-DECL
   i. ‘John runs habitually.’ (Non exhaustive-habitual reading)
   ii. ‘John is running now.’ (Episodic reading)

b. John-un(L) ttwi-n-ta.
   John-TOP run-PRS-DECL
   i. ‘John runs habitually.’ (Habitual reading)
   ii. ‘John is running now.’ (Episodic reading)

Sentences with bare common nouns subjects do not allow the habitual reading is either, when the subject is marked by i/ka(L), as in (62).

(62) a. Sopangkwan-i(L) tampay-lul phi-n-ta.
   fireman-NOM cigarette-ACC smoke-PRS-DECL
   i. ‘Firemen smoke habitually.’ (Non exhaustive-habitual reading)
   ii. ‘A firemen is smoking now.’ (Episodic reading)
b. \textit{Sopangkwan-i(L) yenge-lul kongpuwa-n-ta.}

fireman-NOM English-ACC study-PRS-DECL

i. *‘Fireman study English habitually.’ (Non exhaustive-habitual reading)

ii. ‘A fireman is studying English now.’ (Episodic reading)

c. \textit{Sopangkwan-i(L) ttwi-n-ta.}

fireman-NOM run-PRS-DECL

i. *‘Fireman run habitually.’ (Non exhaustive-habitual reading)

ii. ‘A fireman is running now.’ (Episodic reading)

On the other hand, stage-level predicates given the episodic reading are most salient with subjects marked by \textit{i/ka(L)}, as in (63a).\(^{40}\)

(63) a. \textit{John-i(L) tampay-lul phi-ko iss-ta.}

John-NOM cigarette-ACC smoke-PRG-DECL

‘John is smoking now.’ (Episodic reading)

b. \textit{John-i(L) yenge-lul kongpuwa-ko iss-ta.}

John-NOM English-ACC study-PRG-DECL

‘John is studying English now.’ (Episodic reading)

\(^{40}\) \textit{Un/nun(L)-marked subjects are still compatible with the episodic reading, as in (i).}

(i) \textit{John-un(L) ttwi-ko iss-ta.}

John-TOP run-PRG-DECL

‘John is running.’ (Episodic reading)
c.  John-i(L)  twi-ko  iss-ta.
   John-NOM  run-PRG-DECL
   ‘John is running now.’ (Episodic reading)

In sum, neutral i/ka(L)-marked DPs cannot appear as subjects of generic sentences, while they are fine as subjects of episodic sentences, sentences describing temporary on-going events.

2.2.3.3. Sentences with i/ka(H)-marked subjects

On the other hand, exhaustive i/ka(H)-marked DPs may appear as subjects of individual-level sentences, as in (64). I/ka(H)-marked DPs may also appear as subjects of sentences that are unambiguously episodic, such as in (65). And sentences with stage-level predicates that allow both the habitual reading and the episodic reading are ambiguous when the subject is marked by i/ka(H), as in (66). In sum, i/ka(H)-marked DPs may appear as subjects of both generic sentences and non-generic sentences.

(64)  a.  Saca-ka(H)  hyungphokha-ta
        lion-NOM  ferocious-DECL
        ‘It is Lions that are ferocious.’ (Generic reading)

   b.  Saca-ka(H)  khu-ta.
        lion-TOP  big-DECL
        ‘It is lions that are big.’ (Generic reading)
(65)  \[ Saca-ka(H) \quad ttwi-ko \ iss-ta \]
    lion-NOM    run-PRG-DECL
    ‘It is Lions that are running.’ (Episodic reading)

(66)  a.  \[ John-i(H) \quad tampay-lul \quad phin-ta \]
    John-NOM    cigarette    smoke-DECL
    i.  ‘John is the person who smokes habitually.’ (Habitual reading)
    ii. ‘John is the person who is smoking now.’ (Episodic reading)

b.  \[ Sopangkwan-i(H) \quad yenge-lul \quad kongpwuha-n-ta. \]
    fireman-NOM    English-ACC    study-PRS-DECL
    i.  ‘Firemen are the ones who study English habitually.’ (Habitual reading)
    ii. ‘Firemen are the ones who are studying English now.’ (Episodic reading)

c.  \[ John-i(H) \quad ttwi-n-ta. \]
    John-NOM    run-PRS-DECL
    i.  ‘John is the person who runs habitually.’ (Habitual reading)
    ii. ‘John is the person who is running now.’ (Episodic reading)

2.2.3.4. Summary

To summarize, while neutral \( i/ka(L) \)-marked DPs cannot appear as subjects of generic sentences, \( i/ka(H) \)-marked DPs may appear as subjects of both generic sentences and non-generic sentences.
Table 1: The distribution of i/ka-marked subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject of an individual-level predicate</th>
<th>i/ka(L)</th>
<th>i/ka(H)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Available</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject of a habitual stage-level predicate</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject of an episodic stage-level predicate</td>
<td>Available</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2.4. Summary

I/ka(H)-marked DPs and i/ka(L)-marked DPs differ in how they are interpreted. I/ka(H)-marked bare common nouns allow the generic reading, while i/ka(L)-marked DPs bare common nouns do not. Interpretation of sentences containing i/ka(H)-marked DP subjects and i/ka(L)-marked DP subjects differ also. Sentences with i/ka(H)-marked subjects are given the generic reading, while sentences with i/ka(L)-marked subjects cannot be given the generic reading. The difference is not merely due to the difference in the genericity of the subject DPs as sentences can be given the generic reading without generic subjects (Carlson 1977; 1989; 2011; Gerstner & Krifka 1993; Chierchia 1995; Krifka et al. 1995).

2.3. The interpretation of non-generic i/ka marked DPs

In the previous section, I have shown that both i/ka(H)-marked bare common nouns and i/ka(L)-marked bare common nouns can be given the non-generic reading. In this section, I show that bare common nouns marked by i/ka(H) can be distinguished from bare common nouns marked by i/ka(L) with respect to how presuppositionality/existentiality. While bare common nouns marked
by *i/ka*(L) are given the existential reading, bare common nouns marked by *i/ka*(H) are given the presuppositional reading and the existential reading is not available to them.41

2.3.1. Two readings of non-generic bare common nouns in Korean

A non-generic bare common noun in Korean can be given the presuppositional reading or the existential reading. In (67b), the bare common *chamsay* is non-generic as it does not refer to sparrows as a class. The non-generic bare common noun is also presuppositional as the speaker is referring to a particular sparrow that the speaker is familiar with; *chamsay* ‘sparrow’ is selected from a previously given set ‘John’s pets’, and the speaker is referring to a sparrow among the pets. In sum, non-generic bare common nouns in Korean can be presuppositional.42

(67)  a. John-uy aywan-tongmwul-cwung-ey mwues-i nal-swu iss-ni?
    John-GEN pet animal-among-at what-NOM fly-can-Q?
    ‘Among John’s pets what can fly?’

As for complex DPs, the distribution of *i/ka*-marking seems to be dependent on the type of determiner. DPs that appear with weak determiners (Milsark 1974) are generally marked by *i/ka*(L), while DPs that appear with strong determiners are generally marked by *i/ka*(H). I leave detailed analysis on the distribution of *i/ka* on complex DPs for future research.

(i)  a. han say-ka(L)
    a bird-NOM
    ‘a bird’
b. *ku* say-ka(H)
    that bird-NOM
    ‘the bird’

A DP is presuppositional if the existence of the referent of the DP is presupposed by the speaker (or if the speaker is already familiar with the referent of the DP). On the other hand, a DP is existential if the existence of the referent of the DP is merely asserted by the speaker. Assuming that one cannot re-assert the existence of a referent whose existence is already known, existential DPs are always non-presuppositional (cf. Diesing 1990).

41 As for complex DPs, the distribution of *i/ka*-marking seems to be dependent on the type of determiner. DPs that appear with weak determiners (Milsark 1974) are generally marked by *i/ka*(L), while DPs that appear with strong determiners are generally marked by *i/ka*(H). I leave detailed analysis on the distribution of *i/ka* on complex DPs for future research.

42 A DP is presuppositional if the existence of the referent of the DP is presupposed by the speaker (or if the speaker is already familiar with the referent of the DP). On the other hand, a DP is existential if the existence of the referent of the DP is merely asserted by the speaker. Assuming that one cannot re-assert the existence of a referent whose existence is already known, existential DPs are always non-presuppositional (cf. Diesing 1990).
b.  *(ku cwung-ey-nun) chamsay-ka(H) nal-swu iss-e.*

that among-at-TOP sparrow-NOM fly-can-DECL

‘(Among them) sparrows can fly.

Non-generic bare common nouns in Korean can also be given the existential reading. The bare common noun in (68) does not refer to any specific sparrow the speaker is familiar with. The existence of a sparrow is merely asserted by (68). In sum, bare common noun may be given the presuppositional reading, as in (67b), or the existential reading, as in (68).\(^\text{43}\)

(68)  *etinka-eyse chamsay-ka(L) nal-ko iss-keyss-ci.*

some.where-at sparrow-NOM fly-PRG-FUT-DECL

‘A sparrow may be flying somewhere.’

2.3.2. Bare common nouns marked by *i/ka(H)*

When progressive tense is used, as in (69), both the sentence and the subject DP is given the non-generic reading. Non-generic bare common nouns marked by *i/ka(H)* in (69) can be given the presuppositional reading, as in (69i), but not the existential reading, as in (69ii).

---

\(^{43}\) Enç (1991) distinguishes DPs that the speaker is already familiar with (specific DPs) from DPs that the speaker is not familiar with (non-specific DPs). The presuppositional DPs are specific DPs in Enç’s terminology, while the existential DPs are non-specific DPs.
(69)  *Say-ka(H)  nal-ko iss-ta.*

bird-NOM fly-PRG-DECL

i. What is flying is a (specific) bird (that the speaker is familiar with).

(Non-generic presuppositional)

Inference: No other animal is flying.

ii. *There is a bird flying. (Non-generic existential)

*i/ka(H)-marked DPs are given the exhaustive reading. Say marked by *i/ka(H) in (69) is understood to be selected exhaustively from a pre-established set. Since the speaker is already familiar with the set (and the members of the set), the speaker is already familiar with the members that are selected from the set. Thus, exhaustive *i/ka(H)-marked say in (69) will always be presuppositional and will not be given the existential reading.

*i/ka(H)-marking is only available when the set from which the exhaustive *i/ka(H)-marked DP is selected from is pre-established, either by prior discourse, as in (70), or by extralinguistic context, as in (71). In (70b), John is selected from a set that consists of John and Mary, which is introduced by the prior discourse in (70a). In (71b), John is selected also from a set that consists of John and Mary, but the set is introduced by extralinguistic context, by pointing at John and Mary. Regardless of how the set is pre-established, what is important is that an exhaustive *i/ka(H)-marked DP requires a pre-established set that includes the referent of the *i/ka(H)-marked DP.

(70) a. John-kwa Mary cwung-ey nwukwu-ka te khu-ni?

John-and Mary among-at who-NOM more tall-Q?

‘Among John and Mary, who is taller?
b. *John-i(H) te khe-yo.*

John-Nom more tall-DECL

‘(Among John and Mary) John is taller.’

(71) Context: While pointing at John and Mary.

a. *nwukwu-ka te khu-ni?*

who-NOM more tall-Q?

‘Who is taller?’

b. *John-i(H) te khe-yo.*

John-Nom more tall-DECL

‘(Among John and Mary) John is taller.’

Since the referent of an exhaustive DP is selected from a pre-established set, an exhaustive DP is inherently presuppositional; the existence of the referent is already known to the speaker. Therefore, *i/ka*(H) marking cannot appear on existential DPs whose existence is not previously established. Assuming that no other context is given, (72b) is deemed infelicitous as the referent of the *i/ka*(H)-marked DP (nor a set that includes the referent) is not previously introduced to the speaker.⁴⁴ In other words, *i/ka*(H) marking cannot appear on DPs that the speaker is not already familiar with.

---

⁴⁴ *(72b) will be felicitous if the referent of the *i/ka*(H)-marked DP (or a set that includes the referent) is previously introduced to the speaker by some other context, such as pointing.*
(72) a. ecyey pam-ey kheyik-ul sawa-ss-supnita.
yesterday night-at cake-ACC buy-PST-DECL.
‘Yesterday night, (I) bought a cake.

b. #achim-ey ilena-boni cwi-ka(H) kehyik-ul
morning-at wake-up-when mouse-NOM cake-ACC
ta mek-ess-supnita.
all eat-PST-DECL
‘When I woke up in the morning, mice had eaten up all the cake.’

On the other hand, (73b) is felicitous with i/ka(H)-marked DP, as the referent of the i/ka(H)-marked DP is presented in a prior discourse in (73a).

(73) a. ecyey silhemyong cwi-wa haymsuhte-lul
yesterday experimental mouse-and hamster-ACC sawa-ss-supnita.
buy-PST-DECL.
‘Yesterday (I) bought some experimental mice and hamsters.’

b. achim-ey ilena-boni cwi-ka(H) kehyik-ul ta
morning-at wake-up-when mouse-NOM cake-ACC all mek-ess-supnita.
eat-PST-DECL
‘When I woke up in the morning, (some of) the experimental mice (but not the experimental hamsters) had eaten up all the cake.’
While *i/ka*(H)-marked DPs are presuppositional, they are not necessarily definite. While mice in (73b) must be included in the group of mice introduced in (73a), they may refer to some of the mice introduced in (73a). In other words, the group of mice in (73b) does not have to be identical to the group of mice in (73a).

In sum, non-generic *i/ka*(H)-marked DPs are given the presuppositional reading, but not the existential reading.

### 2.3.3. Bare common nouns marked by *i/ka*(L)

On the other hand, bare common nouns marked by *i/ka*(L) are given the existential reading, as in (74ii), but not the presuppositional reading, as in (74i).

(74) \[ \text{Say-}ka(L) \text{ } nal-ko iss-ta. \]

bird-NOM fly-PRG-DECL

i. *A specific bird (that the speaker is familiar with) is flying.*

ii. There is an unspecified bird flying.

Since bare DPs marked by *i/ka*(L) are not allowed the presuppositional reading, a DP cannot be marked by *i/ka*(L) if the referent of the DP is previously introduced to the speaker, either by a prior discourse, as in (75b), or by an extralinguistic context, as in (76b).
On the other hand, DPs are marked by \textit{i/ka(L)} when the existence of the referent of the DP is asserted by the sentence. (77b) is grammatical when the \textit{i/ka(L)}-marked DP does not refer to a specific mouse or a group of mice already known to the speaker. In sum, non-generic neutral
i/ka(L)-marked DPs are given the existential reading, and the presuppositional readings are not available to them.

(77)  a.  ecye  pam-ey  kheyik-ul  sawa-ss-supnita.
   yesterday  night-at  cake-ACC  buy-PST-DECL
   ‘Yesterday night, (I) bought a cake.

   b.  (achim-ey  ilena-boni)  cwi-ka(L)  ku  kehyik-ul
   morning-at  wake-up-when  mouse-NOM  that cake-ACC
   ta  mek-ess-supnita.
   all  eat-PST-DECL
   ‘(When I woke up in the morning,) some mice had eaten up all the cake.’

2.3.4. Summary

In sum, non-generic bare common nouns marked by i/ka(H) are given the presuppositional reading, while bare common nouns marked by i/ka(L) are given the existential reading.

Table 2: The interpretation of non-generic i/ka-marked DPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>i/ka(L)</th>
<th>i/ka(H)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The non-generic presuppositional reading</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The non-generic existential reading</td>
<td>Available</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.4. The behaviors of other prosodically prominent DPs

So far, I have shown that there are two types of \(i/ka\)-marked DPs in Korean. One type of \(i/ka\)-marked DP is prosodically prominent, and is given the exhaustive reading. \(i/ka\):(H)-marked DPs compatible with generic DPs and generic sentences, but not compatible with existential DPs. On the other hand, \(i/ka\):(L)-marked DPs are compatible with existential DPs but not with generic DPs and generic sentences.

Previously, I have argued that that prosodic prominence cannot be solely responsible for the exhaustive reading given to \(i/ka\):(H)-marked DPs as \(un/nun\):(H)-marked DPs and particle-less DPs pronounced with prosodic prominence are not given exhaustive readings. In this section, I argue that prosodic prominence cannot be solely responsible for other interpretive difference between \(i/ka\):(L)-marked DPs and \(i/ka\):(H)-marked DPs either.

2.4.1. The existential reading and prosodic prominence

Previously, I have argued that non-generic bare common nouns marked by \(i/ka\):(H) are given the presuppositional reading, as in (78ai), but not the existential reading, as in (78a(ii)). On the other hand, non-generic bare common nouns marked by \(i/ka\):(L) are given the existential reading, as in (78b(ii)), but not the presuppositional reading, as in (78bi).
(78) a.  Say-ka(H)  nal-ko iss-ta.
     bird-NOM  fly-PRG-DECL
   i.  What is flying is a specific bird (that the speaker is familiar with).
    Inference: No other animal (within the group) is flying but birds.
   ii. *There is a bird flying. (Existential)

b.  Say-ka(L)  nal-ko iss-ta.
     bird-NOM  fly-PRG-DECL
   i.  *What is flying is a specific bird (that the speaker is familiar with).
    Inference: No other animal (within the group) is flying but birds.
   ii. There is a bird flying. (Existential)

The most striking difference between (78a) and (78b) is the prosodic marking. However, prosodic prominence cannot be solely responsible for the difference in the interpretation between i/ka(H)-marked bare common nouns and i/ka(H)-marked bare common nouns. If prosodic prominence on a bare common noun is what disallows the existential reading in (78a), the expectation is that the existential reading would be unavailable to all bare common nouns that are prosodically prominent, while the existential reading would become available to all bare common nouns that are prosodically neutral. However, we find that the existential reading is not available to un/nun(L)-marked bare common nouns.

In (79), we see that both un/nun(H)-marked bare common nouns and un/nun(L)-marked bare common nouns do not allow the existential reading. Assuming that no other context is provided, both un/nun(H)-marked bare common nouns and un/nun(L)-marked bare common nouns are infelicitous when the speaker is not already familiar with the referents of the DPs; both (79b) and
(79c) are infelicitous when following (79a).

(79) a. ecye pam-ey kheyik-ul sawa-ss-supnita.
yesterday night-at cake-ACC buy-PST-DECL.
‘Yesterday night, (I) bought a cake.

b. #achim-ey ilena-boni cwi-nun(L) kehyik-ul
morning-at wake-up-when mouse-TOP cake-ACC
ta mek-ess-supnita.
all eat-PST-DECL

c. #achim-ey ilena-boni cwi-nun(H) kehyik-ul
morning-at wake-up-when mouse-TOP cake-ACC
ta mek-ess-supnita.
all eat-PST-DECL

Intent: ‘When I woke up in the morning, some mice had eaten up all the cake.’

On the other hand, both un/nun(H)-marked bare common nouns and un/nun(L)-marked bare common nouns are felicitous when the speaker is familiar with the referents of the DPs; (80b) and (80c) are both felicitous following (80a). In other words, the referents of the un/nun-marked DPs

---

45 While both un/nun(L)-marked DPs and un/nun(H)-marked DPs require the speaker to be familiar with the referents, the distribution of the two DPs are not identical; (ib) may not follow (ia), while (ic) may. A detailed discussion on the differences between un/nun(L)-marked DPs and un/nun(H)-marked DPs will follow in chapter 5.

(i) a. ecye silhemyong cwi-wa haymsuthe-lul sawa-ss-supnita.
yesterday experimental mouse-and hamster-NOM buy-PST-DECL.
‘Yesterday (I) bought some experimental mice and hamsters.’
are presuppositional.

(80) a. ecye silhemyong cwi-wa haymsuthe-lul
    yesterday experimental mouse-and hamster-NOM
    sawa-ss-supnita.
    buy-PST-DECL.
    ‘Yesterday (I) bought some experimental mice and hamsters.’

b. pam-cwung-ey cwi-nun(H) kehyik-ul mek-ess-supnita.
    night-during-at mouse-TOP cake-ACC eat-PST-DECL
    ‘As for the mice, they ate the cake during the night.

c. pam-cwung-ey cwi-wa haymsuthe-nun(L) kehyik-ul
    night-during-at mouse-and hamster-TOP cake-ACC
    mek-ess-supnita.
    eat-PST-DECL
    ‘To tell you about the mice and hamsters, they ate the cake during the night.

That sentences with un/nun-marked DPs cannot appear as answers to general questions, as in (81), or in an out-of-the-blue context, as in (82), also suggests that un/nun-marked DPs are presuppositional DPs.

b. #pam-cwung-ey cwi-nun(L) kheyik-ul mek-ess-ta.
    night-during-at mouse-TOP cake-ACC eat-PST-DECL.
    ‘To tell you about the mice, they ate some cake during the night.’

c. pam-cwung-ey cwi-nun(H) kheyik-ul mek-ess-supnita.
    night-during-at mouse-TOP cake-ACC eat-PST-DECL
    ‘As for the mice, they ate the cake during the night.’
(81) Q: What’s up?

a. #achim-ey  ilena-boni  cwi-nun(L)  kehyik-ul
   morning-at  wake-up-when  mouse-TOP  cake-ACC
   ta  mek-ess-supnita.
   all  eat-PST-DECL

b. #achim-ey  ilena-boni  cwi-nun(H)  kehyik-ul
   morning-at  wake-up-when  mouse-TOP  cake-ACC
   ta  mek-ess-supnita.
   all  eat-PST-DECL

Intent: ‘When I woke up in the morning, a mice had eaten up all the cake.’

(82) Context: An out-of-the-blue context

a. #achim-ey  ilena-boni  cwi-nun(L)  kehyik-ul
   morning-at  wake-up-when  mouse-TOP  cake-ACC
   ta  mek-ess-supnita.
   all  eat-PST-DECL

b. #achim-ey  ilena-boni  cwi-nun(H)  kehyik-ul
   morning-at  wake-up-when  mouse-TOP  cake-ACC
   ta  mek-ess-supnita.
   all  eat-PST-DECL

Intent: ‘When I woke up in the morning, a mice had eaten up all the cake.’

So far, I have argued that un/nun(L)-marked DPs are presuppositional and not existential. This
suggests that prosodic prominence is not solely responsible for the absence of the existential reading on non-generic \textit{i/ka}(H)-marked bare common nouns, as prosodically neutral DPs do not always receive existential readings.

\textbf{2.4.2. The generic reading and prosodic prominence}

Prosodic prominence cannot be solely responsible for the generic reading in \textit{i/ka}(H)-marked DPs and sentences with \textit{i/ka}(H)-marked subjects. If prosodic prominence is what provides the generic reading, all prosodically prominent DPs and all sentences with prosodically prominent subjects should be given the generic reading. However, there are prosodically prominent DPs that are not given the generic reading, and sentences with prosodically prominent subjects that are not given the generic reading, such as in (83). In (83a), the prosodically prominent DP is not given the generic reading and the sentence is also not a generic sentence as it does not ascribe a tendential property to the fireman. \textit{Un/nun}(H)-marked DPs and sentences with \textit{un/nun}(H)-marked subjects can also be given the non-generic reading, as in (83b).

(83) a. \textit{Sopangkwan-i}(H) \textit{talli-ko iss-ta}.

\begin{tabular}{ll}
fireman-NOM & run-PRG-DECL \\
\end{tabular}

‘The person who is running is a fireman.’

Inference: No one else is running.

b. \textit{Sopangkwan-un}(H) \textit{talli-ko iss-ta}.

\begin{tabular}{ll}
fireman-TOP & run-PRG-DECL \\
\end{tabular}

‘As for the fireman, he/she is running.

Inference: There are others who may be running.
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Prosodically prominent DPs and sentences with prosodically prominent subjects are not the only DPs/sentences that are given the generic reading either. \textit{Un/nun}(L)-marked DPs and sentences with \textit{un/nun}(L)-marked subjects are also easily given the generic reading, as in (84). As a matter of fact, generic sentences such as in (84) are most natural with \textit{un/nun}(L)-marked subjects.

(84) a. \textit{Sopangkwan-un}(L) \textit{pappu-ta}.

\begin{tabular}{ll}
fireman-TOP & busy-DECL \\
\end{tabular}

‘Firemen have the tendency to be busy.’

b. \textit{John-un}(L) \textit{tampay-lul} \textit{phi-n-ta}.

\begin{tabular}{llll}
John-TOP & cigarette-ACC & smoke-PRS-DECL \\
\end{tabular}

‘John has the tendency to smoke habitually.’

That not all DPs/sentences with prosodically prominent subjects are given the generic reading, and that the generic reading is available to \textit{un/nun}(L)-marked DPs and sentences with \textit{un/nun}(L)-marked subjects, even though the subject DP is not prosodically prominent, suggests that prosodic prominence, if responsible, is not solely responsible for the generic reading of \textit{i/ka}(H)-marked DPs and sentences with \textit{i/ka}(H)-marked subjects.

\textbf{2.4.3. Summary}

Prosodically prominent \textit{i/ka}-marked DPs are interpreted differently from \textit{i/ka}-marked DPs that appear with neutral prosody. However, prosodic prominence is not solely responsible for the differences in the interpretation between the two types of DPs.
Table 3: Differences between *i/ka*(H) and *i/ka*(L)-marked DPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><em>i/ka</em>(L)</th>
<th><em>i/ka</em>(H)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The exhaustive reading</td>
<td>Non-exhaustive</td>
<td>Exhaustive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The generic reading of bare common nouns</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation of non-generic bare common nouns</td>
<td>Existential</td>
<td>Presuppositional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a subject of a generic sentence</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 3

The genericity and vP-external DPs

In this chapter, I argue that that i/ka(L)-marked DPs and i/ka(H)-marked DPs are interpreted at two different positions at LF, based on the observation that i/ka(H)-marked bare plurals are sentences with i/ka(H)-marked subjects are given the generic reading. The argument is based on the following assumptions.

3.1. Assumptions

3.1.1. The generic operator

I will adopt the widespread assumption that generic sentences attain the generic reading via some phonologically null generic operator (GEN), and that the generic operator is an adverb of quantification (Q-adverb) with a special, modal character (Carlson 1989; Chierchia 1995; Diesing 1990; 1992; Kratzer 1988; 1995). In other words, I will assume that a generic sentence is a quantificational sentence with a special Q-adverb; GEN.

3.1.2. Generic quantification and tripartite structure

I will also adopt the assumption that quantificational sentences have tripartite logical representations, consisting of a quantifier, a scope, and a restrictor (cf. Kamp 1981; Heim 1982).
Thus, a quantificational sentence such as in (85a), can be split into the quantifier, the scope, and the restrictor; the quantifier provides the logical interpretation -- whether with universal force or existential force, etc. --- the restrictor identifies the domain (or subdomain) over which the quantifier operates, and the scope provides the statement that is made about the elements in that domain/subdomain.

(85)  

a. Fred always smokes.

b. \( \forall s \left[ C(\text{Fred}, s) \right] \left[ \text{smoke} (\text{Fred}, s) \right] \)

c. \( \forall \) = universal quantifier, \( C = \) contextual situation,  
\( s = \) situation variable

The quantifier in (85a) is the universal quantifier \textit{always}. Assuming that the restrictive contextual situation (provided implicitly) is a situation in which Fred can smoke, excluding situations such as while asleep or while eating, the truth condition of (85a) will be roughly paraphrased as “In all situations, if a situation is a situation in which Fred can smoke, the situation is a situation in which Fred smokes.” The quantificational sentence in (85a), can be formalized as (85b), with \( \forall \) representing the universal quantifier and \( C \) representing the specific restrictive contextual situations, and \( s \) representing the situation variable.

Likewise, a generic sentence will also have a tripartite structure consisting of the quantifier (GEN), the scope, and the restrictor. Assuming that generic sentences are sentences that generalize over situations (cf. Carlson 2011), generic sentences are sentences in which the generic operator binds
a situation variable, as depicted in (86b) (Kratzer 1988; 1995, Chierchia 1995).46

(86)  
  a. Fred smokes.  
  b. GEN s [C(Fred, s) [smoke (Fred, s)]]  
  c. GEN = the generic operator, C= contextual situation,  
     s = situation variable

In (86), the scope makes a statement about situations in the restriction. Specifically, it states that those situations are situations where Fred smokes. Assuming that the contextual situation that restricts the generalization is a situation in which Fred can smoke, as in (85a), the truth condition of (86a) can be paraphrased as “Generally for a situation s, if situation s is a situation in which Fred can smoke, the situation is a situation in which Fred smokes,” with the generic operator replacing the universal quantifier.

The generic operator may also bind individuals. When the generic operator binds individuals, the individuals are generalized, as in (87). In other words, they are given the generic reading.

(87)  
  a. Lions are ferocious.  
  b. Dogs bark.

46 According to Chierchia (1995), individual-level predicates that do not seem to involve abstraction of particular events also involve generic operators binding situations variables, as in (i). (ia) can be paraphrased as “Generally for a situation s, if s is a situation involving John, s is a situation in which John knows Latin.”

(i)  
  a. John knows Latin. → GEN s [C (John, s)] [ know (John, Latin ,s)]  
  b. John is a smoker. → GEN s [C (John, s)] [ smoker (John, s)]  
  c. John is intelligent. → GEN s [C (John, s)] [ intelligent (John, s)]  
     C = contextual restriction, s = situation variable
3.1.3. The Mapping Hypothesis

I will also assume Diesing’s Mapping Hypothesis is applicable to Korean. Diesing (1990) observes that vP-internal bare plurals and vP-external bare plurals are given different interpretations and proposes that the difference in the interpretation is due to a mapping principle that relates DPs in particular syntactic positions to particular types of interpretations; the Mapping Hypothesis.

The Mapping Hypothesis states that the semantic partition into restrictive clause and nuclear scope is achieved by a function that maps the syntactic structure into the tripartite quantificational structure (Kamp 1981; Heim 1982); elements within the vP are mapped into the scope, while elements outside of the vP are mapped into the restrictor (88).

(88) The Mapping Hypothesis (Diesing 1990; 1992)
   a. elements at IP: mapped into the restrictor.
   b. elements at VP(vP): mapped into the scope.

I will assume that the Mapping Hypothesis is applicable to Korean. Following the Mapping Hypothesis, assuming that generic sentences are quantificational sentences with a covert generic operator binding a situation variable, vP-external material of a generic sentence will be mapped into the restrictor, while vP-internal material will be mapped into the scope.47

47 Chierchia (1995) argues that the split between the scope and the restrictor is not so rigid. According to him, the split between the scope and the restrictor is dependent on the location of the quantifier at LF; elements to the left of the quantifier are mapped into the restrictor, while elements to the right are mapped into the scope. However, he assumes that the location of the generic operator is rigidly set as the outer Specifier position of the verb (VP in Chierchia 1995, vP in this thesis). Therefore, with respect to generic quantification, the split between the scope and the restrictor is again set rigidly at the vP.
3.2. The generic reading of vP-external bare plurals

Diesing observes that there are two different structural positions for subjects in German, and bare plural subjects located at the two different positions are interpreted differently; vP-external bare plurals are given the generic reading, while vP-internal bare plurals are given only the non-generic reading. Based on the observation, Diesing argues that the generic reading is only given to DPs interpreted outside of the vP, while the non-generic reading is only given to DPs interpreted within the vP.

3.2.1. Two subject positions in German

In German, a subject may appear in two different positions at the surface, as in (89); a subject may either appear to the right of ja doch, as in (89a), or to the left, as in (89b).

(89)  German (adapted from Diesing 1990:56)

a. … weil ja doch **Haifische** sichtbar sind.
   since PRT sharks visible are
   ‘Since there are sharks visible...’

b. … weil **Haifische** ja doch sichtbar sind.
   since sharks PRT visible are
   ‘Since sharks (in general) have the tendency to be visible...’

Assuming that ja doch is a sentential particle realized at I⁰, subject that appears to the left of ja doch, as in (89b), will be located outside of the vP, while the subject that appears to the right of ja...
doch, as in (89a), will be located within the vP.\textsuperscript{48}

(90) The two subject positions in English and German

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{IP} \\
\text{vP-external Subj} \quad \text{I'} \\
\quad \text{I = ja doch} \quad \text{vP} \\
\quad \text{vP-internal Subj} \quad \text{v'} \\
\quad \quad \text{v} \quad \text{VP}
\end{array}
\]

\textbf{3.2.2. Extraction from subjects in German}

Diesing (1990) adds support to the argument that the two different subject positions at the surface reflect two different positions in the structure, by showing that subjects at the two different positions show difference with respect to extraction.

In German, \textit{was-für} (meaning ‘what kind of’) may appear as one unit, or may be split; \textit{was} (the \textit{wh}-word) may be fronted by \textit{wh}-movement, leaving the rest of the phrase behind, as in (91b), or the entire \textit{was}-phrase may be fronted by \textit{wh}-movement, as in (91a).

\textsuperscript{48} Others have argued that \textit{ja doch} is a sentential adverbial that marks the boundary of vP (Webelhuth 1989). That sentential adverbials mark the boundary of vP has been also argued for by Jackendoff (1972) for English, and Holmberg (1986) for Scandinavian.
(91) *Was-für* split (German) (Adapted from Diesing 1990: 48)

a. [[CP [NP [Was für Ameisen]i haben [IP denn [vP ti einen
   what for ants have PRT a
   Postbeamten gebissen?]]]]
   Postman bitten
   ‘What kind of ants have bitten a postman?’

b. [[CP Wasi haben [IP denn [vP [NP ti für Ameisen] einen
   what have PRT for ants a
   Postbeamten gebissen?]]]
   Postman bitten
   ‘What kind of ants have bitten a postman?’

c. *[CP Wasi haben [IP [NP ti für Ameisen] denn [vP einen
   what have for ants PRT a
   Postbeamten gebissen?]]]
   Postman bitten
   ‘Intended meaning: What kind of ants have bitten a postman?’

Assuming that the ‘*Was-für* split’ is a case of sub-extraction (a case where the *wh*-element *Was* has moved out of the DP leaving the rest of the DP behind), we see that the possibility of extraction changes depending on the surface linear word order; while extraction out of subject DPs that appear to the right of the sentential particles is permitted, as in (91b), extraction out of subject DPs that appear to the left of the sentential particles is not permitted, as in (91c).49

49 Diesing attributes the discussion on *Was-für* splits to den Besten (1985).
A similar asymmetry in the possibility of extraction is found between a subject that appears to the left of a sentential particle and a subject that appears to the right of a sentential particle in the split-topic construction. When the topic phrase is fronted, the topic phrase may be split, leaving a part of the phrase behind, as in (92a). Assuming that the split-topic construction in German is an instance of sub-extraction, we see that extraction out of subjects that appear to the right of sentential particles is allowed, as in (92a), while extraction out of subjects that appear to the left of the sentential particles is not allowed, as in (92b).  

(92) Topic split (German) (Diesing 1990: 49-50)

a. Ameisen_i haben [IP ja [vP einen Postbeamten [NP viele ti] gebissen.]]
   ants have PRT a postman many bitten.
   ‘As for ants, many have bitten a postman.’

b. *Ameisen_i haben [IP [NP viele ti] ja [vP einen Postbeamten gebissen.]]
   ants have many PRT a postman bitten.
   ‘Intended meaning: As for ants, many have bitten a postman.’

That extraction is not possible from subjects located to the left of the sentential particle, as in (91c)

\footnote{For further discussion on split-topic constructions in German, Diesing (1990) directs readers to van Riemsdijk (1989), Fanselow (1988), and Webelhuth (1984).}
and (92b), while it is possible from subjects located to the right of the sentential particle, as in (91b) and (92a) suggests that the subjects occupy two different positions in the syntax.

The difference in the possibility of extraction is expected if subjects located to the left of the sentential particle have undergone movement. It has been often noted that extraction from moved NPs is restricted. The ill-formedness of the English examples in (93) and (94) suggests that extraction from moved NPs is restricted (cf. Huybrechts 1976; Lasnik & Saito 1990; 1992; Collins 1994).\(^{51,52}\)

(93)  
  a. *Who\(_j\) do you think that [\(\text{IP} [\text{pictures of } t_1]_i\) were painted \(t_i\)]?  
  b. *Which cars\(_j\) were [\(\text{IP} [\text{the hoods of } t_1]_i\) damaged \(t_i\)]?

(94)  
  a. ??Whose books\(_j\) do you think that [\(\text{IP} [\text{reviews of } t_1]_i\) [\(\text{IP} \text{John never reads } t_i\)]]

  b. ??Vowel harmony\(_j\), I think that [\(\text{IP} [\text{articles about } t_1]_i\) [\(\text{IP} \text{you should read } t_i\) carefully]]

Assuming that the subjects in (91) and (92) all are base-generated in [Spec, \(vP\)], and that subjects that appear to the left of the sentential particles are moved subjects, subjects that appear to the right of the sentential particle will be in [Spec, \(vP\)], while subjects that appear to the left of the sentential particle will have moved out of [Spec, \(vP\)]. Assuming that there is no movement to the specifier of

\(^{51}\) While Lasnik and Saito (1990; 101) have judged the sentences in (94) as marginal, Corver (2006) reports that others have judged the sentences completely ungrammatical.

\(^{52}\) Islandhood of moved constituents was also independently observed by Wexler and Culicover (1977; 1980).

(i)  
  a. [\(\text{NP} \text{Some people from Philadelphia}\) greeted me  
  b. [\(\text{NP} \text{Some people } t_i\) greeted me [from Philadelphia]_] 
  c. *[\(\text{What city}\) did you expect [ [\(\text{NP} \text{some people } t_i\) to greet you [\(\text{PP from } t_j\)]]]\)?
the same projection, subjects that appear to the left of the sentential particle will be located outside of the vP.\textsuperscript{53}

In sum, there are two different subject positions in German at the syntactic level; one is located external to the vP, while the other is located within the vP. Subjects at two different positions are distinguishable at the surface.

\textbf{3.2.3. The interpretation of bare plurals at the two subject positions in German}

So far, we have reviewed the argument that there are two different subject positions in German; the vP-internal position and the vP-external position. According to Diesing (1990), the generic reading is only available to vP-external bare plural subjects in German. In (95a), since the bare plural \textit{Haifische} ‘sharks’ appears to the right of the sentential particle \textit{ja doch}, the bare plural subject is assume to be located within the vP and the vP-internal bare plural subject is given the non-generic reading. On the other hand, if a bare plural subject appears to the left of the sentential particle, as in (95b), the subject is given the generic reading.

\begin{itemize}
\item (95) German (Diesing 1990; 56)
\begin{enumerate}
\item a. … weil ja doch Haifische sichtbar sind
\begin{itemize}
\item since PRT-PRT sharks visible are
\end{itemize}
\item ‘since there are sharks visible’
\end{enumerate}
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{53} According to the current analysis, the vP-internal subject will not satisfy the EPP in \textsc{[Spec, IP]} as it will stay in \textsc{[Spec, vP]}, which is not a novel claim for German (cf. Rosengren 2002; Biberauer 2008; Appleton 2009).
According to Diesing (1990), the difference in the interpretation between the two bare plurals subjects in (95) arises from the difference in their syntactic positions. She takes bare plurals to denote variables (following Heim’s 1982 analysis of indefinites). The variables are always bound, but by different operators based on their syntactic positions. She assumes that the nuclear scope is scoped over by an existential quantifier if there are free variables in it. Thus, assuming that vP-internal bare plurals are mapped into the nuclear scope (the Mapping Hypothesis), when bare plurals appear vP-internally, they are bound by existential closure and the existential reading results. When they appear vP-externally, bare plurals are bound by a generic operator (GEN) and the generic reading results.54

3.2.4. The interpretation of vP-external subjects in English

English subjects may appear in two different positions on the surface with respect to tense morphology. English subjects generally appear to the left of the tense morphology, as in (96a). However, in there-insertion constructions, subjects appear to the right of the tense morphology, as in (96b).

54 In Diesing’s (1990) original analysis, the division is between VP-external bare plurals and VP-internal bare plurals. During the discussion, I will use vP to refer to Diesing’s VP.
(96) a.  [IP Firemen
 are [vP firemen available.]]
       b.  [IP There are [vP firemen available.]]

Assuming that tense morphology is realized at the I-head, subjects that appear to the left of the tense morphology are generally assumed to be located at [Spec, IP] (external to the vP). On the other hand, what is generally assumed for the there-construction is that the expletive element occupies the canonical subject position, [Spec, IP], while the logical subject is located within the vP in [Spec, vP] (Chomsky 1981; 1982). The two subject positions are shown in (97).

(97)  The two subject positions in English

\[
\text{IP} \\
\text{vP-external Subj} \quad \text{I'} \\
\text{I} = \text{be (tense morphology)} \quad \text{vP} \\
\text{vP-internal Subj} \quad \text{v'} \\
\text{v} \quad \text{VP}
\]

Assuming that the interpretation is dependent on the syntactic position (Diesing 1990), the expectation is that vP-external bare plurals will be given the generic reading only, while vP-internal bare plurals are given the non-generic reading only. However, while vP-internal bare plurals are only allowed the non-generic reading, as in (98a), vP-external bare plurals are ambiguous between
the generic reading and the non-generic reading, as in (98b).  

(98) a.  \[ [\text{IP} \text{Firemen are } [v_P \text{ available.}]] \]

   i. Firemen in general have the tendency to be available. (Generic)
   
   ii. There is some unspecified group of firemen that is available. (Non-generic)

b.  \[ [\text{IP} \text{There are } [\bar{v}_P \text{ firemen available.}]] \]

   i. *Firemen in general have the tendency to be available. (Generic)
   
   ii. There is some unspecified group of firemen that is available. (Non-generic)

To account for (98b), Diesing proposes that the interpretations dependent on the position of the DPs at LF (mapping occurs at LF) and that \( v_P \)-external bare plurals in English are given the non-generic reading when they are reconstructed at their trace within the \( v_P \) at LF, as in (99b).

(99) a.  \[ [\text{IP} \text{Firemen}_i \text{ are } [\bar{v}_P \text{ firemen}_i \text{ available.}]] \] (The generic reading)

   b.  \[ [\text{IP} \text{Firemen}_i \text{ are } [\bar{v}_P \text{ firemen}_i \text{ available.}]] \] (The non-generic reading)

Assuming that the subject in [Spec, IP] is based-generated inside the \( v_P \), as in (100a), Diesing proposes that the \( v_P \)-external bare plural subject may be reconstructed at the trace within the \( v_P \) at LF.  

When the bare plural is interpreted at the reconstructed position within the \( v_P \) at LF, as in

\-----------------------------

55 The generic reading may be available to firemen in (98b), but it is ruled out as it is highly unlikely for firemen as a kind to possess such property, based on our world knowledge. What is important for our discussion here is that firemen in (98b) can be given the existential reading.

56 According to Diesing, not all subjects are base-generated within the \( v_P \). Diesing argues that subjects of individual-level predicates are not allowed the existential reading as they are base-generated outside of the \( v_P \); while firemen in (ib) is ambiguous between the generic reading and the existential reading, firemen in (ia) is only allowed the generic reading.
(99b)/(100b), the non-generic reading is attained, while the bare plural is given the generic reading when the DP is interpreted outside of the vP, as in (99a). In other words, the non-generic reading is available in (98a) only because the apparent vP-external bare plural subject is interpreted within the vP via reconstruction at LF.

(100) a. [IP Firemen; are [vP t available.]]
   
   b. LF: [IP Firemen; are [vP Firemen; available.]]

3.2.5. Summary

In sum, Diesing (1990) proposes that there are two different syntactic positions for subjects in English and German and that bare plural subjects at the two different positions are interpreted differently as they are bound by two different covert operators; vP-internal bare plurals at LF are given the non-generic reading as they are mapped into the scope and are bound by a covert existential operator, while vP-external bare plurals at LF are given the generic reading as they are

57 Since vP-internal bare plurals are not allowed the generic reading, the expectation would be that all object DPs are non-generic. However, not all bare plurals objects are non-generic. The bare plural object in (i) is easily understood as to refer to cows as a kind, without reference to any particular group of cows, as in (ia). To account for generic objects (objects given the generic reading), such as in (i), Diesing proposes that generic objects have moved covertly out of the vP at LF.

(i) [IP Firemen; are [ PRO; intelligent.] (Individual-level predicate)
   b. [IP Firemen; are [ ti available.] (Stage-level predicate)

57 Since vP-internal bare plurals are not allowed the generic reading, the expectation would be that all object DPs are non-generic. However, not all bare plurals objects are non-generic. The bare plural object in (i) is easily understood as to refer to cows as a kind, without reference to any particular group of cows, as in (ia). To account for generic objects (objects given the generic reading), such as in (i), Diesing proposes that generic objects have moved covertly out of the vP at LF.

(i) [IP John [vP hates cows.]]
   a. John hates cows in general. (the generic reading)
   b. *There are some cows that John hates. (the non-generic reading)
mapped into the restrictor and are bound by a covert generic operator.

3.3. Sentences lacking vP-external material entirely

Another difference between vP-internal bare plurals and vP-external bare plurals in German is that sentences with vP-external bare plurals as their subjects are understood as a generic sentence, as in (95b), while sentences with vP-internal bare plurals as their subjects are not allowed such reading, as in (95a). However, not all sentences with vP-internal subjects are given the non-generic reading. Sentences with vP-internal subjects are not allowed the generic reading only when there are no other elements that can be interpreted outside of the vP other than the subject. In other words, sentences are not allowed the generic when vP-external material is entirely absent.

3.3.1. Simple intransitive sentences and complex sentences

Carlson (1989) observes that there is an asymmetry between sentences that consist solely of a subject and a simple intransitive predicate (simple intransitives, hereafter) and more complex sentences; while simple generic intransitive sentences are incompatible with non-generic subjects, as in (101), more complex generic sentences are compatible with both generic subjects and non-generic subjects, as in (102).

(101) a. Flowers grow. (Adapted from Carlson 1989)
   i. Flowers in general have the tendency to grow. (Generic subject)
   ii. *Generally, there grows some flowers. (Non-generic subject)
b. A robot cooks.
   i. Robots in general have the tendency to cook. (Generic subject)
   ii. *Generally, there is some robot that has the tendency to cook.
       (Non-generic subject)

(102) a. Flowers grow out behind the old shed.
   i. Flowers in general have the tendency to grow out behind the old shed.
       (Generic subject)
   ii. Generally, there grows some flowers out behind the old shed.
       (Non-generic subject)

b. A robot cooks my morning breakfast.
   i. Robots in general have the tendency to cook my morning breakfast.
       (Generic subject)
   ii. There is a robot that has the tendency to cook my morning breakfast.
       (Non-generic subject)

(101a) is a simple generic intransitive. The bare plural subject flowers in (101a) could refer to flowers as a kind (the generic reading of the subject), as in (101ai), but it could not refer to some group of flowers (the non-generic reading of the subject), as in (101a ii). The same behavior is observed with a robot in (101b). In other words, simple intransitives are incompatible with non-generic subjects.

Generic simple intransitives in (101) are incompatible with non-generic subjects because simple intransitives with non-generic subjects are not allowed the generic reading. According to Chierchia (1995), sentences that lack vP-external material entirely at LF are not allowed the generic reading.
If we follow Diesing (1990) and assume that bare plurals (an indefinite singulars) are given the non-generic reading only when they are interpreted within the vP, the subjects in (101) will be located within the vP at LF (via reconstruction), when they are given the non-generic reading. Then, assuming that the predicates in (101) cannot be interpreted outside of the vP, simple intransitives with non-generic subjects will not have any vP-external material at LF. On the other hand, simple intransitives with generic subjects, as in (101aii), are allowed the generic reading as the generic subjects are interpreted outside of the vP.

Following Chierchia (1995), the expectation is that generic reading will be available with non-generic subjects when there are other elements that can be interpreted vP-externally. As expected, complex generic sentences are compatible with non-generic subjects, as in (102).

(102a) is a generic sentence that ascribes a tendential property to the subject. However, unlike in simple generic intransitives, (102a) allows a reading in which the subject flowers refers to some group of flowers (the non-generic reading of the subject), as in (102aii). Flowers in (102a) may also refer to flowers as a kind (the generic reading of the subject), as in (102ai). The same is true for the sentence in (102b). According to Chiechia (1995), generic readings are available with non-generic subjects in (102) because there are other materials that can be interpreted vP-externally.

In sum, sentences in (95a) and (98a) are not allowed the generic reading with vP-internal subjects, as the sentences are simple intransitives. While an expletive element occupies the vP-external subject position in (98a), an expletive element has no interpretation at LF.

3.3.2. Kratzer’s PVQ

The generic reading would not be available to sentences lacking vP-external material entirely at LF if we assume Kratzer’s prohibition against vacuous quantification (PVQ).
In *when*-conditionals, sentences with individual-level predicates are ungrammatical when none of its arguments are indefinites, as in (103a). Sentences become grammatical if one of the arguments is an indefinite, as in (103b) and (103c), or if the predicate is a stage-level predicate, as in (103d).

(103) a. *When Mary knows French, she knows it well.
   b. When a Moroccan knows French, she knows it well.
   c. When Mary knows a foreign language, she knows it well.
   d. When Mary speaks French, she speaks it well.

According to Kratzer (1995), sentences in (103) are quantificational sentences with a non-overt quantifier *always*. She claims that (103a) is ungrammatical as the non-overt quantifier in (103a) has no variable to bind, thus violating the PVQ. PVQ states that quantifiers must bind a variable, such that appears at both the restrictive clause and the nuclear scope. If PVQ is violated quantification fails.

(104) Prohibition against Vacuous Quantification (PVQ) (Kratzer 1995; 131)

For every quantifier Q, there must be a variable x such that Q binds an occurrence of x in both its restrictive clause and its nuclear scope.

Assuming that *when*-clauses are devices for restricting the domain of some operators (Kratzer 1978; 1986), and that the non-overt operator in (103) is *always*, the sentences in (103) can be given the formulae in (105); *always* is the non-overt operator, the *when*-clause is the restrictor, and the clause that follows the *when*-clause is the scope.
(105) a. *Always [knows (Mary, French)] [knows-well (Mary, French)]

b. Always \( x \) [Moroccan (x) & knows (x, French)]

[ knows-well (x, French)]

c. Always \( x \) [foreign language (x) & knows (Mary, x)]

[ knows-well (Mary, x)]

d. Always \( s \) [speaks (Mary, French, s)] [speaks-well (Mary, French, s)]

Assuming that indefinites introduce variables that need to be bound by a quantifier for proper interpretation (cf. Heim 1982), (103b) and (103c) are grammatical as the quantifier binds the variable \( x \) (introduced by the indefinites) at both the restrictor and the scope, as depicted in (105b) and (105c). On the other hand, (103a) is ungrammatical, as the quantifier has no variable to bind (at either the scope or the restrictor), as depicted in (105a).

(103d) is like (103a) in that none of the arguments are indefinites. Therefore, assuming that definite DPs do not introduce variables, we would expect (103d) to be ungrammatical. However, (103d) is grammatical. According to Kratzer, (103d) is grammatical because stage-level predicates possess extra Davidsonian event argument (the situation variable in our terminology), represented as \( s \) in (105d). In other words, unlike the individual-level sentence in (103a), the non-overt quantifier in (103d) binds the situation variable \( s \) at the restrictor and the scope, thus making the sentence grammatical.

In sum, assuming that generic sentences are quantificational sentences, generic sentences will become ungrammatical if the generic operator does not bind a variable, such that appears at both the scope and the restrictor. In other words, for generic sentences to be grammatical, the generic operator must bind a situation variable in both its restrictive clause and its nuclear scope.
3.3.3. Violation of PVQ and the absence of the generic reading

PVQ states that the generic operator must bind an occurrence of a variable at both the restrictor and the scope. And the Mapping Hypothesis states that vP-external material is interpreted as information about the restriction of genericity, i.e. the kind of situation/individuals about which the relevant generalization is made. Therefore, a sentence that lacks vP-external elements entirely at LF will not be allowed the generic reading, as the generic operator will not have a variable to bind in the restrictor, thus violating the PVQ.

According to Chierchia (1995), the sentence in (102b) can be given the generic reading with a non-generic subject because the object can be interpreted outside of the vP. That the object is given the generic reading in (102b) (does not refer to any specific morning breakfast) suggests that the object is interpreted outside of the vP in (102bii). 58

In sum, generic sentences must possess vP-external material at LF. 59 Sentences with vP-internal subjects in (95a) and (98a) (repeated below as (106a) and (106b)) are not allowed the generic reading as they are simple intransitives with vP-internal subjects that lack vP-external material.

58 Diesing (1990) proposes that objects may move covertly to a vP-external position. Since English subjects are generally argued to be located at [Spec, IP], such movement does not necessary involve objects scrambling past the subject. The existential reading of the subject is argued to be a result of reconstruction operation at LF (Diesing 1990). In other words, subject-object word order can be maintained at the surface, even when the subject is given the existential reading, while the object is given the generic reading.

59 Chierchia (1995) proposes that generic sentences that do not seem to be restricted in any sense, such as in (ia), is still restricted to situations involving the subject. According to him, the sentence in (ia) can be paraphrased as (ib).

(i)  a. John is intelligent.
    b. Generally for situation s, if s is a situation involving John, s is a situation in which John is intelligent.
entirely, thus violating PVQ.

(106) a. … weil ja doch Haifische sichtbar sind.
    since PRT sharks visible are
    ‘Since there are sharks visible...’ (Non-generic reading)

b. [IP There are [vP firemen available.]]
    ‘There are some group of firemen that are available. (Non-generic)’

3.4. The interpretation of i/ka-marked DPs and sentences with i/ka-marked subjects

3.4.1. The generic reading of i/ka-marked DPs in Korean

Unlike English and German, vP-external subjects (presumably in [Spec, IP]) and vP-internal subjects are not distinguishable by the linear word order, as Korean is a head final language.

(107)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{IP} \\
\text{vP-external Subject I'} \\
\text{vP I} \\
\text{vP-internal Subject \ldots}
\end{array}
\]

However, the two positions may be distinguished by the possibility of the non-generic reading. If Diesing’s proposal is applicable to Korean as well, that a bare DP is allowed the non-generic reading may indicate that the bare DP is interpreted within the \(vP\). In chapter 2, I have shown that
common nouns marked by \textit{i/ka}(L) are given the non-generic reading, while bare common nouns marked by \textit{i/ka}(H) are ambiguous between the generic reading and the non-generic reading.

\begin{enumerate}
\item Say-\textit{ka}(H) \textit{na-n-ta}.
\begin{itemize}
\item bird-NOM fly-PRS-DECL
\end{itemize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item What has the tendency to fly are birds. (Generic reading) 
\hspace{1cm} Inference: No other kind of animals has the tendency to fly.
\item What is flying is a bird. (Non-generic reading) 
\hspace{1cm} Inference: No other animal is flying.
\end{enumerate}
\end{enumerate}

\begin{enumerate}
\item Say-\textit{ka}(L) \textit{na-n-ta}.
\begin{itemize}
\item bird-NOM fly-PRS-DECL
\end{itemize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item *Birds in general have the tendency to fly.
\item There is a bird flying.
\end{enumerate}
\end{enumerate}

Assuming that the non-generic reading is only available to bare common nouns interpreted within the \textit{vP}, that bare common nouns marked by \textit{i/ka}(L) are given the non-generic reading but not the generic reading suggests that \textit{i/ka}(L)-marked DPs are interpreted within the \textit{vP}. On the other hand, that bare common nouns marked by \textit{i/ka}(H) are allowed the generic reading suggests that the DPs are interpreted outside of the \textit{vP}.\textsuperscript{60}

\textbf{3.4.2. The genericity of sentences with \textit{i/ka}-marked subjects}

Assuming that PVQ and the Mapping Hypothesis are applicable to Korean, a generic sentence

\textsuperscript{60}The non-generic reading of \textit{i/ka}(H)-marked DPs will be discussed in detail in Chapter 4.
must possess vP-external material. Therefore, that simple intransitive sentences with *i/ka*(H)-marked subjects allow the generic reading, as in (64a), (64b), and (66c) (repeated below as (110)) suggests that *i/ka*(H)-marked subjects are interpreted outside of the vP.

(110) a. *Saca-ka*(H) _hyungphokha-ta_
   
   lion-NOM ferocious-DECL
   
   ‘It is Lions that are ferocious.’ (Generic reading)

b. *Saca-ka*(H) _ku-ta._
   
   lion-TOP big-DECL
   
   ‘It is lions that are big.’ (Generic reading)

c. *John-i*(H) _ttwi-n-ta._
   
   John-NOM run-PRS-DECL
   
   ‘John is the person who runs habitually.’ (Habitual reading)

### 3.4.2.1. PVQ in Korean

If Kratzer’s PVQ is applicable to Korean generic sentences, sentences that lack vP-external elements entirely will not be given the generic reading in Korean either. If so, that a simplest intransitive sentence with *i/ka*(H)-marked subject is allowed the generic reading will suggest that *i/ka*(H)-marked subject are located outside of the vP.

_Ttay_-conditionals in Korean are similar to English _when_-conditionals in how they are interpreted. In (111), _enceyna_ ‘always’ is the operator (the operator may be overt or covert), _ttay_-clause is the restrictor of the operator, and the clause following the _ttay_-clause is the scope, as depicted in the formula in (111b). (111b) can be paraphrased as, “For every individual _x_, if _x_ is a Moroccan and _x_
knows Latin, \( x \) knows Latin well.’

(111) a. *molokho salam-un lathine-lul al-ttay,

\[
\begin{array}{lll}
\text{Moroccan-TOP} & \text{latin-ACC} & \text{know-when} \\
(enceyna) & \text{ceytaylo an-ta.}
\end{array}
\]

always well know-DECL

‘When a Moroccan knows Latin, he always knows it well.’

b. always \( x \) [Moroccan (\( x \)) & knows (\( x \), Latin)] [knows-well (\( x \), Latin)]

If PVQ is applicable to Korean quantificational sentences, *ttay*-conditionals will be ungrammatical with individual-level predicates, when indefinites are not used. And that is indeed the case in (112). (112a) is ungrammatical as the operator has no variable to bind at the scope or the restrictor, as depicted in (112b). *Ttay*-conditionals are also grammatical with stage-level predicates, even when indefinites are not used, as in (113). In sum, that quantificational sentences in Korean become ungrammatical when the quantifier does not have a variable to bind suggests that PVQ is applicable to Korean, as well.

(112) a. *John-un lathine-lul al-ttay, (enceyna)

\[
\begin{array}{lll}
\text{John-TOP} & \text{latin-ACC} & \text{know-when} \\
\text{always} & \text{ceytaylo an-ta.}
\end{array}
\]

well know-DECL

‘*When John knows Latin, he always knows it well.’

b. always [knows (John, Latin)] [knows-well (John, Latin)]
(113) a.  

\[
\text{John-un ttwi-l-ttay, (enceyna) ceytaylo ttwi-n-ta.}
\]

John-TOP run-REL-when always well run-PRS-DECL

‘When John runs, he (always) runs his well.’

b. always, [run (John, s)] [run-well (John, s)]

Assuming that a generic sentence in Korean is a quantificational sentence in which the generic operator binds the situation variable (cf. Kratzer 1988; 1995, Chierchia 1995), the generic operator must bind an occurrence of the situation variable at both the restrictor and the scope. Otherwise, the quantification will fail as it violates PVQ.

3.4.2.2. Sentences with i/ka(H)-marked subjects

In (114), we see that intransitive sentences are allowed the generic reading when the sole argument is marked by i/ka(H). Intransitive sentences with individual-level predicates are grammatical, as in (114a) and (114b). Intransitives with stage-level predicates are allowed the generic reading, regardless of whether the predicate is unergative or unaccusative, as in (114c) and (114d). Intransitive passive constructions are also allowed the generic reading, as in (114e). That intransitive sentences with i/ka(H)-marked subjects are allowed the generic reading suggests that i/ka(H)-marked DPs are located outside of the vP at LF.

(114) a.  

\[
\text{Saca-ka(H) hyungphokha-ta.}
\]

lion-NOM ferocious-DECL

‘It is Lions that are ferocious.’
apple-NOM tasty-DECL
‘It is Apples that are tasty.’
c. *Saca-ka*(H) *ttwi-n-ta.*
lion-NOM run-DECL
i. ‘It is Lions that have the tendency to habitually run.’
ii. ‘It is a lion that is running.’
d. *Saca-ka*(H) *ssuleci-n-ta.*
lion-NOM fall-PRS-DECL
i. ‘It is lions that have the tendency to fall habitually.’
ii. ‘It is lions that are falling.’
e. *Chayk-i*(H) *ilk-hi-n-ta.*
book-NOM read-PASS-PRS-DECL
i. ‘It is books that have the tendency to be read.’
ii. ‘It is books that are being read.’
f. GEN [IP Subj-ka(H) [vP t V ]]

If *i/ka*(H)-marked DPs are indeed located outside of the *vP*, transitive sentences with *i/ka*(H)-marked subjects are also expected to be allowed the generic reading, as the subjects are already outside of the *vP*. And as expected transitive sentences with *i/ka*(H)-marked subjects are allowed the generic reading, as in (115), and the habitual reading, as in (116).
(115) \textit{Saca-ka(H) koki-lul mek-nun-ta.}
lion-NOM meat-ACC eat-PRS-DECL

i. ‘It is lions that have the tendency to eat meat.’ (Generic reading)

ii. ‘It is lions that are eating meat now.’ (Episodic reading)

(116) \textit{John-\textit{i}(H) tampay-lul phin-ta.}
John-NOM cigarette smoke-DECL

i. ‘John is the person who smokes habitually.’ (Habitual reading)

ii. ‘John is the person who is smoking now.’ (Episodic reading)

In sum, that simple intransitive sentences with \textit{i}/\textit{ka}(H)-marked subjects are allowed the generic reading suggests that \textit{i}/\textit{ka}(H)-marked subjects are located outside of the \textit{vP}.

3.4.2.3. Intransitives with \textit{i}/\textit{ka}(L)-marked subjects

On the other hand, simple intransitives with \textit{i}/\textit{ka}(L)-marked subjects are not allowed the generic reading. This is expected if \textit{i}/\textit{ka}(L)-marked DPs are located within the \textit{vP}.

In (117), we see that intransitive sentences cannot be given the generic reading when the sole argument is marked by \textit{i}/\textit{ka}(L). Intransitive sentences with individual-level predicates are ungrammatical, as in (117a) and (117b). Intransitives with stage-level predicates are not allowed the generic reading, regardless of whether the predicate is unergative or unaccusative, as in (117c) and (117d). Intransitive passive constructions are also not allowed the generic reading, as in (117e).

\footnote{I assume that passivized verb project a defective \textit{vP} that does not assign external theta-role. The internal argument of the passivized verb will be located at [Spec, \textit{vP}], internal to the \textit{vP}.}
reading suggests that $i/ka(L)$-marked DPs are located within the $vP$.

(117) a. *Saca-ka(L) hyungphokha-ta.
   
   lion-NOM ferocious-DECL
   
   ‘Lions are ferocious.’

b. *Sakwa-ka(L) masiss-ta.
   
   apple-NOM tasty-DECL
   
   ‘Apples are tasty.’

c. *Saca-ka(L) ttwi-n-ta.
   
   lion-NOM run-DECL
   
   i. *‘Lions have the tendency to habitually run.’

   ii. ‘There is a lion running.’

d. *Saca-ka(L) ssuleci-n-ta.
   
   lion-NOM fall-PRS-DECL
   
   i. *‘Lions have the tendency to habitually fall.’

   ii. ‘There is a lion falling.’

e. Chayk-i(L) ilk-hi-n-ta.
   
   book-NOM read-PASS-PRS-DECL
   
   i. *‘Books have the tendency to be read.’

   ii. ‘There is a book being read.’

f. *GEN [IP $\emptyset$ [vP subj-ka(L) $V$ ]]
3.4.2.4. Overtly scrambled transitives with \emph{i/ka}(L)-marked subjects

If simple intransitives with \emph{i/ka}(L)-marked DPs are not allowed the generic reading as they lack $vP$-external elements that may form a restrictive clause, the expectation is that sentences with \emph{i/ka}(L)-marked DPs will be allowed the generic reading when there are elements located outside of the $vP$ other than the subject, such as scrambled objects.

A canonical Korean transitive sentence has subject-object word order. Objects of canonical transitive sentences are assumed to be located within the VP below the subject, as in (118).

(118) a. \textit{John-i(L) tampay-lul phi-n-ta}

\hspace{1cm} John-NOM cigarette-ACC smoke-PRS-DECL

b. \hspace{1cm} $\begin{array}{c} \textit{John-i(L) tampay-lul phi} \\ \text{John-NOM cigarette-ACC smoke-PRS-DECL} \end{array}$

Assuming that $vP$-internal subjects in Korean are at [Spec, $vP$], and that scrambled objects are located outside of the $vP$, transitive sentences with scrambled objects would be allowed the generic reading. And as expected, the habitual reading is available to transitive sentences with \emph{i/ka}(L)-marked subjects regardless of whether the transitive predicate is of native origin, as in (119a), (119b), or Chinese loan word, as in (119c). The same is true with causative transitives, as in (119d).
    cigarette-ACC John-NOM smoke-DECL
    i. ‘Cigarettes are what John has the tendency to smoke habitually.’
    ii. ‘Cigarettes are what John is smoking (now).’

    apple-ACC John-NOM eat-PRS-DECL
    i. ‘Apples are what John has the tendency to eat habitually.’
    ii. ‘Apples are what John is eating (now).’

    studying-ACC John-NOM do-PRS-DECL
    i. ‘Studying is what John has the tendency to do habitually.’
    ii. ‘Studying is what John is doing (now).’

    Mary-ACC John-NOM cry-CAUSE-PRS-DECL
    i. ‘John has the tendency to make someone cry, and the person is Mary.’
    ii. ‘John is making someone cry (now); someone is Mary.’

e. GEN \[ \text{IP Obj-lul}(H) [\text{vP Subj-i(L) ti V }] \]

While the generic reading becomes available when the object is interpreted outside of the vP, what satisfies the PVQ is not necessarily the object (or the variable introduced by the object). As long as there are vP-external elements at LF, scrambled objects need not be bare DPs that introduce
variables, as in (119d). What satisfies the PVQ in (119d) are situations variables.\textsuperscript{62} When the object has scrambled past the subject overtly, the object may be marked by \textit{ul/lul}, as in (119), or by \textit{un/nun}, as in (120).\textsuperscript{63} And in both cases, regardless of the markers, the sentences are allowed the generic reading, despite the fact that the \textit{i/ka(L)}-marked subject is given the non-generic reading (interpreted vP-internally).

(120) a. \textit{Tampay-nun(H) John-i(L) phin-ta.}

\begin{tabular}{lll} cigarette-TOP & John-NOM & smoke-DECL \\
\end{tabular}

i. ‘As for cigarettes, John has the tendency to smoke them habitually.’

ii. ‘As for cigarettes, John is smoking them (now).’

b. \textit{Sakwa-nun(H) John-i(L) mek-nun-ta.}

\begin{tabular}{lll} apple-TOP & John-NOM & eat-PRS-DECL \\
\end{tabular}

i. ‘As for apples, John has the tendency to eat them habitually.’

ii. ‘As for apples, John is eating them (now).’

\textsuperscript{62} While maintaining PVQ, I move away from Kratzer (1995) and assume that the situation variables are also present in individual-level predicates (cf. Chierchia (1995)). Following Chierchia (1995), I assume that (103a) does not satisfy the PVQ even with situation variables present, because the situation in (103a) cannot be re-iterated. Since the variable is already fixed, the Q-adverb is deemed useless when quantifying situation variables, which makes the quantification fail (nonvacuity presupposition). In other words, quantifiers should not only bind variables at both the restrictor and the scope, but also the variables they bind should not have fixed value.

\textsuperscript{63} Scrambled objects with the accusative Case particle \textit{ul/lul} are given prosodic prominence. And like \textit{i/ka(H)}-marked DPs, accusative Case-marked DPs with prosodic prominence are interpreted with the exhaustive reading. On the other hand, scrambled object marked by \textit{un/nun(H)} are given the contrastive reading.
c. *Kongpwu-nun(H) John-i(L) ha-n-ta.*
   study-TOP John-NOM do-PRS -DECL

   i. ‘As for studying, John has the tendency to do it habitually.’

   ii. ‘As for studying, John is doing it (now).’

d. *Mary-nun(H) John-i(L) ul-i-n-ta.*
   Mary-TOP John-NOM cry-CAUSE-PRS -DECL

   i. ‘As for Mary, John has the tendency to make her cry.’

   ii. ‘As for Mary, John is making her cry (now).’

e. **GEN [IP Obj-nun(H) [vP Subj-i(L) ti V ]]**

That (121a) can be understood as a statement about modern air planes (in general) having the tendency to be controlled by some computer also suggests that sentences can be given the generic reading with non-generic subjects (that are interpreted within the vP) when scrambled objects are given the generic reading (interpreted vP-externally). Only the episodic reading is available when the subject-object word order is maintained, as in (121b).

(121) a. *Hyentay-uy phiyangki-nun khemphuthe-ka(L) cocongha-n-ta.*
   modern-GEN plane-ACC computer-NOM control-PRS-DECL

   ‘A computer routes modern air planes.’ (Generic)

b. *Khemphuthe-ka(L) hyentay-uy phiayngki-lul(L) cocongha-n-ta.*
   computer-NOM modern-GEN plane-ACC control-PRS-DECL

   ‘A computer is routing a modern air plane.’ (Episodic)
3.4.2.5. Canonical transitive sentences with i/ka(L)-marked subjects

The generic reading is not available when transitive sentences with i/ka(L)-marked DP subjects appear with canonical subject-object word order. Canonical transitive sentences (transitives with subject-object word order) with i/ka(L)-marked subjects are not allowed the generic/habitual reading, regardless of the predicate, as in (122).

(122) a. *John-i(L) tampay-lul phin-ta*
   John-NOM cigarette smoke-DECL
   i. ‘*John has the tendency to smoke habitually.’
   ii. ‘John is smoking (now).’

b. *John-i(L) sakwa-lul mek-nun-ta*
   John-NOM apple-ACC eat-PRS-DECL
   i. ‘*John has the tendency to eat apples habitually.’
   ii. ‘John is eating apples (now).’

c. *John-i(L) kongpwu-lul ha-n-ta.*
   John-NOM study-ACC do-PRS-DECL
   i. ‘*John has the tendency to study habitually.’
   ii. ‘John is studying (now).’

d. *John-i(L) Mary-lul ul-i-n-ta.*
   John-NOM Mary-ACC cry-CAUSE-PRS-DECL
   i. ‘*John has the tendency to make Mary cry.’
   ii. ‘John is making Mary cry (now).’
This is quite different from English, in which transitive sentences with vP-internal subjects are allowed the generic reading without scrambled objects, as in (123). According to Carlson (1989), sentences such as in (123) are most salient when the subject is given the non-generic reading with the object given the generic reading, as in (123i). Assuming that non-generic subjects are located within the vP at LF, Chierchia (1995) argues that sentences in (123) and may be given the generic reading despite the vP-internal subject, as objects in English can move covertly outside of the vP at LF. That the object DP in (123) is given the generic reading suggests that the DP is interpreted outside of the vP.

(123) A computer routes a modern plane.
   i. Modern planes in general have the tendency to be routed by some computer.
   ii. ??Computers in general route modern planes.

I argue that canonical transitive sentences with /ka(L)-marked DPs in Korean are not allowed the generic reading as Korean does not allow objects to scramble past the subject covertly.\textsuperscript{64} That

\textsuperscript{64} The assumption here is that PF-scrambling does not occur in Korean. If Korean allows scrambling of arguments without any LF consequences, any word order will be possible. However, clear restrictions that may be traced to syntactic constraints have been observed in scrambling in Korean (Cho 1994; Choi 2004, among others).
Korean does not allow covert scrambling of the object is supported by the behaviors of reflexive pronouns in Korean.

It is generally observed that reciprocal pronoun selo in Korean must appear lower than its co-indexed item, as in (124a). Sentences are ungrammatical when the reciprocal pronoun appears above its co-indexed item, as in (124b). The general view on the reciprocal pronoun selo is that it must have a C-commanding antecedent (S. Ahn 1988; Lee 2001, among others). The sentence in (125) can be given the reading in which the reciprocal pronoun is antecedced by John-kwa Mary-uy chinkwutul ‘John and Mary’s friends’, but not the reading in which the reciprocal pronoun is antecedced by John-kwa Mary (Lee 2001).

(124) a. [John-kwa Mary]-ka selo-lul miwehan-ta.
   John-and Mary-NOM each other-ACC hate-DECL
   ‘John and Mary hate each other.’

      each other-NOM John-and Mary-ACC hate-DECL
      ‘*Each other hates John and Mary.’

65 An apparent exception to the generalization is given in (i). However, as pointed out by S. Ahn (1988) and Lee (2001), selo in (i) is not understood as a reciprocal pronoun.

(i) [selo-uy sensayngnim]-i kutul-ul pinanhay-ss-ta.
   each other-GEN teacher-NOM they-ACC criticize-PST-DECL
   i. ‘Their teachers criticized their students.’
   ii. *‘Their teachers criticized each other’s students.’
What has been also argued is that the C-commanding antecedent relation can be satisfied by a trace of the reciprocal pronoun. In (126a), the sentence is grammatical with the reflexive pronoun located above its co-indexed item. It has been argued that (126a) is grammatical because the co-indexed antecedent C-commands the trace of the reciprocal pronoun. However, the C-commanding antecedent relation is not always checked by the trace. The grammaticality of (126b) suggests that sentences are grammatical as long as either the scrambled position or the base position satisfies the C-commanding antecedent relation, because, in (126b), the C-commanding antecedent relation is satisfied by the moved item.

(126) a. [selo-ulu] [John-kwa Mary]-ka tₗ miwehan-ta.
   each other-ACC  John and Mary-NOM  hate-DECL
   ‘John and Mary hates each other.’ (John and Mary > selo (trace))

b. ?[[John-kwa Mary]-ulu] selo-ka tₗ miwehan-ta.
   John and Mary-ACC each other-NOM hate-DECL
   ‘John and Mary hates each other.’ (John and Mary (scrambled) > selo)

If objects can scramble past the subject covertly at LF, there is no reason why (124b) should be ungrammatical. The accusative marked co-indexed item may scramble past the subject at LF, as
in (127), which will produce the same LF form as (126b), thereby satisfying the C-commanding antecedent relation.


John and Mary-ACC each other-NOM hate-DECL

‘John and Mary hates each other.’ (John and Mary (scrambled) > selo)

That (124b) is ungrammatical shows that covert movement of the object past the subject is not allowed in Korean.

If objects cannot scramble covertly past the subject in Korean, objects will always be located below the subject at LF in canonical transitive sentences. Therefore, if i/ka(L)-marked subjects are located within the vP, canonical transitive sentences with i/ka(L)-marked subjects will not be allowed the generic reading, as both of their arguments are located within the vP. And the expectation is met in (122).

3.4.2.6. Summary

Assuming that i/ka(L)-marked subjects are interpreted within the vP, the expectation is that simple intransitive sentences and canonical transitive sentences with i/ka(L)-marked subjects will not be allowed the generic reading, while transitive sentences with objects scrambled past the i/ka(L)-marked subject should be allowed the generic reading. And the predictions are all met in (117), (119), (120), and (122).
3.5. Summary

According to Diesing’s Mapping Hypothesis, the non-generic reading is only available to DPs interpreted within the vP. Assuming Kratzer’s PVQ, only simple intransitives with vP-external subjects will be allowed the generic reading. In this chapter, I have argued $i/ka$-(L)-marked DPs are interpreted within the vP as they are given the non-generic reading, while $i/ka$-(H)-marked DPs are interpreted outside of the vP, as simple intransitives with $i/ka$-(H)-marked DPs are allowed the generic reading.
Chapter 4

The existential reading of \(i/ka\)-marked bare common nouns and its structural implications

In this chapter, I add support to the argument that \(i/ka\)(L)-marked DPs and \(i/ka\)(H)-marked DPs are interpreted at two different positions at LF based on the observation that \(i/ka\)(L)-marked DPs are given the existential reading, while \(i/ka\)(H)-marked DPs are given the presuppositional reading. According to Diesing (1990), the existential reading is only available to DPs located within the \(vP\), while DPs located outside of the \(vP\) are not allowed the existential reading in English and German. Assuming that the same is also true in Korean, that \(i/ka\)(L)-marked bare DPs are allowed the existential reading will indicate that \(i/ka\)(L)-marked DPs are interpreted within the \(vP\). On the other hand, that \(i/ka\)(H)-marked bare DPs are given the presuppositional reading will suggest that \(i/ka\)(H)-marked DPs are interpreted outside of the \(vP\).\(^{66}\)

\(^{66}\) As noted in chapter 2, not all non-generic bare DPs are given the existential reading in Korean. Therefore, that \(i/ka\)(H)-marked DPs are not allowed the existential reading does not mean that \(i/ka\)(H)-marked DPs are obligatorily given the generic reading. This is quite different from how Diesing categorizes bare plurals in English.
4.1. The existential reading of vP-internal DPs

4.1.1. The existential reading of vP-external bare plurals in English

As noted in the previous chapter, Diesing (1990) argues that bare plurals interpreted within the vP are obligatorily given the existential reading in English. She supports her claim by arguing that raised subjects in English cannot be given the existential reading when reconstruction within the vP is blocked. In the following sections, we see examples of bare plurals in raising constructions where reconstruction is blocked by Condition C violations, and we will see that in just these constructions, the existential readings of bare plural indefinites are blocked.

4.1.1.1. Raising constructions in English

In English, when a verb that does not assign an external argument of its own takes a clause that cannot assign Case to its external argument (raising infinitives), the external argument of the embedded clause raises to the matrix subject position to be assigned nominative Case, as in (128). Constructions such as in (128), in which the embedded subject obligatorily raises to the matrix subject position, are termed raising constructions.

(128) a. Firemen [IP \[ \_t_i \_t_i \_be \_available]]

b. Sharks [IP \[ \_t_i \_t_i \_be \_visible]]

That the apparent matrix subject of a raising construction (raised subject, hereafter) is base-generated as the subject of an embedded clause is supported by the intuition that the raised subject is understood as an argument of the embedded clause. In other words, what is available in (128a)
are firemen, while what is visible in (128b) are sharks.

That the raised subject is not base-generated as the external argument of the matrix subject (but has raised from the embedded clause) is also supported by the observation that the sentences become ungrammatical when external arguments are inserted at the matrix clause. When the matrix verb *seem* embeds a finite clause, the embedded subject may stay within the embedded clause, as in (129). Since the embedded subject does not raise to the matrix clause, the external argument position of the matrix verb becomes available. However, the external argument position cannot be filled by anything other than an expletive element, as in (129). Sentences become ungrammatical when an argumental DP is inserted at the matrix clause instead of an expletive element, as in (130) and (131).

(129) a. It seems that [firemen are available].
   b. It seems that [sharks are visible].

(130) a. *John seems that firemen are available.
   b. *Fisherman seems that sharks are visible.

(131) a. Firemenᵢ seems that [ti are available].
   b. Sharksᵢ seems that [ti are visible].

That the sentences above remain grammatical when quasi-argumental PPs are inserted (to achieve a similar reading), as in (132) and (133), suggests that the ungrammaticality of (130) is not due to semantic incompatibility.

(132) a. It seems to the Mayor that firemen are available.
   b. It seems to the predators that sharks are visible.
(133) a. Firemen seem to the mayor to be available.
   b. Sharks seem to the predators to be visible.

In short, the ungrammaticality of (130) suggests that the matrix verb *seem* does not license an external argument. Therefore, the raised subject in (128) cannot be base-generated as the external argument of the matrix verb *seem*.

The movement in (128) is triggered by the need to check Case. Assuming that nominative Case is assigned locally (cannot probe into the embedded vP), and also assuming that raising infinitives do not assign nominative Case (Martin 2001), the subject of a non-finite embedded clause will need to move to the matrix clause to be assigned nominative Case. In other words, the movement in (128) is obligatory.

In sum, raised subjects of raising constructions in English are base-generated as embedded subjects but move obligatorily to the matrix subject position for Case reasons.

4.1.1.2. Reconstruction of raised subjects

It has been argued that raised subjects of raising constructions can be reconstructed at the trace position within the embedded clause at LF (Diesing 1990; 1992; Fox 1999). In other words, the raised subject is interpreted as if it were in its trace position, as in (134b).

(134) a. PF: [IP Firemen_i seem [vP <Firemen_i> to be available.]]
   b. LF: [IP Firemen_i seem [vP <Firemen_i> to be available.]]

That the raised subject can be reconstructed at the embedded subject position is supported by the scopal ambiguity shown by the raised subjects, as in (135). (135) is ambiguous between two
readings. One reading is a specific reading in which the raised subject *someone from Chicago* scopes over the matrix predicate *likely* (the wide scope reading), which can be paraphrased as (135a). The other reading is a non-specific reading in which the matrix predicate *likely* scopes over the raised subject (the narrow scope reading), which can be paraphrased as (135b).

(135)  Someone from Chicago is likely to win a Nobel Prize.

a. There is someone from Chicago who is likely to win a Nobel Prize.

(The wide scope reading: *someone from Chicago* scopes over *likely*)

b. It is likely that there is someone from Chicago who will win a Nobel Prize.

(The narrow scope reading: *likely* scopes over *someone from Chicago*)

According to Fox (1999), the narrow scope reading of the subject in (135) arises when the raised subject is reconstructed in the embedded subject position below the matrix verb, as in (136LF₂), while the wide scope reading is attained when the raised subject is interpreted at the moved position above the matrix verb, as in (136LF₁).

(136) LF₁:  [IP [Someone from Chicago]ₙ is likely [vP <Someone from Chicagoₙ to win a Nobel Prize.]] (someone from Chicago scopes over likely)

LF₂:  [IP [Someone from Chicago]ₙ is likely [vP <Someone from Chicagoₙ to win a Nobel Prize.]] (likely scopes over someone from Chicago)

4.1.1.3. The existential reading of raised subjects

Following Fox (1999) and assuming that raised subjects can be reconstructed within the vP in the embedded subject position at LF, Diesing’s proposal (that bare plurals located within the vP at LF
are obligatorily given the existential reading) predicts that raised bare plural subjects should be allowed the existential reading (when they reconstruct). And as expected, the raised subject in (137) is allowed both the generic reading and existential reading; the raised subject could refer to firemen/sharks as a kind, or some group of firemen/sharks.

(137) a. Firemen seem to the Mayor to be available.
   i. To the Mayor, firemen as a kind seem to have the tendency to be available. (Generic)
   ii. To the Mayor, there seems to be some firemen that are available. (Existential)

b. Sharks seem to the predator to be visible.
   i. To the predators, sharks as a kind seem to have the tendency to be visible. (Generic)
   ii. To the predators, there seem to be some sharks that are visible. (Existential)

Another expectation is that the existential reading of the raised bare plurals will be blocked if reconstruction is blocked. And the expectation is met in (138).

(138) a. Firemen\textsubscript{i} seem to their\textsubscript{i} Mayor to be available.
   i. To their\textsubscript{i} Mayor, firemen\textsubscript{i} in general seem to have the tendency to be available.
   ii. *To their\textsubscript{i} Mayor, there seem to be some firemen\textsubscript{i} that are available.
b. Sharks\textsubscript{i} seem to their\textsubscript{\textit{i}} predators to be visible.

i. To their\textsubscript{\textit{i}} predators, sharks\textsubscript{i} in general seem to have the tendency to be visible.

ii. *To their\textsubscript{\textit{i}} predators, there seem to be some sharks\textsubscript{i} that are visible.

Bound variable readings of pronouns are only possible when pronouns are C-commanded by their co-indexed antecedents, as in (139a). Bound variable readings are not available when pronouns are not C-commanded by their co-indexed elements, as in (139b).\textsuperscript{67} The grammaticality of (139c) suggests that the binding relation can be satisfied by reconstruction at LF.

(139) a. Every men\textsubscript{i} is like an angel to their\textsubscript{\textit{i}} mothers.

b. *Their\textsubscript{\textit{i}} mothers thinks that every men\textsubscript{i} is like an angel.

c. To their\textsubscript{\textit{i}} mothers, every men\textsubscript{i} is like an angel \textit{t}.

Assuming that binding relations must be met at LF, the raised subject in (138) will not be able to reconstruct within the embedded clause as the co-indexed pronoun will not be bound by its co-indexed antecedent. And as expected, Diesing finds that the raised subjects in (138) are not allowed the existential reading.

4.1.1.4. The existential reading within the matrix \textit{vP}

A similar restriction on reconstruction has been proposed by Fox (1999) using Binding Condition

\textsuperscript{67} Similarly, it has been proposed that reconstruction is blocked if a pronoun appears above its co-indexed antecedent as a result of the reconstruction (Chomsky 1993; Chomsky & Lasnik 1993).
C. Binding Condition C is a condition on the distribution of R-expressions.\(^{68}\)

(140) Condition C: An R-expression must be A-free everywhere.

The sentences in (142) are examples of Binding Condition C violations. While the sentences in (141) are fine, the sentences in (142) are ungrammatical as the R-expressions are bound by a pronoun co-indexed with the R-expression.\(^{69}\)

(141) a. He\(_i\) hit John\(_j\).
   b. They\(_i\) love sharks\(_j\).

(142) a. *He\(_i\) met John\(_i\).
   b. *They\(_i\) love sharks\(_i\).

According to Fox (1999), Binding Condition C must be met at LF. Therefore, R-expressions cannot be reconstructed to a position C-commanded by their co-indexed pronouns. Raised subjects are generally ambiguous between the narrow scope reading and the wide scope reading, as in (143i) and (143ii). Following Fox (1999), the narrow scope reading of a raised subject is attained when the raised subject is reconstructed at the embedded subject position.\(^{70}\)

\(^{68}\) Chomsky (1982) categorizes DPs into four types using two features; anaphoric and pronominal. An R-expression is a DP that is neither anaphoric nor pronominal.

\(^{69}\) \(\alpha\) binds \(\beta\) if and only if
   i. \(\alpha\) c-commands \(\beta\);
   ii. \(\alpha\) and \(\beta\) are co-indexed.

\(^{70}\) Diesing makes a similar proposal regarding specific DPs. According to her, specific DPs are located outside of the \(vP\) (VP in Diesing’s terminology), while non-specific DPs are located within the \(vP\) (VP).
Thus, the scopal ambiguity shows that the raised subject in (143) can be reconstructed at its trace.

(143) [A student of his\_i] seems to David\_i t\_j to be at the party.

i. ‘It seems to David that there is an unspecified student of his at the party.’

(The narrow scope reading: seem > ∃)

ii. ‘There is a particular student of David’s that to him seems to be at the party.’ (The wide scope reading: ∃ > seem)

On the other hand, the raised subject in (144) is not allowed the narrow scope reading. According to Fox (1999), the narrow scope reading is not available as reconstruction of the subject at the embedded subject position will violate Condition C; if the raised subject is reconstructed at its trace at LF, the R-expression will be bound by a co-indexed pronoun, thus violating Condition C.\(^71\)

(144) [A student of David\_i] seems to him\_i t\_j to be at the party.

i. *‘It seems to David that there is an unspecified student of his at the party.’

(The narrow scope reading: seem > ∃)

ii. ‘There is a particular student of David that to him seems to be at the party.’

(The wide scope reading: ∃ > seem)

If reconstructed subjects must obey Condition C, as argued by Fox (1999), the raised subjects in (145) will not be allowed to reconstruct within the embedded vP, as the R-expression John will be

\(^{71}\) As Kandybowicz (p.c.) points out, there seems to be no C-command relation between pronoun him and the trace in (144), as the pronoun will not be able to C-command out of the PP. However, binding relation is still observed between the pronoun and the trace of the R-expression. Assuming that binding relation indicates C-command relation, I will treat to as a dummy P (cf. Ticio 2009).
bound by the pronoun *him*. If the existential reading is only available to vP-internal bare plurals, the expectation is that the raised subjects in (145) will not be allowed the existential reading.

(145) a. [Children from John’s building] seem to him [tj to be missing].
   
b. [Children from John’s building] seem to him [tj to be noisy].

However, (145a) allows the existential reading. According to Nissenbaum (p.c.), the raised subject in (145a) cannot be given the narrow scope reading but the wide scope reading is available, as in (146ii).

(146) Children from John’s building seem to him to be missing
   (#but he doesn’t know which ones).

   i. *It seems to John that there are children (from his building) who are missing. (Narrow scope reading)

   ii. There are children (from John’s building) such that it seems to him that they are missing. (Wide scope reading reading)

To account for (145), while maintaining that the Mapping Hypothesis, I will assume that the matrix verb *seem* projects vP, albeit a defective one that does not assign external theta-role. Assuming that the raised subject moves via the matrix [Spec, vP], the raised subject in (145) can be interpreted at the matrix [Spec, vP]. The raised subject interpreted at the matrix vP will be given the existential reading as it is interpreted within the vP, but will be not allowed the narrow scope reading as it is
interpreted above the matrix verb.\textsuperscript{72}

As expected, when reconstruction is not blocked, both the narrow scope reading and the wide scope reading become available, as in (147).

(147) a. [Children from his\textsubscript{i} building]\textsubscript{j} seem to John\textsubscript{i} [t\textsubscript{j} to be missing].

b. [Children from his\textsubscript{i} building]\textsubscript{j} seem to John\textsubscript{i} [t\textsubscript{j} to be noisy].

4.1.1.5. Summary

Bare plurals in English can be given two different readings; the generic reading or the existential reading. According to Diesing (1990), the interpretation of bare plurals in English is dependent on where they are interpreted at LF. She assumes that there are two covert operators that binds variables; a covert generic operators that binds variables located outside of the vP, and a covert existential operator that binds variables located within the vP. Since bare plurals denote variables, bare plurals located within the vP at LF are given the existential reading, while bare plurals located

\textsuperscript{72} Kandybowicz (p.c.) reports that he finds both the narrow scope reading and the wide scope reading acceptable. The speaker variation may arise if C-command out of to-phrase is blocked for some speakers, thereby allowing the reconstruction of the raised subject within the embedded clause.
outside of the vP at LF are not allowed the existential reading.73

4.1.2. The existential reading of vP-internal complex DPs

Not only bare DPs but complex DPs are also given the existential reading only when they are interpreted within the vP in English and German.

Milsark (1974) distinguishes two types of determiners; strong determiners and weak determiners. The two types of determiners differ in their presuppositionality. Strong determiners are presuppositional; they presuppose the existence of the entities they are applied to, as in (148a). On

73 A caveat of the analysis is that the analysis does not seem to apply to singular indefinite subjects of stage-level predicates. According to Diesing, bare plurals outside of the vP are always given the generic reading because bare plurals outside of the vP are obligatorily bound by a covert generic operator. Diesing assumes that there is a covert generic operator that binds all free variables located outside of the vP at LF. If so, singular indefinites located outside of the vP should also be given the generic reading. However, unlike bare plurals, singular indefinites are allowed the non-generic reading even when reconstruction is blocked. If the bare plural subject in (138) cannot be reconstructed within the embedded subject position because of the co-indexed pronoun, as in (ib), reconstruction within the embedded vP of the singular subject should also be blocked by the existence of a co-indexed pronoun above the embedded subject position, as in (ia). However, unlike bare plural subjects in (138), singular indefinite subjects are allowed the non-generic reading even when reconstruction within the embedded subject position is blocked, as in (ii).

(i) a. *[A fireman]i seems to his/her mother [vP [a fireman]i to be available. ]
   b. *[Firemen; seem to their mothers [vP firemen; to be visible. ]

(ii) A firemani seems to his/her mother to be available.
   a. There is a fireman who seems to his/her mother to be available.
   b. ?Firemen in general have the tendency to appear to be available to their mothers.

Of the two readings in (ii), the existential reading seems be the more salient reading. Some may even find the generic reading unacceptable. The marginality of the generic reading in (iib) is somewhat expected as the generic reading is generally hard to get with singular indefinites in English, as in (iii). However, what is important for us is that the singular indefinites outside of the vP at LF are allowed the non-generic reading, which is unexpected if all un-bound indefinites outside of the vP must be bound by the generic quantifier. According to Diesing (1990), complex DPs may be given the non-generic presuppositional reading outside of the vP.

(iii)a. A fireman is available.
   b. A shark is visible.
the other hand, weak determiners are ambiguous between the presuppositional reading and the non-presuppositional reading. When the weak determiner is stressed (indicated by (H)), the DP is given the presuppositional reading, as in (148b). When the weak determiner is unstressed (indicated by (L)), the DP is given the non-presuppositional reading, as in (148c). For sentences in (148a) and (148b) to have truth value, ghosts must exist as their existence is presupposed.

(148) a. The/Every ghost is in the pantry. (Adapted from Diesing 1990:94)
   (Presuppositional: presupposes the existence of ghosts)
   b. Some(H) ghosts are in the pantry, the others are in the attic.
   (Presuppositional: presupposes the existence of ghosts)
   c. There are some(L) ghosts in my house.
   (Non-presuppositional: asserts existence of ghosts)

According to Diesing (1990), the presuppositional reading is induced when the complex DP is interpreted external to the vP (or is mapped into the restrictive clause). The restrictor identifies the domain (or subdomain) over which the quantifier operates. If the restrictor is empty, the truth condition for the sentence will be undefined. In other words, vP-external materials mapped into the restrictor must be presuppositional.74

Another difference between the two types of determiners is that weak determiners may appear with subjects of there-insertion constructions, while strong determiners cannot. According to Diesing (1990), strong determiners/quantifiers are not allowed with subjects of there-insertion

74 For detailed discussion on the relation between the restrictive clause and presupposition of existence, Diesing directs readers to Hausser (1973).
constructions because vP-internal DPs are obligatorily given the existential reading.

(149) a. There is/are a/some/a few/many/57 fly (flies) in my soup.
   b. *There is/are the/every/all/most fly (flies) in my soup.

That strongly quantified (presuppositional) DPs are located above weakly quantified (existential) DPs at LF is also supported by scope interaction. According to Diesing, strongly quantified object DPs always take scope over weakly quantified subject DPs in (150).

(150) a. Some(L) Cellists played every suite today.
   b. Many(L) Cellists played some(H) suite today.
   c. Two(L) Cellists played some(H) suite today.

That the presuppositional reading is given to vP-external DPs, while the existential reading is given to vP-internal DPs is also supported by the interpretation of complex DPs with weak determiners in German. When a DP appears with a numeral, a weak quantifier, the DP is given the presuppositional reading when the DP is located external to the vP. In (148a), the existence of some group of kids is already presupposed, and zwei Kinder is understood as two kids among the group of kids. The presuppositional reading is not attained when the complex DP is located vP-internally, as in (148b).

(151) a. …weil zwei Kinder ja doch auf der straße spielen
   since two kid PTR in the street play
   ‘Since two of the kids are playing on the street…’ (Presuppositional reading)
b. …weil ja doch zwei Kinder auf der straße spielen

   since PTR two kid in the street play

   ‘Since there are two kids playing on the street…’

   (Non-presuppositional reading)

In sum, complex DPs in English and German are given two different reading. They are given the presuppositional reading when interpreted vP-externally, while they are given the non-presuppositional (existential) reading when interpreted vP-internally.

4.2. The existential reading of i/ka-marked DPs in Korean

4.2.1. The existential reading of bare common nouns in Korean

Unlike English vP-external bare plurals, bare common nouns marked by $i/ka(H)$ in Korean can be given the non-generic reading. However, $i/ka(H)$-marked non-generic bare common nouns are still not allowed the existential reading; as noted in chapter 2, while non-generic bare common nouns marked by $i/ka(L)$ are given the existential reading, non-generic bare common nouns marked by $i/ka(H)$ are given the presuppositional reading.
(152) a. *Say-ka(H) nal-ko iss-ta.

bird-NOM fly-PRG-DECL

i. What is flying is a specific bird (that the speaker is familiar with).

(Presuppositional reading)

Inference: No other animal is flying.

ii. *There is a bird flying. (Existential reading)

b. Say-ka(L) nal-ko iss-ta.

bird-NOM fly-PRG-DECL

i. *What is flying is a specific bird (that the speaker is familiar with).

(Presuppositional reading)

Inference: No other animal is flying.

ii. There is a bird flying. (Existential reading)

If Diesing’s proposal is applicable to Korean as well, that *i/ka(L)-marked DPs are given the existential (non-presuppositional) reading will suggest that the DPs are interpreted within the vP. On the other hand, that *i/ka(H)-marked DPs are given the presuppositional reading will suggest the DPs are interpreted within the vP.

4.2.2. The existential reading of bare common nouns in raising constructions

In English raising constructions, we have seen that the narrow scope existential reading becomes unavailable when reconstruction within the embedded vP is blocked. The same behavior is also observed in Korean raising constructions.
4.2.2.1. Two types of poi-constructions in Korean

*Poi*-constructions in Korean can be categorized into two types depending on the finiteness of their clausal complements. The matrix verb *poi* may take a finite clausal complement, as in (153a), or a non-finite clausal complement in (153b). The finiteness of the clausal complements can be distinguished at the surface by the suffix *tus*. The finite embedded clause in (153a) contains the suffix *tus*, while the non-finite embedded clause in (153b) does not.  

(153) a. [IP Chelswu-ka nobaylsang-ul ta-l/n-tus ]

Chelswu-NOM Nobel Prize-ACC win-FUT/PRS-COMP

*poi*-n-ta.

appear-PRS-DECL

‘It appears that Chelswu won/will win a Nobel prize.’


Chelswu-NOM tired-INF appear-PRS-DECL

‘Chelswu appears tired.’

The general view in Korean linguistics is that finiteness can be identified by the possibility of honorific agreement (Han 1989; Ahn & Yoon 1989; Yang 1996). In English, finiteness of a clause is often identified by tense; the tensed embedded clause in (154a) is considered finite, while tense-less embedded clause in (154b) is considered non-finite (Martin 2001).

75 The motivation for the movement in (153b) and the landing site of the raised subject will be discussed in section 4.2.2.3.
(154) a. It seem that [IP firemen are available.]
   b. Firemen seem [IP t to be available.]

However, for Korean, it is often argued that finiteness is not associated with tense, as nominative Case can be assigned to subjects of tense-less clauses; the embedded subject in (155a) is assigned nominative Case despite the fact that the clause is incompatible with tense morphology.

(155) Lee (2009)
   a. Mina-nun [IP nay-ka ku il-ul kkutnay-(*ess)]-tolok
      Mina-TOP I-NOM the job-ACC finish-PST-COMP
towa-cwu-ess-ta
      help-give-PST-DECL
      ‘Mina helped me finish the job.’
   b. Mina-nun [IP sensayngnim-keyse ku il-ul kkutnay-si]-tolok
      Mina-TOP teacher-NOM the job-ACC finish-HON-COMP
towa-tuly-ess-ta
      help-give-PST-DECL
      ‘Mina helped the teacher finish the job.’

To accommodate (155a), what has been claimed is that nominative Case is licensed by some
inflectional projection below the tense projection (Han 1989; Ahn & Yoon 1989; Yang 1996). While finite clauses may be tense-less, as in (155a), they always allow honorific agreement, as in (155b). And since linear word order suggests that inflectional projections, such as the one that is responsible for the honorific agreement in (155b), are located below the tense projection, as depicted in (156b), it was claimed that the $I^0$ and not $T^0$ is what licenses nominative Case in Korean.


Teacher-NOM(HON) that job-ACC finish-HON-PST-DECL

‘Teacher finished the job.’

---

76 Lee (2009), on the other hand, argues that mood is responsible for Case assignment in Korean (cf. Aygen 2002 for Turkish). According to Lee (2009), in embedded clauses, complementizers may function as mood markers. Thus, following Lee, nominative Case in (153a) is license by the complementizer *tus*, while the embedded subject in (153b) cannot be assigned nominative Case as there is no complementizer to license nominative Case. In sum, (153a) is a finite clause while (153b) is a non-finite clause by Lee’s diagnostics, as well.
Assuming that Inflectional heads are what license nominative Case in Korean, the possibility of honorific agreement will indicate the finiteness of a clause. That the embedded clause with *tus* in (153a) is finite is identified by the possibility of honorific agreement; honorific agreement is possible with an embedded clause containing the suffix *tus*, as in (157a), but not possible when the embedded clause does not contain *tus*, as in (157b).

(157) a.  
\[ Sensayngnim-keyse nobaylsang-ul ta-si-l/n-tus \]

\[ \text{teacher-NOM} \quad \text{Nobel Prize-ACC} \quad \text{win-HON-FUT/PRS-COMP} \]

\[ poi-n-ta \]

\[ \text{appear-PRS-DECL} \]

‘It appears that the teacher won/will win a Nobel Prize.’

   teacher-NOM    tired-HON-INF    appear-PRS-DECL

   ‘The teacher appears tired.’

In sum, there are two types of poi-construction in Korean, one that embeds a non-finite clause (raising poi-constructions), as in (153b), and the other that embeds a finite clause (tus constructions, hereafter), as in (153a).

4.2.2.2. Subjects of poi-constructions

Like raised subjects of English raising constructions, subjects of poi-constructions in Korean are base-generated as the subjects of the embedded clauses.

First, subjects of poi-constructions (both raising poi-constructions and tus-constructions), are interpreted as an argument of the embedded clause. In (158), Chelswu is understood as the person who is tired in all the examples.

(158) a. [vP Chelswu-ka(H) [vP t [IP t phikonha-y] poi]-n-ta.

   Chelswu-NOM    tired-INF    appear-PRS-DECL

   ‘It is Chelswu that appears tired.’

b. [vP Chelswu-ka(L) [IP t phikonha-y] poi]-n-ta.

   Chelswu-NOM    tired-INF    appear-PRS-DECL

   ‘Chelswu appears tired.’
c.  $\text{[IP Chelswu-ka(H) phikonha-n] - tus poi-n-ta.}$  
Chelswu-NOM tired-PRS-COMP appear-PRS-DECL  
‘It appears that it is Chelswu who is tired.’

d.  $\text{[IP Chelswu-ka(L) phikonha-n] - tus poi-n-ta.}$  
Chelswu-NOM tired-PRS-COMP appear-PRS-DECL  
‘It appears that Chelswu is tired.’

That the matrix verb $\text{poi}$ cannot assign an external theta-role, also suggests that subjects of $\text{poi}$-constructions are base-generated as the subjects of the embedded clauses. $\text{Poi}$-constructions become ungrammatical when the matrix verb $\text{poi}$ appears with an extra argument, as in (159a) and (159b). Sentences will be grammatical with an extra argument inserted at the matrix clause if the matrix verb can assign an external argument, as in (159c).\textsuperscript{77}

(159) a.  $\text{*simin-un Sopangkwan-i phikon-hay poi-n-ta.}$  
citizen-TOP fireman-NOM tired-INF appear-PRS-DECL  
‘Intended meaning: To the citizens, the firemen appear tired.’

b.  $\text{*simin-un sopangkwan-i phikonha-n-tus poi-n-ta.}$  
citizen-TOP fireman-NOM tired-PRS-COMP appear-PRS-DECL  
‘Intended meaning: It appears to the citizens that the firemen are tired.’

\textsuperscript{77} The same is true with English.

(i) a. *The police appeared that the firemen stayed calm.  
b. The police decided that the firemen stayed calm.
c. Yenghi-nun sopangkwan-i phikonha-tako po-n-ta.

Yenghi-TOP fireman-NOM tired-COMP feel-PRS-DECL

‘Yenghi feels that the fireman is tired.’

That the ungrammaticality of (159a) and (159b) is caused by the addition of an extra argument is supported by the fact that the sentences are grammatical if a similar interpretation is provided by a quasi-argumental PP, as in (160).


firemen-NOM citizens-to-TOP tired-INF appear-PRS-DECL

‘To the citizens, the firemen appear tired.’

b. Simin-eykey-nun sopangkwan-i phikonha-n-tus poi-n-ta.

citizen-to-TOP firemen-NOM tired-PRS-like appear-PRS-DECL

‘It appears to the citizens that the firemen are tired.’

4.2.2.3. Evidence for raising in raising poi-constructions

A subject of a raising poi-construction that is base-generated as a subject of an embedded clause must move obligatorily to the matrix subject position.

In English raising constructions, that the raised subjects are located at the matrix subject position on the surface is identifiable by the linear word order; the raised subject appears to the left of the matrix verb, as in (161a).
(161) a. The police appeared \[ \text{to stay calm.} \]

\[ \text{Firemen-NOM} \quad \text{tired} \quad \text{appear-PRS-DECL} \]

‘The firemen appears tired.’

On the other hand, in Korean, whether the subject of the embedded clause in raising poi-construction has raised to the matrix subject position or not is not identifiable by the linear word order, as the movement of the embedded subject to the matrix subject position (if there is such movement) is string vacuous, as depicted in (161b). However, there is still motivation to posit such movement.

First, the movement in (161b) is motivated by the wide scope reading of the raised subject. Previously, we have seen that raised subjects in English are scopally ambiguous between the narrow scope (non-specific) reading and the wide scope (specific) reading.

(162) Someone from Chicago is likely to win a Nobel Prize.

a. There is someone in Chicago who is likely to win a Nobel Prize.

\[(\text{someone scopes over likely})\]

b. It is likely that there is someone from Chicago who will win a Nobel Prize.

\[(\text{likely scopes over someone})\]

Following Fox (1999), I have assumed that the wide scope reading is attained when the raised subject is interpreted at the moved position above the matrix verb, as in (163LF1), while the narrow
scope reading is attained when the subject is interpreted below the matrix verb via reconstruction, as in (163LF₂).

(163) LF₁:  [IP [Someone from Chicago]₁ is likely [vP <Someone from Chicago>₁ to win a Nobel Prize.]]  (someone scopes over likely)

     LF₂:  [IP [Someone from Chicago]₁ is likely [vP <Someone from Chicago>₁ to win a Nobel Prize.]]  (likely scopes over someone)

Assuming that the wide-scope reading becomes available when the subject is interpreted above the matrix verb in Korean as well, that the raised subject of a poi-construction is allowed the wide scope reading, as in (164), suggests that the subject of a poi-construction is interpreted above the matrix clause.⁷⁸ ⁷⁹ That the subject is interpreted above the matrix verb will suggest that the embedded subject has raised to the matrix clause, as in (164b).⁸⁰

---

⁷⁸ Unlike subjects of raising constructions in English, subjects of raising po-constructions cannot be given the non-specific reading. According to Fox (1999), what this would suggest is that subjects of raising po-constructions cannot be interpreted below the matrix verb. The possibility of reconstruction in raising po-construction will be discussed in section 4.2.2.4.

⁷⁹ Here again, I stipulate that raising verbs project vP, albeit a defective one, and that embedded subject moves to the specifier of the defective vP.

⁸⁰ The assumption here is that the embedded subject cannot raise covertly to the matrix clause at LF. If embedded subject in (164) can move covertly to the matrix clause at LF, the subject of the embedded clause may stay within the embedded clause at the surface and still receive the specific reading.
(164) a. \([IP{Sikhako\ chwulsin-uy\ etten\ salam-i}; [t_i\ phikonha-y]\]

Chicago origin-GEN someone-NOM tired-INF

appear-PRS-DECL

i. ‘*It appears that there is someone from Chicago who is tired.’

(Narrow scope reading: etten salam ‘someone’ < poi ‘appear’)

ii. ‘There is a particular person from Chicago that appears tired.

(Wide scope reading: etten salam ‘someone’ > poi ‘appear’)

b.  

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{VP} \\
\text{[sikhako.chwulsin-uy\ etten.salam-i]}_i \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{V'} \\
\text{IP} \\
\text{V = poi-}
\end{array}
\]

\[
t_i\ phikonha-y
\]

Subjects of tus-constructions, on the other hand, are ambiguous between the wide scope reading and the narrow scope reading, as in (165). Following Fox, the scopal ambiguity will suggest that the embedded subject can be interpreted either above or below the matrix verb. Since the subject of a tus-construction may stay within the embedded clause, it is natural that the subject is allowed the narrow scope reading. I assume that the wide scope reading is attained when subjects of tus-
constructions are raised optionally to the matrix clause by a non-Case related trigger.\(^81\)

\begin{equation}
(165) \quad \text{sikhako } \text{chwulsin-uy } \text{etten salam-i } \text{phikonha-n-tus}
\end{equation}

Chicago origin-GEN someone-NOM tired-PRS-like(COMP)

\begin{equation}
\text{poi-n-ta.}
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\text{appear-PRS-DECL}
\end{equation}

i. ‘It appears that there is someone from Chicago who is tired.’ (Narrow scope)

ii. ‘There is a particular person in Chicago that appears tired.’ (Wide scope)

That the subject of a raising \textit{poi}-construction has moved to the matrix clause is also supported by the observation that the subjects of \textit{poi}-constructions may appear to the left of a PP merged at the matrix clause. While raising constructions in English cannot appear with an extra argument of the matrix verb, the matrix verb may appear with a quasi-argumental PP, as in (166b). Similarly in raising \textit{poi}-constructions, the matrix verb may appear with a PP, as in (167b).

\begin{equation}
(166) \quad \text{a. The firemen appeared to stay calm.}
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\text{b. The firemen appeared [pp to the citizens] to stay calm.}
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
(167) \quad \text{a. Sopangkwan-i } \text{phikonha-y } \text{poi-n-ta.}
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\text{fireman-NOM tired-INF appear-PRS-DECL}
\end{equation}

‘The firemen appear to be tired.’

\(^{81}\) Another possibility is that subjects of \textit{tus}-constructions raise obligatorily to the matrix clause but can be reconstructed within the vP. This seems less likely as there seems to be no motivation to trigger obligatory movement of subjects of \textit{tus}-constructions, and we would have to distinguish between the two types of obligatorily raised subjects, one that allows reconstruction (subjects of \textit{tus}-constructions), and one that does not (subjects of raising \textit{poi}-constructions).
b. *Sopangkwan-i*  

\[\text{[PP simin-hantey]} \text{ phikonha-y poi-n-ta}.\]

fireman-NOM citizen-to tired-INF appear-PRS-DECL

‘The firemen appear to the citizens to be tired.’

Assuming that the PP is located outside of the embedded clause, as the PP is understood as a quasi-argument of the matrix verb, that the subject of a raising *poi*-construction may appear to the left of the PP, as in (167b), suggests that the subject of raising *poi*-construction has moved out of the embedded clause to the matrix subject position.\(^8\)

As for the subjects of *tus*-constructions, they may appear either to right or left of the quasi-argumental PPs, as in (168). This is expected assuming that subjects of *tus*-constructions may raise optionally to the matrix clause. When the subject raises to the matrix clause, it will appear to the left of the PP, as in (168a). When the subject stays within the embedded clause, it will appear to the right of the PP, as in (168b).

(168) a. *Sopangkwan-i*  

\[\text{simin-eykey phikonha-n-tus poi-n-ta}.\]

fireman-NOM citizen-to tired-PRS-like appear-PRS-DECL

‘It appears to the citizens that the firemen are tired.’

\(^8\) While the post-position phrase may also appear to the left of the subject, as in (i), that the PP in the sentence initial position is most natural when it is marked by *un/nun* suggests that the PP has also raised out of its natural position when the PP appears ahead of the raised subject, as in (i).

(i) *Simin-hantey-nun sopangkwan-i*  

\[\text{t} \text{[t} \text{ phikonha-y ] poi-n-ta}.\]

citizen-to-TOP Firemen-NOM tired-INF appear-PRS-DECL

‘To the citizens, firemen appears to be tired.’
b. Simin-eykey sopangkwan-i phikonha-n-tus poi-n-ta.

citizen-to firemen-NOM tired-PRS-like appear-PRS-DECL

‘It appears to the citizens that the firemen are tired.’

That the subject in (168a) has raised to the matrix clause, while the subject in (168b) remains within the embedded clause is supported by the observation that subjects of tus-constructions that appear to the left of the quasi-argumental PPs are not allowed the narrow scope non-specific reading. When the narrow scope reading is forced, subjects of tus-constructions cannot appear to the left of the quasi-argumental PP. Given a situation in which an item is stolen in the museum, and it is unclear as to who has stolen the item, the subject of a tus-construction may appear to the right of the PP, as in (169a), but not to the left, as in (169b).

(169) Context: A guard finds that a diamond is missing from a museum collection.

a. Kyengpiwon-eykey totwuk-i(L) taimontu-lul hwumchi-n-tus

Guard-to thief-NOM diamond-ACC steal-PRS-like

poi-n-ta.

appear-PRS-DECL

‘It appears to the guards that there is a thief who stole the diamond.’

(Narrow scope reading)

b. *Totwuk-i(L) kyengpiwon-eykey taimontu-lul hwumchi-n-tus

thief-NOM Guard-to-TOP diamond-ACC steal-PRS-like

poi-n-ta.

appear-PRS-DECL
The movement in (161b) has some conceptual motivation as well. In English, the movement of the non-finite embedded subject to the matrix clause, as in (170a), is argued to be triggered by the need to check Case. Assuming that nominative Case is checked locally (cannot probe into the embedded vP), and also assuming that raising infinitives do not assign nominative Case (Martin 2001), the subject of a non-finite embedded clause will need to move to the matrix clause to be assigned nominative Case (presumably to matrix [Spec, vP]).

(170) a. The police appeared [IP t\textsubscript{i} to stay calm.]
   b. *It appeared [IP the police to stay calm.]
   c. It appeared that [IP the police stayed claim.]

Therefore, the embedded subject must move to the matrix subject position (for local feature checking) when the embedded clause is a non-finite clause, otherwise the sentence becomes ungrammatical, as in (170b). On the other hand, the embedded subject stays within the embedded clause when the embedded clause is a finite clause, as nominative Case can be assigned within the embedded clause, as in (170c).

Assuming that nominative Case is assigned to DPs via a similar operation in Korean, subjects of non-finite embedded clauses will have to move to the (finite) matrix clause to receive Case in Korean as well (as the matrix I\textsuperscript{0} will not be able to probe into the embedded vP). Since the clausal complement of a raising poi-construction in (161b) is a non-finite clause, the subject of the non-finite clausal complement cannot receive Case from the embedded I\textsuperscript{0}. Therefore, the embedded...

\textsuperscript{83} Since I have stipulated that the raising verbs ‘appear’ and ‘poi’ project vP, the embedded vP will not be local to the matrix I\textsuperscript{0} and the matrix I\textsuperscript{0} will not be able to probe into the embedded vP.
subject raises to the finite matrix clause so that the subject is local to the matrix \( I^0 \). The finiteness of the matrix clause is identified by the fact that the honorific agreement is available at the matrix clause, as in (171a).

(171) a. \textit{Sensayngnim-keyse} [t \textit{phikonha-y}] \textit{poi-si-n-ta}.

\begin{tabular}{lll}
  teacher-NOM & tired-INF & appear-HON-PRS-DECL \\
\end{tabular}

\textquote{The teacher appears tired.}

b. *\textit{Sensayngnim-keyse} [t \textit{phikonha-si-e}] \textit{poi-n-ta}.

\begin{tabular}{lll}
  teacher-NOM & tired-HON-INF & appear-PRS-DECL \\
\end{tabular}

\textquote{The teacher appears tired.}

Unlike the clausal complements of raising \textit{poi}-constructions, clausal complements of \textit{tus}-constructions are finite clauses. Therefore, embedded subjects of \textit{tus}-constructions can receive Case within the embedded clause from the matrix \( I^0 \). Since, embedded subjects can receive Case, there is no motivation to posit obligatory movement of subjects of \textit{tus}-constructions to the matrix clause.\footnote{This does not mean that subjects of \textit{tus}-constructions cannot raise to the matrix clause. It’s only that subjects of \textit{tus}-constructions do not raise obligatorily to the matrix clause for Case reasons. In other words, there is still the possibility that subjects of \textit{tus}-constructions may raise optionally to the matrix clause as a result of some other operation not related to Case.}

4.2.2.4. Reconstruction of subjects of raising \textit{poi}-constructions

When a \textit{poi}-construction takes a non-finite clausal complement, the subject of the embedded clause raises to the matrix clause. However, unlike raised subjects of English raising constructions, raised
subjects of *poi*-constructions that take non-finite clausal complements (raising *poi*-constructions, hereafter) are interpreted in the matrix subject position obligatorily. In other words, they cannot be reconstructed at their trace.

Based on the observation that raised subjects in English can be given the narrow scope reading, as in (135), it was argued that the English raised subject can be reconstructed at the embedded subject position at LF. That the raised subjects of raising *poi*-constructions cannot be given the narrow scope reading, as in (164) (repeated below as (172)), suggests that the raised subjects of raising *poi*-constructions cannot be reconstructed within the embedded clause below the matrix verb at LF at all.

(172)  [IP[Sikhako chwulsin-uy etten salam-i]i [t_i phikonha-y ]

| Chicago origin-GEN | someone-NOM | tired-INF |

.poi-n-ta.]

appear-PRS-DECL

i. ‘*It appears that there is someone from Chicago who is tired.’

(Narrow scope reading)

ii. ‘There is a particular person from Chicago that appears tired.

(Wide scope reading)

That raised subjects of raising *poi*-constructions cannot be interpreted in the embedded subject position is also supported by the absence of anaphoric reconstruction effect in Korean. Binding Condition A is a condition on the distribution of anaphoric DPs; anaphoric DPs must be bound by an antecedent. (173b) and (173c) are ungrammatical as anaphoric expressions are not bound.
In English, anaphoric raised subjects behave as if they are reconstructed at their trace, as in (174). Even though the anaphoric expressions in (174) appear above their co-indexed antecedents at the surface, the sentences are grammatical as the raised subjects are interpreted at the trace position, thus obeying Condition A.

(174) a. [Each other's students] appear to them [ to be smart].
   b. [Pictures of himself] were shown to John.

However, the anaphoric reconstruction effect is not observed with Korean raised subjects. Cho (1994) observes that sentences with anaphoric raised subjects are ungrammatical when they appear above their co-indexed antecedents at the surface, as in (175). The absence of the anaphoric reconstruction effect suggests that raised subjects of pois-constructions in Korean cannot be reconstructed at their trace.¹⁸⁵

¹⁸⁵ The anaphoric reconstruction effect is not observed in other supposed raising constructions either, such as passives, as in (ia), or unaccusatives, as in (ib).

   self-GEN student-NOM he-to introduce-become-PST-DECL
   ‘His student was introduced to him.’
   b. *[Caki-unhaksayng-i] ku-ekey t_j tolaw-ss-ta.
   self-GEN student-NOM he-to return-PST-DECL
   ‘His student was introduced to him.’
(175) a. *[Selö-uy  haksayng]j-i kutul-eykey [ t j  ttokttokhay]
    Each.other-GEN  student-NOM  them-to  smart

    poi-n-ta.

    appear-PRS-DECL

    ‘Each other, i,’s students appear to them, i to be smart.’

b. *[Caki-i-uy  haksayng]j-i ku-eykey [ t j  phikonha-n-tus ]
    self-GEN  student-NOM  he-to  tired-PRS-COMP

    poi-n-ta.

    appear-PRS-DECL

    ‘His, i student appears to him, i to be tired.’

The ungrammaticality of (176b) is another indication that raised subjects in Korean cannot be reconstructed at their trace. Pronouns in Korean are generally ungrammatical when they appear above their co-indexed antecedent. When a pronoun ku appears to the left of its co-indexed antecedent John, the sentence becomes ungrammatical, as in (177). On the other hand, sentences are fine when pronouns appear to the right their co-indexed antecedents, as in (178).

---

86 The ungrammaticality of (177) does not seem to involve binding condition violation as there is no C-command relation between ku and John. However, there seems to be a general condition in Korean which disallows co-indexed pronouns to appear above (to the left of) their co-indexed R-expressions. As to why (177) is ungrammatical, I leave it for future research.
(176) a.  
\[ \text{[John}_{i} \text{-} i \quad [\text{ku}_{i} \text{-} uy \quad \text{haksayng}-i] \text{-} eykey \quad [\text{iP} \quad t_{i} \quad \text{phikonha-y} ]} \]
John-NOM  he-GEN  student-to  tired-INF

\textit{poi-n-ta}.
appear-PRS-DECL

‘John\textsubscript{i} appears to his\textsubscript{i} students to be tired.’

b.  
\*\[ \text{[ku-uy \quad haksayng-i]_{i} \quad John-i \text{-} eykey \quad [\text{iP} \quad t_{i} \quad \text{phikonha-y} ]} \]
he-GEN  student-NOM  John-to  tired-INF

\textit{poi-n-ta}.
appear-PRS-DECL

‘His\textsubscript{i} students appear to John\textsubscript{i} to be tired.’

(177) a.  
\*\[ \text{[Ku-uy \quad apeci]-ka \quad John}_{i} \text{-} ul \quad honnay-ss-ta.} \]
he-GEN  father-NOM  John-ACC  scold-PST-DECL

‘His\textsubscript{i} father scolded John\textsubscript{i}.’

b.  
\*\[ \text{[Ku-uy \quad haksayng]-i \quad John-i \text{-} eykey \quad phyenci-lul \quad ss-ess-ta} \]
he-GEN  student-NOM  John-to  letter-ACC  write-PST-DECL

‘His\textsubscript{i} students wrote a letter to John\textsubscript{i}.’

(178) a.  
\text{John-i \quad ku_{i} \text{-} uy \quad atul-lul \quad honnay-ss-ta.}
John-NOM  he-GEN  son-ACC  scold-PST-DECL

‘John\textsubscript{i} scolded his\textsubscript{i} son.’
However, there are cases in which pronouns may appear ahead of their co-indexed antecedent at the surface, as in (179). It is generally assumed that the sentences in (179) are grammatical, as scrambled elements can be reconstructed below their antecedents at the trace at LF. In other words, at LF, the sentences in (179) will have structures similar to that of the grammatical sentences in (178).

(179) a.  
\[ [Ku-uy \text{ } atul-ul]_j \quad John-i \quad t_j \quad honnay-ss-ta. \]
  he-GEN  son-ACC  John-NOM  scold-PST-DECL
  ‘John scolded his son.’

b.  
\[ [Ku-uy \text{ } haksayng-eykey]_j \quad John-i \quad t_j \quad phyenci-lul \]
  he-GEN  student-to  John-NOM  letter-ACC
  ss-ess-ta.
  write-PST-DECL
  ‘To his students, John wrote a letter.’

If reconstruction at LF is what remedies the expected ungrammaticality of (179), (176b) should also be grammatical if the raised subject in (176b) can be reconstructed in the embedded subject position below the co-indexed antecedent. That (176b) is ungrammatical suggests that the raised
subject of a raising poi-construction cannot be reconstructed at the embedded subject position. In sum, while A'-movement allows reconstruction in Korean, A-movement do not.

4.2.2.5. The existential reading in raised subjects

Previously, we have seen that the wide scope existential reading is available to the raised subjects in raising poi-constructions, while the narrow scope existential reading is not available, as in (180).

(180) Sopangkwan-i(L) t₁ phikonha-y poi-n-ta.
    fireman-NOM       tired-INF   appear-PRS-DECL

  i. There is a firemen that appears to be tired. (Wide scope reading)
  ii. *It appears that there is a tired firemen. (Narrow scope reading)

To account for the possibility of the wide scope existential reading in poi-constructions, I propose that matrix [Spec, vP] is available in Korean poi-constructions and that i/ka(L)-marked raised subjects are interpreted at the matrix [Spec, vP]. Assuming that nominative Case is assigned vP-internally, embedded subjects of non-finite clauses will move to the matrix [Spec, vP] to receive Case. And since i/ka(L)-marked subjects are not given the exhaustive reading, they will stay within the matrix vP. Since raised i/ka(L)-marked subjects are located outside of the embedded clause but within the matrix vP, i/ka(L)-marked subjects are given the wide-scope existential reading, as in (180).

This is not to say that raised subjects of raising poi-constructions are always located in the matrix [Spec, vP]. Assuming that i/ka(H)-marked DPs must move out of [Spec, vP], i/ka(H)-marked raised subjects should be located outside of the matrix vP and should be allowed the generic reading. In
(181), we see that \( i/ka(H) \)-marked raised subjects may be given the generic reading, as in (181a), while \( i/ka(L) \)-marked raised subjects are not allowed the generic reading, as in (181b).

(181) Q: *Etten cikep-i phikonha-y poi-ni?*

what job-NOM tired-INF appear-PRS-DECL


a. *Sopangkwan-i(H) t\(_i\) phikonha-y poi-n-ta.*

fireman-NOM tired-INF appear-PRS-DECL

‘Firemen appear hard.’ *(Generic reading)*

b. *#Sopangkwan-i(L) t\(_i\) phikonha-y poi-n-ta.*

fireman-NOM tired-INF appear-PRS-DECL

‘There is a fireman that appears to be tired.’

In sum, raised subjects of raising *poi*-constructions cannot be interpreted within the embedded \( \nu P \), therefore they are not allowed the narrow scope existential reading. However, raised subjects are allowed the wide scope existential reading as they are located within the matrix \( \nu P \) above the matrix verb.
4.2.3. The existential reading of complex DPs in Korean

If $i/ka(H)$-marked DPs are interpreted external to the $vP$, the expectation is that complex DPs marked by $i/ka(H)$ will not be allowed the existential reading. On the other hand, if $i/ka(L)$-marked DPs are interpreted within the $vP$, $i/ka(L)$-marked complex DPs will be given the existential reading. And the expectation is met. When a complex DP with a numeral is marked by $i/ka(L)$, the DP is given the existential reading, as in (183a). On the other hand, when the complex DP is marked by $i/ka(H)$, the DP is given the partitive (presuppositional) reading, as in (183b).

(183) a. \( \text{Twu} \ a\text{-}ka(L) \ \text{hakkyo-ey} \ \text{ka-nta.} \)

\[ \text{two \ children-NOM \ school-to \ go-PRS-DECL} \]

‘Two children are going to school.’ (non-presuppositional)
b. *Twu ai-ka(H) hakkyo-ey ka-n-ta.*

two children-NOM school-to go-PRS-DECL

‘Two of the children are going to school.’ (Presuppositional)

4.2.4. Summary

Bare common nouns and complex DPs marked by *i/ka*(L) are obligatorily given the existential reading, while bare common nouns and complex DPs marked by *i/ka*(H) are not allowed the existential reading. This adds support to the proposal that *i/ka*(L)-marked DPs are interpreted within the vP.

4.3. vP-internal subjects in Korean and the EPP

So far, I have argued that *i/ka*(L)-marked DPs and *i/ka*(H)-marked DPs are interpreted at two different positions in syntax. To account for the difference in the position of interpretation, I propose that exhaustive *i/ka*(H)-marked DPs must move out of the vP to some functional projection; FP.\(^{87}\)

\(^{87}\) A plausible landing site for *i/ka*(H)-marked DPs will be [Spec, IP]. However, I will leave open the exact landing site of *i/ka*(H)-marked DPs for future research.
The proposal that exhaustive *i/ka*-marked DPs and non-exhaustive *i/ka*-marked DPs occupy different syntactic positions is not a novel claim.

Yoon (2004) and Choi (2005), while independently arguing that *i/ka* is always a nominative Case particle, have proposed that the exhaustive reading on *i/ka*-marked DPs is not provided by *i/ka* but is attained structurally via movement; the exhaustive reading is attained when *i/ka*-marked DPs move (string-vacuously) to a functional projection responsible for the exhaustive reading (FocP), as in (185b), while neutral *i/ka*-marked DPs appear in [Spec, IP], as in (185a). However, their argument was generally focuses on providing arguments against analyses that treat *i/ka* as a semantic marker, rather than providing direct arguments for movement of *i/ka*-marked DPs given the exhaustive reading.

(185) a. \[\text{IP } John-i(L) \quad mesiss-ta.]\]

John-NOM handsome-DECL

‘John is handsome.’ (Non-exhaustive reading)

b. \[\text{FP } F' \quad \text{DP(exhaustive)-}i/ka(H) \quad F'\]

\[\text{vP } F \quad t \quad \ldots\]

\[\text{DP(neutral)-}i/ka(L) \quad \ldots\]

‘John is the one who is handsome.’ (Exhaustive reading)
I take exhaustive *i*/ka DPs to appear in different structural positions from non-exhaustive *i*/ka DPs, which is in agreement with Yoon (2004) and Choi (2005). But unlike Yoon (2004) and Choi (2005), I argue that non-exhaustive *i*/ka DPs appear vP internally rather than in [Spec,IP], while exhaustive *i*/ka-marked DPs appear external to the vP. In other words, I propose that *i*/ka(L)-marked DPs and *i*/ka(H)-marked DPs occupy two different positions at the surface. *i*/ka(L)-marked DPs stay at [Spec, vP] and are interpreted there, while *i*/ka(H)-marked DPs move out of [Spec, vP] and are interpreted vP-externally. Consequences of the proposal are that the EPP need not be satisfied in Korean and that nominative Case can be assigned at [Spec, vP].

4.3.1. The EPP in Korean

The EPP has been claimed to be a universal principle. It has been claimed that the subject must move obligatorily to [Spec, IP], or to put in more formally, that the EPP feature on T is universally “strong.” (Chomsky 1995). However, others have argued that there are languages in which subjects do not raise obligatorily to [Spec, IP], such as in Japanese (Fukui 1986; Kuroda 1988; Kitagawa 1994) and German (Appleton 2009). Whether the EPP is active in Korean has been an unsettled issue, as original motivation for the EPP, such as DP-raising or expletive insertion is not observable in Korean.

88 Another possibility is to assume that *i*/ka(L)-marked DPs have moved out of [Spec, vP] to [Spec, IP], but are reconstructed within the vP at LF. This way, EPP will be satisfied by *i*/ka(L)-marked DPs and nominative Case need not be assigned vP-internally. However, DPs that have undergone A-movement cannot be reconstructed at their trace in Korean (Cho 1994).
4.3.1.1. Motivation for the EPP in English

The EPP was originally introduced to explain the obligatory presence of an expletive element in [Spec, IP] when the subject fails to raise in English, as in (186b) (Chomsky 1981; 1982).

(186) a.  [A stranger] is t in our garden.
        b.  [There] is a stranger in our garden.
        c.  *[∅] is a stranger in our garden.

Assuming that the tense morphology is realized on the I-head in English, ‘a stranger’ in (186b) and (186c) do not occupy [Spec, IP].

(187) a.  [IP A stranger; I is [vP t in our garden.]]
        b.  *[IP I is [vP a stranger in our garden.]]
        c.  [IP there I is [vP a stranger in our garden.]]

Since sentences with vP-internal subjects are ungrammatical when [Spec, IP] is left empty, as in (187b), but are grammatical when [Spec, IP] is filled by an expletive element, as in (187c), it was proposed that there is a principle in syntax that requires [Spec, IP] to be filled, which is the EPP.

(188) EPP

[Spec, IP] must be filled.

If the EPP, as defined in (188), is active in Korean, [Spec, IP] in Korean must be filled by either overt DP-raising, as in (187a), or expletive insertion, as in (187c).
4.3.1.2. DP-raising

In English, when the subject raises from [Spec, vP] to [Spec, IP], the subject must move past the I head, as depicted in (189a). Therefore, the movement of the subject to [Spec, IP] can be identified by the relative position of the subject with respect to the tense morphology. Korean is a head final language. Therefore, in Korean [Spec, vP] to [Spec, IP] movement will not move past the I-head, as shown in (189b). As a result, even if there is [Spec, vP] to [Spec, IP] movement such a movement will not be visible at the surface, as shown in (190a) and (190b). In sum, there is no overt empirical motivation to posit DP-raising in Korean at the surface.

(189) a. \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{IP} \\
\text{Subj} \\
\ I' \\
\ I \\
\ vP \\
\ t_{\text{Subj}} \\
\ v' \\
\ v \\
\ VP
\end{array}
\]

b. \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{IP} \\
\text{Subj} \\
\ I' \\
\ vP \\
\ I \\
\ t_{\text{Subj}} \\
\ v' \\
\ v \\
\ VP
\end{array}
\]

(190) a. \[
\text{[CP [IP} \text{John}-i \ [vP} \text{t}i \ pap-ul \ mek]-ess]-ta.]
\]

\begin{tabular}{llll}
John-NOM & meal-ACC & eat-PST-DECL \\
\end{tabular}

b. \[
\text{[CP [IP} \text{John}-i \ pap-ul \ mek]-ess]-ta.]
\]

\begin{tabular}{llll}
John-NOM & meal-ACC & eat-PST-DECL \\
\end{tabular}

‘John ate.’
4.3.1.3. The expletive-insertion construction

The expletive-insertion construction is also absent in Korean. In English, an expletive element is inserted when the nominative DP does not raise to [Spec, IP], as in (191). However, in Korean, there is no expletive-insertion construction at all. In English, the expletive-insertion construction is used in unambiguously existential sentences and weather phrases, as in (191). In Korean, unambiguously existential sentences do not appear with expletive subjects, as shown in (192a). Expletives are also not used with weather phrases either, as in (192b). In sum, the original motivation for the EPP is not applicable in Korean at all.

(191) a. *(There) is a cat in the garden.
   b. *(It) is raining.

(192) a. sey salam-i cengwon-ey iss-ta.
   three men-NOM garden-at is-DECL
   ‘There are three men in the garden.’

   b. phi-ka o-n-ta.
   rain-NOM come-PRS-DECL
   ‘It is raining.’

4.3.2. Agree-based Case assignment

Even if the EPP is not active in Korean, vP-internal subjects will have to move out of [Spec, vP] if nominative Case is assigned at [Spec, IP]. I will assume that nominative Case is assigned within the vP.
Previously in the literature, the standard assumption on the nominative Case checking was that a nominative Case checker (Infl or AgrS) checks its Case feature with a DP in the Specifier position of the Case checking head ([Spec, IP], or [Spec, AgrSP]) via Spec-Head agreement (193). Such a theory forced obligatory movement of the subject DP to [Spec, IP] (or [Spec, AgrSP]), in order to check Case (assuming that the subject is base-generated within the vP).

(193) a. IP
   \[\text{Subj} \quad I'\]
   \[\text{vP} \quad \text{Infl}_{\text{NOM}}\]
   
   b. AgrSP
   \[\text{Subj} \quad \text{AgrS'}\]
   \[\text{AgrOP} \quad \text{AgrS}_{\text{NOM}}\]
   ...

However, in German, DPs with the same morphological case as vP-external nominative DPs may appear within the vP, as in (194a), which suggests that the vP-external subject in (194b) and the vP-internal subject in (194a) are assigned the same (nominative) Case. In English, the grammaticality of (195a) seems to suggest that the lexical subject in (195a) checks its Case at the vP-internal position.\(^{89}\)

(194) German (Diesing 1990:46)

a. … weil ja doch Ameisen einen Posteamten gebissen haben.
   since PRT ants a postman bitten have
   ‘Since there are ants that have bitten a postman...’

---

\(^{89}\) Another possibility is if ‘firemen’ is in [Spec, IP] and ‘there’ is in a higher functional specifier. However, such an analysis is incompatible with this thesis as the bare plural subject will be located outside of the vP, which would allow the generic reading of the bare plural (Diesing 1990).
b. … weil **Ameisen** ja doch einen Postamten gebissen haben.

since ants PRT a postman bitten have

‘Since ants (in general) have indeed bitten a postman...’

(195) a. There are firemen in the lobby.

b. Firemen are in the lobby.

The Case assignment operation, as depicted in (193), faced conceptual issues in the minimalist era as well. First, the movement triggered by Case assignment seemed to be redundant, as the EPP also triggered movement to [Spec, IP] (Martin 1999; Epstein & Seely 1999; Boeckx 2000; Bošković 2002). Secondly, split Infl nodes, such as AgrSP and AgrOP were considered as stipulations the theory should be rid of in the minimalist era, as they were empirically not well-grounded (Chomsky 2000).

Following Chomsky (2000, 2008), I assume that nominative Case is assigned through φ-feature agreement and value assignment in [Spec, vP]. The I-head, with unvalued φ-features, probes and enters into an Agree relation with a DP with an unvalued Case feature. As a result of this Agree relation, I-head obtains the values for its φ-features from the DP and values the Case of the DP as nominative (196).

(196)

```
  I  {φ : __ } [vP ... DP {φ, Case: __} ...]
```

Following this approach, the subject DP in [Spec, vP] will not have to move to [Spec, IP] for Case
reasons. The approach is advantageous in that the vP-internal subjects in (194) and (195a) will check nominative Case through the same operation by which the vP-external subjects check nominative Case.

Assuming that nominative Case is valued in [Spec, vP] via feature agreement with $I^0$, the subject will not move obligatorily to [Spec, IP] for Case reasons.

### 4.4. Summary

Assuming that the existential reading is only available to bare DPs located within the vP, that bare common nouns marked by $i/ka(L)$ are given the existential reading will suggest that $i/ka(L)$-marked DPs are interpreted within the vP. On the other hand, that $i/ka(H)$-marked DPs are not allowed the existential reading will suggest that the DPs are interpreted outside of the vP. To account for the difference in the position of interpretation, I propose that non-exhaustive $i/ka(L)$-marked DPs stay within the vP, while exhaustive $i/ka(H)$-marked DPs must move out of the vP to

---

90 Unless feature checking in [Spec, vP] is otherwise restricted by some other factor, such as, Chomsky (2005)'s restriction on feature valuation on elements base-generated at their theta-position.

91 If subjects can receive Case within the vP in English and if movement of the subject to [Spec, IP] is triggered by the EPP, subjects should be allowed to be left within the vP when the EPP is satisfied by an expletive element. However, that is not always the case, as in (ia). This may seem to pose a problem for the proposal as there seems to be no reason why (ia) is ungrammatical. According to McFadden (2001), the ungrammaticality of (ia) is not caused by Case reasons, but rather by a constraint on expletive licensing. McFadden (2001) claims that subjects may stay within the vP with an expletive element present, which is the case in German (ib), but (ia) is ungrammatical because the expletive is not properly licensed in the sentence.

(i) a. *It arrived a young man.
   b. Es ist ein junger Mann angekommen
      It is a young man arrive
      ‘There arrived a young man.’
some functional projection; FP.
Chapter 5

Two types of un/nun-marked DPs

The previous chapters were largely focused on the syntactic/semantic behavior of i/ka marked DPs when prosodically prominent, and when not. Here, I turn my attention to DPs that co-occur with another morphological marker: un/nun. As is the case with i/ka-marked DPs, the interpretation of un/nun-marked DPs is sensitive to prosodic marking; prosodically prominent un/nun-marked DPs (un/nun(H)-marked DPs) are given the contrastive reading and prosodically neutral un/nun-marked DPs (un/nun(L)-marked DPs) that are given non-contrastive reading. With i/ka-marked DPs, I have argued that i/ka(H)-marked DPs are located external to the vP, while i/ka(L)-marked DPs are located within the vP. In this chapter, we will examine whether un/nun(L)-marked DPs and un/nun(H)-marked DPs are distributed in a similar way.

5.1. Background

A notable difference between semantic particles and Case particles is that semantic particles may appear with either structural Case. And since un/nun may appear with both nominative and accusative DPs; un/nun may appear with both arguments of transitive sentences, as in (197a), or with the sole argument of unergatives, as in (197b), or unaccusatives, as in (197c), un/nun is generally analyzed as a semantic particle.
However, *un/nun* behaves quite differently from canonical semantic particles. First, while semantic particles like *man* can co-occur with Case particles, as in (198a), *un/nun* cannot co-occur with Case particles, as shown in (198b) and (198c). Sentences are ungrammatical when *un/nun* and *i/ka* are attached to the same word.
Un/nun-marked DPs are also different from other semantic particles in that they have the tendency to appear sentence-initially. Sentences become ungrammatical when un/nun-marked DPs are preceded by other DPs, as in (199b). This is quite different from other semantic particles that do not show such preference, as shown in (200). The semantic particle man may appear either sentence-initially, as in (200a), or sentence-medially, as in (200b).

    John-TOP apple-ACC eat-PST-DECL
    ‘(Let me tell you about John,) John ate apples.’

        John-NOM apple-TOP eat-PST-DECL

        apple-TOP John-NOM eat-PST-DECL
        ‘(Let me tell you about apples,) John ate apples.’

92 Un/nun-marked DPs given the contrastive reading may appear sentence-medially if un/nun-marked DPs appear as verbatim repetitions, as in (ib). DPs that appear as a verbatim repetition are distinguished from other DPs in that they are generally considered redundant and are generally omitted in colloquial forms. In this thesis, DPs that appear as a verbatim repetition will be considered as an anomaly and not be considered in the discussion.

    John-NOM apple-and banana-ACC bought-bring-PST-DECL
    ‘John bought apples and bananas.’

        John-NOM apple-TOP eat-PST-DECL
        ‘As for apples, John ate them.’

    c. #Papo-i sakwa-nun mek-ess-ta.
        fool-NOM apple-TOP eat-PST-DECL
        ‘As for apples, the fool ate them.’
In sum, while un/nun is generally considered a semantic particle, un/nun is different from other semantic particles in that it has the tendency to appear sentence-initially, and that it is incompatible with i/ka.

5.2. Two types of un/nun-marked DPs

5.2.1. Un/nun-marked DPs and contrastiveness

In this section, I will discuss un/nun-marked DPs by looking at how it is affected by prosodic marking, and later compare it to i/ka-marked DPs.

5.2.1.1. Contrastive DPs vs. Non-contrastive DPs

In English, given the context in (201), apples in (201a) is often said to be given the contrastive reading; we get the impression that John may not be the person who has eaten oranges.
(201) Context: John brought some apples and some oranges yesterday night, but there aren’t any left this morning.

   a. As for the apples, it was John who ate them.

      Inference: There are other foods that John may have eaten.

   b. What about oranges, who ate them?’

According to Büring (1997), the contrastive reading arises from an inference that there are unanswered questions. For example, (201a) provides the expectation that a question about oranges should follow the actual sentence, such as in (201b). And the contrastive reading arises as the question about oranges is left unanswered.

un/nun(H)-marked DPs in Korean have been observed to provide a similar reading (Lee 1999; 2003; 2007). For example, (202a) implies that there are other foods to consider other than apples and that the speaker is uncertain about whether John ate those other foods. As expected, (202a) also provides the expectation that a question about oranges – being the only other salient food item – should follow the actual sentence, such as in (202b).

(202) Context: John brought some apples and some oranges yesterday night, but there aren’t any left this morning.

   a. Sakwa-nun(H) John-i(H) mek-ess-e.

      apple-TOP John-NOM eat-PST-DECL

      ‘As for apples, it is John who ate them.’

      Inference: There are other foods that John may have eaten.
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b. *oleyni-nun(H) nwukwu-ka mek-ess-ni?*

orange-TOP who-NOM eat-PST-Q

‘As for oranges, who ate them?’

The interpretation of *un/nun*-marked DPs that are not prosodically prominent (*un/nun*(L)-marked DPs) is different from that of *un/nun*(H)-marked DPs. Unlike in (202a), the *un/nun*(L)-marked phrase in (203a) does not imply the existence of any other kind of food. When there is no other food in the context (to ask questions about), *un/nun*(H) marking becomes awkward, as in (203b).

(203) Context: John brought some apples and some oranges yesterday night, but there aren’t any left this morning.


apple-and orange-TOP John-NOM eat-PST-DECL

‘(Let me tell you about apples and oranges), it is John who ate them.’

b. #*Sakwa-ya oleynci-nun(H) John-i(H) mek-ess-e.*

apple-and orange-TOP John-NOM eat-PST-DECL

‘As for apples and oranges, it is John who ate them.’

Inference: There are other foods that John may have eaten.

According to Park (2007), contrastive *un/nun*-marked DPs involve selection from a pre-established set which contains other relevant alternatives, such as oranges in (202). Therefore, a prerequisite for the use of *un/nun*(H) is a set of alternatives which the referent of the contrastive DP is a member of. Since *un/nun*(H) requires other relevant alternatives (to ask questions about), when the question is about John (and nobody else), (204a) is infelicitous with *un/nun*(H).
(204) Q: John-un(L) sangtay-ka ette-ni?
   John-TOP condition-NOM how-Q?
   ‘What is the condition of John?’

a. #John-un(H) paykophu-ta.
   John-TOP hungry-DECL
   ‘As for John, he is hungry.’ (Contrastive)
   Inference: There are others who may be hungry

b. John-un(L) paykophu-ta.
   John-TOP hungry-DECL
   ‘To tell you about John, he is hungry.’

Following Park, the un/nun(H)-marked DP in (202a) can be given the contrastive reading as ‘apples’ is selected from a set introduced by the discourse ‘apples and oranges’, and leaves a member ‘oranges’ unselected. On the other hand, the un/nun(L)-marked DP in (203a) is non-contrastive as there aren’t any unselected members within the set to contrast with. In other words, since both ‘apples and oranges’ are included in the phrase marked by un/nun, there aren’t any other relevant alternatives.

The set of relevant alternatives may be established by prior discourse, as in (205), or by extralinguistic context (such as pointing fingers).

(205) a. Uli cip-ey nekuli-wa cwi-ka iss-ta.
   our house-at raccoon-and mouse-NOM is-DECL
   ‘There are raccoons and mice in our house.’
b. *pam-cwung-ey nekuli-nun(H) cap-ass-ta.*

night-during-at raccoon-TOP catch-PST-DECL

‘At night, (I) caught (some of the) raccoons.’

Inference: There are other pests that I may have caught (such as mice).

c. *pam-cwung-ey-to cwi-nun(H) soli-lul nay-n-ta.*

night-during-at-even mouse-TOP sound-ACC make-PRS-DECL

‘Mice are noisy even at night.’

Inference: There are others pests that may be noisy even at night.

If a set that includes the referent of the *un/nun*(H)-marked DPs is not established previously, *un/nun*(H)-marked DPs are infelicitous. Therefore, sentences containing *un/nun*(H)-marked DPs are infelicitous as discourse initial utterances, as in (206a) and (206b).

(206) Out-of-the-blue context

a. #*pam-cwung-ey kaymi-nun(H) cap-ass-ta.*

night-during-at ant-TOP catch-PST-DECL

‘At night, (I) caught some of the ants.’

Inference: There are other pests that I may have caught.

b. #*pam-cwung-ey-to cwi-nun(H) soli-lul nay-n-ta.*

night-during-at-even mouse-TOP sound-ACC make-PRS-DECL

‘Mice are noisy even at night.’

Inference: There are other pests that may be noisy even at night.
5.2.1.2. Contrastive DPs vs. Exhaustive DPs

The need for salient alternatives is common to both un/nun(H)-marked DPs and i/ka(H)-marked DPs. Previously, it was argued that the referents of exhaustive DPs are also selected from a previously established set of relevant alternatives. Thus, when there are no relevant alternatives, the contrastive reading and the exhaustive reading are both unavailable. When the question is about John (and nobody else), i/ka(H)-marked DPs are also infelicitous, as in (207a).93

(207) Q: John-un(L) sangtay-ka ette-ni?
   John-TOP condition-NOM how-Q?
   ‘What is the condition of John?’
   a. #John-i(H) paykophu-ta.
      John-NOM hungry-DECL
      ‘It is John who is hungry.’ (Exhaustive)
      Inference: Others are not hungry.
   b. John-un(L) paykophu-ta.
      John-TOP hungry-DECL
      ‘To tell you about John, he is hungry.’

While referents of contrastive DPs and exhaustive DPs are selected from a set of alternatives, the two types of DPs differ in what is implied about the other members of the set. If we force a situation

____________________________

93 Ko (2000; 2002) reports similar intuition about i/ka-marked DPs. According to Ko (2000; 2002), i/ka cannot appear on DPs that do not possess any relevant alternatives, as i/ka-marked DPs inherently involve selection. While Ko’s claim is for all i/ka-marked DPs, he does not distinguish between i/ka(H)-marked DPs and i/ka(L)-marked DPs.
in which John and Mary are the only relevant individuals, when (208a) is produced, we are uncertain about the status of Mary. Thus, given the context where both John and Mary are hungry, (208a) is not truth conditionally false, as the speaker leaves open whether Mary is hungry or not. On the other hand, (208b) infers that the other members of the set are not hungry. Therefore, if both John and Mary are hungry, (208b) would be truth conditionally false.

(208) Context: Both John and Mary are hungry.

a.  *John-un(H) paykophu-ta.*  (True)

   John-TOP    hungry-DECL

   ‘As for John, he is hungry.’ (Contrastive)

   Inference: There are other relevant individuals involving questions about hungriness.

b.  *John-i(H) paykophu-ta.*  (False)

   John-NOM    hungry-DECL

   ‘It is John who is hungry.’ (Exhaustive)

   Inference: There are other relevant individuals. And none of them are hungry.

According to Büring (1997), the uncertainty about the other members of the set arises as questions about the other members of the set are left unanswered. However, it seems that not all questions invoked by the contrastive *un/nun*(H)-marked DPs need to be left unanswered. Given the context in which there are three instructors and three courses, and each instructor is assigned only one course, and assuming that the sentences in (209) are uttered sequentially from (209a) to (209c), Mary in (209c) is infelicitous when it is given prosodic prominence. On the other hand, *un/nun*-marked DPs in (209a) and (209b) must appear with prosodic prominence.


(209) Context: There are three instructors; John, Tom, and Mary. And three courses; phonology, syntax, and semantics. Only one course can be assigned per each instructors.

a. John-un(H) umwunlon-ul(H) kaluchi-n-ta.
   John-TOP phonology-ACC teach-PRS-DECL
   ‘As for John, he teaches phonology.’
   Inference: there are others who teach other subjects

b. Tom-un(H) thongsalon-ul(H) kaluchi-n-ta.
   John-TOP syntax-ACC teach-PRS-DECL
   ‘As for Tom, he teaches syntax.’
   Inference: there are others who teach other subjects

c. Mary-nun(L)/nun(H) uymilon-ul(H) kaluchi-n-ta.
   John-TOP semantics-ACC teach-PRS-DECL
   ‘To tell you about Mary, she teaches semantics.’

The difference between (209a), (209b), and (209c) is that the potential questions invoked by (209c) have been already answered by (209a) and (209b), while some of the questions invoked by (209a) and (209b) are left unanswered.

In isolation, each of (209a), (209b), and (209c) are understood to leave unanswered questions about the remaining relevant alternatives; (209a) about Tom and Mary, (209b) about John and Mary, and (209c) about John and Tom. In this sequence of utterances however, the range of remaining questions is cut as each utterance is made, leaving the final utterance (209c) infelicitous.

Mary in (209c) is also the last member of the set to enter the discourse. However, that alone is not
enough to block the contrastive reading. Given a situation where John, Tom, and Mary are involved in a free-for-all shooting game, in which anybody can shoot anyone multiple times, Mary in (210c) is given prosodic prominence even though she is the last member of the set to enter the discourse. And as expected, unlike in (209c), there are potential questions about other members of the set that can be invoked by (210c), as we are uncertain whether Tom has shot John, or whether John has shot himself. In other words, Mary in (210c) can be given the contrastive reading as questions invoked by the un/nun-marked DP are left unanswered.

(210) Context: John, Tom, and Mary are participants of a shooting game in which anybody can shoot anyone multiple times.

a.  
John-un(H)  Tom-ul(L)  sso-ass-ta.
John-TOP  Tom-ACC  shoot-PST-DECL
‘As for John, he shot Tom.’

b.  
Tom-un(H)  Mary-lul(L)  sso-ass-ta.
Tom-TOP  Mary-ACC  shoot-PST-DECL
‘As for Tom, he shot Mary.’

c.  
Mary-nun(H)  John-ul(L)  sso-ass-ta.
Mary-TOP  John-ACC  shoot-PST-DECL
‘As for Mary, she shot John.’

5.2.1.3. Summary

Contrastive un/nun(H)-marked DPs are different from non-contrastive un/nun(L)-marked DPs in that some of the questions about other members of the set should be left unanswered. Another
requisite for *un/nun*(H) marking is that they require a pre-established set of alternatives which includes the referent of the contrastive *un/nun*(H)-marked DP.

Thus, when the set of alternatives is not pre-established, as in (206), or when there aren’t any other relevant alternatives to be considered at all, as in (207), *un/nun*(H) marking is not available. *Un/nun*(H) marking also becomes unavailable if questions about other members of the set are already answered, as in (209c), or if there aren’t any other members of the set to ask questions about, as in (211c).


apple-and orange-TOP who-NOM eat-PST-Q

‘About apples and oranges, who ate them?’


apple-and orange-TOP John-NOM eat-PST-DECL

‘To tell you about apples and oranges, it is John who ate them.’


apple-and orange-TOP John-NOM eat-PST-DECL

‘As for apples and oranges, it is John who ate them.’

Inference: There are other fruits that John may have eaten.

5.2.2. *Un/nun*-marked DPs and topicality

As shown in (203a), *un/nun*(L)-marked DPs are not given the contrastive reading. Non-contrastive *un/nun*(L)-marked DPs are generally analyzed as topics (Park 1999; Kim 2005; Nam 2005; Jo & Yoon 2006; Oh 2007, among others).
5.2.2.1. ‘What about x’ diagnostics

The debate on whether un/nun-marked DPs are always topical hinges on how the term ‘topicality’ is defined. Here I will use term ‘topic’ to indicate what the sentence is about. More specifically, I will use ‘what about x’ diagnostics (Roberts 2011) to identify the topicality of a DP. In other words, topical elements are those that can replace x in ‘what about x’ questions. And in this sense, un/nun-marked DPs are always topical.

Roberts (2011) introduces ‘what about x’ diagnostics, first proposed in Gundel (1974). Assuming that topics are what the sentences are about, topics are what replace x in the following question-answer pair, as in (212) (Gundel 1974; 1985). Based on the ‘what about x’ diagnostics, John in (213b) is the topic of the sentence as it may be understood as an answer to the question in (213a). On the other hand, (213c) is infelicitous as an answer to (213a) as John is not understood as the topic.

(212) a. What about x? (What did x do?)
   b. x did y.

(213) a. What about John? What did John do?
   b. To tell you about John, he is eating apples.
   c. #To tell you about apples, John is eating them.

94 The ‘say about x that S’ (Reinhart 1981) and ‘Speaking of x,’ and ‘As for x’ test (Gundel 1974; 1985) are some other proposed tests for topicality; topics are what replaces x.
5.2.2.2. Topicality of non-contrastive un/nun(L)-marked DPs

Non-contrastive un/nun-marked DPs are generally accepted as topical DPs in the literature (Park 1999; Kim 2005; Nam 2005; Jo & Yoon 2006; Oh 2007, among others). The topicality of the un/nun(L)-marked DP in (214b) is supported by the ‘What about x’ diagnostics. If the un/nun(L)-marked DP in (214b) is topical, it should be able to appear as an answer to a ‘what about x’ question. And as expected, we see that (214b) with an un/nun-marked DP can be construed as an answer to the question in (214a). In other words, (214b) is understood to be a sentence about the un/nun-marked DP John, and not about apples.95

95 In a recent study on un/nun, Kim (2013) argues that un/nun(L)-marked elements are not always topical. Kim (2013), citing Reinhart (1981), Lambrecht (1994), and Portner & Yabushita (1998), claims that only certain semantic types, a semantic type denoting entities, may serve as topics. Therefore, according to Kim (2013), the un/nun marked phrase in (i) is not a topic, it is not entity denoting.95

(i) [sungli ha-l kyengwu-ey]-nun thim-i taythonglyeng-eykeyse phyochang-ul victory do-FUT case-at-TOP team-NOM president-from award-ACC
pat-ul kes-i-ta.
receive-FUT COMP-COP-DECL
‘If the team wins, they will get an award from the president.’

Regardless, there is no denying that un/nun(L)-marked phrase in (i) is understood as what the sentence is about. It can be easily construed as an answer to the question such as “What about in case the team wins? Who will get an award from the president?” In other words, at least for our purposes, un/nun(L)-marked phrase in (i) are topical, in the sense that they may replace x in ‘what about x’ question-answer pair.
(214) a.  
\[ \text{John-un(H)? John-un(H) mwues-ul hay-ss-ni?} \]
John-TOP John-Top what-ACC do-PST-Q

‘What about John? What did John do?’

b.  
\[ \text{John-un(L) sakwa-lul mek-ess-e.} \]
John-TOP apple-ACC eat-PST-DECL

‘To tell you about John, he ate an apple.’

Based on the ‘What about \( x \)’ diagnostics, \( un/nun(L) \)-marked objects are also topical. (215b) is understood to be a sentence about the \( un/nun \)-marked DP apple, and not about John.

(215) a.  
\[ \text{Sakwa-nun(H)? Sakwa-nun(H) nwukwu-ka mek-ess-ni?} \]
apple-TOP apple-Top who-NOM eat-PST-Q

‘What about apples? Who ate apples?’

b.  
\[ \text{Sakwa-un(L) John-i mek-ess-e.} \]
Apples-TOP John-NOM eat-PST-DECL

‘To tell you about apples, John ate them.’

On the other hand, \( i/ka \)-marked DPs are generally assumed to be non-topical. And as expected, (216b) and (216c) with \( i/ka \)-marked DPs are infelicitous as an answer to the same ‘what about John’ question. In short, \( i/ka \)-marked DPs are not topical as they are not understood as what the sentence is about.
(216) a.  *John-un(H)? John-un(H) mwues-ul hay-ss-ni?*

John-TOP John-Top what-ACC do-PST-Q

‘What about John? What did John do?’

b.  #*John-i(H) sakwa-lul mek-ess-ta.*

John-NOM apple-ACC eat-PST-DECL

‘It is John who ate an apple.’

c.  #*John-i(L) sakwa-lul mek-ess-ta.*

John-NOM apple-ACC eat-PST-DECL

‘John ate an apple.’

5.2.2.3. Topicality of contrastive *un/nun*(H)-marked DPs

Some have argued that the particle *un/nun* that appears on contrastive DPs is a separate lexical item from the particle *un/nun* that appears on non-contrastive DPs (Choe 1995; Lee 1999; 2003; 2007; Jun 2005; 2006, among others). According to their view, only non-contrastive *un/nun*(L)-marked DPs are interpreted as topics, while *un/nun*(H)-marked DPs given the contrastive reading are not topical. However, based on the ‘what about x’ diagnostics, contrastive *un/nun*-marked DPs are also topical, as shown in (217b).

(217) Context: John and Tom are eating.

a.  *John-un(H)? John-un(H) mwues-ul mek-ess-ni?*

John-TOP John-Top what-ACC eat-PST-Q

‘What about John? What did John eat?’
b. *John-un(H) sakwa-lul mek-ess-e.*

John-TOP apple-ACC eat-PST-DECL

‘As for John, he ate an apple.’

Inference: There are others who may have eaten an apple.

Some have argued that *un/nun(H)-*marked objects, specifically contrastive *un/nun(H)-*marked objects that appear to the right of the subject are not topical (Han 1996; Lee 1999; 2003). But once again, based on the ‘what about x’ diagnostics, *un/nun(H)-*marked objects are also topical, regardless of whether the object is located to the left of the subject, as in (218b), or to the right of the subject, as (219b).

(218) Context: There are apples and oranges on the table.

a. *Sakwa-nun(H)? nwukwu-ka(H) sakwa-lul(L) mek-ess-ni?*

Apple-TOP who-NOM apple-ACC eat-PST-Q

‘What about apples?’ Who ate apples?’


apple-TOP John-NOM eat-PST-DECL

‘As for apples, it is John who ate them.’

(219) Context: The speaker is aware that John gave apples and oranges away.

a. *Sakwa-nun(H)? John-i(L) sakwa-lul(H) nwukwu-eykey cwu-ess-ni?*

Apple-TOP John-NOM apple-ACC who-to give-PST-Q

‘What about apples?’ Who did John give apples to?’
b.  John-i(L) sakwa-nun(H) Tom-eykey cwu-ess-e. 96

John-NOM apple-TOP Tom-to give-PST-DECL

‘As for apples, John gave them to Tom.’

I.K. Kim (2013) acknowledges that contrastive un/nun-marked DPs can be topical. But he argues that they are not always topical, such as the un/nun(H)-marked phrase in (220a). 97 He assumes that topical phrases cannot replace wh-words in question-answer pairs. Therefore, un/nun-marked phrases should not appear as answers to wh-questions if they are indeed always topical DPs. According to Kim, the grammaticality of (220a) is an indication that un/nun-marked DPs are not always topical.

(220) Q: Ku chayk-un elma-ni?

that book-TOP how.much-Q

‘How much is the book?’

a.  o-talle-nun(H) nem-e. (Kim’s reported judgment)

5-dollar-NUN more.than-DECL

‘(It’s) more than 5 dollars (at least).’

_________________________

96 While i/ka-marked DPs are generally not allowed to the left of un/nun-marked DPs, (219b) is grammatical, as the i/ka-marked DP appears as a verbatim repetition.

97 I have added the prosody markings on the particles for the reader’s convenience. Kim (2013) acknowledges that un/nun-marked DPs can be either contrastive or non-contrastive but does not explicitly distinguish contrastive un/nun-marked DPs from non-contrastive un/nun-marked DPs, nor does he acknowledge the difference in the prosody between the two types of un/nun-marked DPs.
b. *o-talle-ka*(H) nem-e.

5-dollar-NOM more-than-DEC

‘(It’s) more than 5 dollars (at least).’

However, as Kim acknowledges in his paper, the judgment of (220a) is subject to speaker variation.

For most speakers, contrastive *un/nun*(H)-marked DPs cannot replace *wh*-word in question-answer pairs, as in (221b). *Wh*-Questions are generally answered by exhaustive *i/ka*(H)-marked DPs, as in (221d). And for most speakers, the grammaticality of (220a) is not any better than (221b).

(221) Q: *Nwukwu-ka sakwa-lul mek-ess-ni?*

Who-NOM apple-ACC eat-PST-Q

‘Who ate apples?’


John-TOP apple-ACC eat-PST-DECL

‘To tell you about John, he ate apples.’

b. *#John-un*(H) sakwa-lul mek-ess-e.

John-TOP apple-ACC eat-PST-DECL

‘As for John, he ate apples.’

c. *#John-i*(L) sakwa-lul mek-ess-e.

John-NOM apple-ACC eat-PST-DECL

‘John ate apples.’


John-NOM apple-ACC eat-PST-DECL

‘It is John who ate apples.’
(221b) is generally ruled infelicitous as it is not a direct answer to the question. While (221b) may ultimately provide the information that the question in (221Q) seeks, for the majority of speakers, the fact that (221b) is about *John* and not about *sakwa* ‘apple’ makes (221b) an incongruent answer to the question. As expected, the sentence is felicitous when *sakwa* ‘apple’ is marked by *un/nun*, as in (222b).98 For most speakers, (220a) is infelicitous, for the same reason that (221b) is infelicitous.99

98 The sentences are still fine when ‘apple’ is not topicalized (marked by *un/nun*), as in (221d). What makes the sentence infelicitous is when ‘*John*’ is marked by *un/nun*, as in (221a) and (221b).

99 The uncertainty reading provided by contrastive *un/nun*(H)-marked DPs may be another reason why speakers generally find (221b) is infelicitous. If so, for the speakers who find (220a) grammatical, or improved from (221b), the improvement may be due to the addition of *neme* ‘more than’ in (220).

Assuming that answers to questions are expected to be definitive and complete (The maxim of quantity: be as informative as one possibly can, and give as much information as is needed, and no more), that contrastive *un/nun*-marked DPs are given the uncertainty reading or the scalar reading (Lee 2006; 2007) may have contributed to the ungrammaticality of (221b). If so, that *un/nun*(H)-marked DPs are appearing within a *neme*-construction may improve the acceptability of (220b), as the scalar reading is already expected by the use of *neme*. That the sentence becomes ungrammatical without *neme*, as in (ia), while DP plus a particle is normally a viable answer to a *wh*-question, as in (iia), and that the use of *i/ka* instead of *un/nun* does not improve the grammaticality, as in (ib), suggests that the improved judgment in (220b) may have to do with the peculiarity of *neme*-construction, and has nothing to do with the nominal particles.

(i) Q: *Ku chayk-un elma-ni?*  
   that book-TOP how.much-Q  
   ‘How much is the book?’
   a. *O-talle-nun*  
      5-dollar-NUN  
      ‘(It’s) more than 5 dollars (at least).’
   b. *O-talle-ka*  
      5-dollar-NOM  
      ‘(It’s) more than 5 dollars (at least).’

(ii) Q: *Nwukwu-ka sakwa-lul mek-ess-ni?*  
   Who-NOM apple-ACC eat-PST-Q  
   ‘Who ate an apple?’
(222) a.  

\[ Nwukwu-ka \quad sakwa-lul \quad mek-ess-ni? \]

Who-NOM   apple-ACC   eat-PST-Q  

‘Who ate apples?’

b.  

\[ sakwa-nun(L) \quad John-i(H) \quad mek-ess-e. \]

apple-TOP   John-NOM   eat-PST-DECL  

‘To tell you about apples, it is John who ate them.’

5.2.3. Summary

There are two types of *un/nun*-marked DPs in Korean; contrastive *un/nun*-marked DPs, and non-contrastive *un/nun*-marked DPs. DPs are contrastive when questions about relevant alternatives to the DPs are expected, and the questions are left unanswered. Based on the ‘what about x’ diagnostics for topicality, the two types of *un/nun*-marked DPs are both topical DPs.

5.3. The prosody of the two types of *un/nun*-marked DPs

5.3.1. Prosodic prominence and the contrastive reading

In English, the contrastive reading of a DP is said to be triggered by a special prosody on the DP (Jackendoff 1972; Büring 2003). Similarly in Korean, contrastive DPs are said to be given a
distinctive prosody; contrastive DPs are prosodically more prominent (higher pitch accent) than non-contrastive DPs (Lee 1999; 2003; Kim 2010; 2011). Un/nun-marked DPs with neutral prosody (un/nun(L)-marked DPs) are given the non-contrastive reading, as in (223a), while un/nun-marked DPs with prosodic prominence (un/nun(H)-marked DPs) are given the contrastive reading, as in (223b) (Lee 1999; 2003).

(223) a.  *John-un(L) paykophu-ta.*  
John-TOP hungry-DECL

‘To tell you about John, he is hungry.’ (Non-contrastive)

b.  *John-un(H) paykophu-ta.*  
John-TOP hungry-DECL

‘John is hungry.’ (Contrastive)

Inference: There is somebody else who may be hungry.

In a recent experimental study on prosodic prominence given to un/nun-marked DPs, I.K. Kim observes that when given a set constituted of two individuals, and propositions about the two individuals are given sequentially, as in (224B), the first DP marked by un/nun appears with significantly higher pitch than the second DP marked by un/nun, as shown in Table 1.

(224) A:  *Yengcay-lang  Yengtay-nun  hyengcay-i-ya?*  
Yengcay-and  Yengtay-TOP  brother-COP-Q

Ilum-i pisusha-ney?

name-NOM similar-DECL

‘Are Yengcay and Yengtay brothers? Their names are similar to each other.’
B: \[\text{[Yengcay-nun]}_{\text{CT1}} \quad \text{Micin-uy} \quad \text{tongsayng-i-ko}\]
\[\text{Yengcay-TOP} \quad \text{micin-GEN} \quad \text{Younger.brother-COP-CONJ}\]
\[\text{[Yengtay-nun]}_{\text{CT2}} \quad \text{Changtay-uy} \quad \text{tongsayng-i-ya.}\]
\[\text{Yengtay-TOP} \quad \text{Changtay-GEN} \quad \text{Younger.brother-COP-DECL}\]

‘Yengcay is Micin’s brother and Yengtay is Changtay’s brother.’

Table 4. Pitch of -\text{un/nun} for CT1 and CT2 (Adapted from Kim 2013: 225)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse function</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>StDev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CT1</td>
<td>223.17</td>
<td>80.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT2</td>
<td>188.10</td>
<td>63.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assuming that the contrastive reading arises when there are relevant alternatives to ask questions about and there are questions left unanswered, CT1 will be given the contrastive reading as there are still unanswered questions about the remaining member of the set. On the other hand, CT2 cannot be given the contrastive reading because the potential question invoked by CT2 (if contrastive) is already answered; Yengcay will not be Changtay’s brother as he is already Micin’s brother (unless in the highly unlikely chance that all three or four are siblings).

In sum, the difference in the pitch between CT1 and CT2 may be interpreted as to support the observation that \text{un/nun}-marked DPs given the contrastive reading appear with prosodic prominence.\(^{100}\)

\(^{100}\) Note that I.K. Kim’s interpretation of the data is quite different from my interpretation of the data. I.K. Kim’s interpretation will be laid out in section 5.3.2.2.
5.3.2. Experimental studies on the prosody of contrastive un/nun-marked DPs

Recently two experimental studies have been performed regarding the prosody of contrastive un/nun-marked DPs. The results of two experimental studies confirms that un/nun-marked DPs are given the contrastive reading when prosodically prominent, at least in Pusan dialect.

5.3.2.1. J.E. Kim (2010)

Kim’s experiment focuses on whether un/nun-marked DPs given the contrastive reading appear with prosodic prominence, and whether the prosodic accents given to accented un/nun-marked DPs are different from the prosodic accents given to focused DPs; DPs that replace wh-words in question-answer pairs. The contrastiveness was controlled by providing a context in which the referent of the un/nun-marked DP is selected from a set that includes the referent, as in (225). Kim’s participants were mostly speakers of the Pusan dialect.

(225) [context] Ann is suspicious of Ben, Carl, and Diane about witnessing a murder since they were guarding the place where the murder happened.

Ann: *enu kyenpiwen-i ku salin-ul mokkyek*

which guard-NOM that murder-ACC witness

*ha-ci ahn-ass-ni?*

do-NEG-PST-Q

‘Which of the guards has not witnessed the murder?’
Bill: *Ben-un(H) ha-yss-eyo.*

Ben-TOP  do-PST-DECL

‘As for Ben, he did.’

According to the results of Kim’s experiment, *un/nun*-marked DPs given the contrastive reading, as in (225), appear with prosodic prominence, and the prosodic accents given to contrastive DPs do not differ from the prosodic accents given to focused DPs. In sum, at least for speakers of the Pusan dialect, Kim’s experiment reveals that *un/nun*-marked DPs given the contrastive reading appear with prosodic prominence.\textsuperscript{101}

\subsection*{5.3.2.2. I.K. Kim (2013)}

On the other hand, I.K. Kim’s analysis (2013) focuses on the difference between non-contrastive *un/nun*-marked DPs and contrastive *un/nun*-marked DPs. Kim’s participants were all speakers of the Seoul dialect. Kim tested whether an *un/nun*-marked DP appearing in a contrastive context is produced any differently from a *un/nun*-marked DP appearing in a non-contrastive context.

In Kim’s experiment, *un/nun*-marked DPs are considered contrastive when relevant alternatives are introduced by prior discourse, as in (224B). On the other hand, *un/nun*-marked DPs were considered non-contrastive when the referents of the DPs are presented on its own, as in (226B).

\textsuperscript{101} Unfortunately, J.E. Kim (2011) does not make direct comparison with non-contrastive *un/nun*. While Kim’s experiment shows that *un/nun*-marked DPs with the contrastive reading are given prosodic accents, the experiment does not reveal how significantly different *un/nun*-marked DPs with the contrastive reading are from *un/nun*-marked DPs supposedly without prosodic accent.
I.K. Kim’s experiment shows that the pitch of supposed non-contrastive DPs, as in (226B), are not significantly different from some supposed contrastive DPs, such as CT1 in (224B), but significantly higher than some other supposed contrastive DPs, such as CT2 in (224B). Based on the results, he concludes that prosodic prominence has no correlation with the contrastive reading.

Table 5. Pitch of -un/nun for each discourse function (Kim 2013: 225)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse function</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>StDev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-contrastive</td>
<td>220.81</td>
<td>72.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT1</td>
<td>223.17</td>
<td>80.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT2</td>
<td>188.10</td>
<td>63.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, the result of his experiment may be given a different interpretation. First, it is questionable whether CT2 is indeed contrastive, as assumed by him. As discussed in the previous section, CT2 may be analyzed as non-contrastive in the sense that questions invoked by CT2 are not left unanswered. If CT2 is indeed non-contrastive, the significant difference observed between CT1 and CT2 may be interpreted as the difference between un/nun-marked DPs that are contrastive (CT1) and un/nun-marked DP that are non-contrastive (CT2), showing that un/nun-marked DPs
given the contrastive reading (CT1) are given prosodic prominence (relatively high pitch), contrary to his interpretation of the results.

Second, it is questionable whether the supposed non-contrastive DPs in (226B) are indeed non-contrastive. If a set of relevant alternatives can only be introduced by prior discourse, (226B) will be forced the non-contrastive reading, as there are no relevant alternatives to contrast with. However, as the I.K. Kim also admits, a set of relevant alternatives can be introduced by extralinguistic context. We can easily imagine a situation in which the discourse in (226) is produced in a street full of restaurants. In such case, the speaker may be contrasting swuntay with other foods not mentioned in the discourse. Moreover, that the context in which (226B) is produced involves selecting a place to go for lunch seems to further invoke the contrastive reading of swuntay. In other words, despite the setup, there is a possibility that participants might have imposed contrastiveness on the un/nun-marked DP in (226B), which will explain why (226B) is not significantly different from CT1 of (224B).

That un/nun-marked DPs are infelicitous with prosodic prominence in (227b), further supports that un/nun-marked DPs cannot appear with prosodic prominence when un/nun-marked DPs are non-contrastive.

\[102\] I.K. Kim also admits that the contrastive reading is not dependent on the presence of discourse antecedents when he states that contrastiveness involves imposed saliency and not given saliency (Kim 2013: 84). Clamson et al. (1993) categorizes discourse saliency into two types; given salience which is determined by prior characteristics of the discourse, and imposed salience which is imposed by the speaker (without the aid of any prior discourse).
(227) a.  swuntay-nun  ette-ni?
    swuntay(blood sausage)-TOP  how-Q?
    ‘What is the taste of swuntay?’

b.  #Swuntay-nun(H)  cca-ta.
    swuntay-TOP  salty-DECL
    ‘As for swuntay, it is salty.’
    Inference: There are other foods that may be salty.’

c.  Swuntay-nun(L)  cca-ta.
    swuntay-TOP  salty-DECL
    ‘Swuntay is salty.’

In sum, while I.K. Kim claims that Seoul dialect users do not produce contrastive un/nun-marked DPs with prosodic prominence, his results may be interpreted differently based on our definition of contrastive un/nun-marked DPs.

5.3.3. Summary

Un/nun-marked DPs given the contrastive reading have been widely considered to be more prosodically prominent than non-contrastive un/nun-marked DPs (Lee 1999; 2003; Kim 2010; 2011). Recently there have been two experimental studies regarding prosody of contrastive un/nun-marked DPs. J.E. Kim (2010) claims that contrastive un/nun-marked DPs are prosodically prominent. On the other hand, I.K. Kim (2013) claims that non-contrastive un/nun and contrastive un/nun are not produced any differently. However, his experimental results may be interpreted...


differently based on our definition of contrastive DPs.103

5.4. The structural position of un/nun-marked DPs

In chapters 3 and 4, I have mainly used two diagnostics to argue that i/ka(H)-marked DPs and i/ka(L)-marked DPs are interpreted in two distinct positions in the syntax. One is that i/ka(H)-marked DPs cannot be given the existential reading, and the other is that simple intransitives with i/ka(H)-marked subjects can be given the generic reading. In the following section, based on the results of the two diagnostics, I will argue that both un/nun(H)-marked DPs and un/nun(L)-marked DPs are interpreted outside of the vP.

5.4.1. The absence of the existential reading in un/nun-marked DPs

Assuming that the existential reading is only given to bare DPs located within the vP (Diesing 1990), that bare DPs marked by un/nun(L) and un/nun(H) are not allowed the existential reading suggests that both un/nun-marked DPs are interpreted outside of the vP.

Assuming that existential DPs are non-presuppositional (Diesing 1990), that non-contrastive un/nun(L)-marked DPs and contrastive un/nun(H)-marked DPs are always presuppositional would show that both types of un/nun-marked DPs cannot be given the existential reading. Generally, the referents of un/nun(L)-marked DPs are already known to exist by the speaker. Un/nun(L)-marked

103 That participants of I.K. Kim’s experiment consists of exclusively Seoul dialect users, while participants of J.E. Kim’s experiment consist of exclusively Pusan dialect users may also be a cause for the difference in the results of the experiments. The Pusan dialect is part of the southern dialect and the consensus is that southern dialects users are generally more sensitive to prosodic differences than Seoul dialect users.
DPs are infelicitous in out-of-the-blue contexts, as in (228), and un/nun(L)-marked DPs are also generally infelicitous when the referent of the un/nun(L)-marked DP is not introduced in a prior discourse, as in (229).\footnote{Sentences in (228) and (229b) may be felicitous if the referents of un/nun(L)-marked DPs have been introduced to the speaker by some extralinguistic context.}

(228) Out-of-the-blue context

\begin{enumerate}
\item \#pam-cwung-ey kaymi-nun(L) pizza-lul mek-ess-ta.
\begin{flushright}
\text{night-during-at ants-TOP pizza-ACC eat-PST-DECL}
\end{flushright}
\text{‘Some (familiar) ants ate pizza during the night.’}
\item \#John-un(L) khu-ta.
\begin{flushright}
\text{John-TOP tall-DECL}
\end{flushright}
\text{‘To tell you about John, he is tall.’}
\end{enumerate}

(229) a. ecey cenyek-ey pizza-lul sa-wa-ss-ta.
\begin{flushright}
\text{yesterday evening-at pizza-ACC buy-bring-PST-DECL}
\end{flushright}
\text{‘Yesterday (I) brought home pizza.’}
\begin{enumerate}
\item \#pam-cwung-ey kaymi-nun(L) pizza-lul mek-ess-ta.
\begin{flushright}
\text{night-during-at ants-TOP pizza-ACC eat-PST-DECL}
\end{flushright}
\text{‘To tell you about some (familiar) ants, they ate the pizza during the night.’}
\end{enumerate}

Un/nun(L)-marked DPs are felicitous only when the referents of the DPs have been introduced into the discourse previously, either by discourse, as in (230) or by extralinguistic context, as in (231).
(230) a. *ecey cenyek-ey pizza-lul sa-wa-ss-ta.*
    yesterday evening-at pizza-ACC buy-bring-PST-DECL
    ‘Yesterday (I) brought home pizza.’

b. *pizza-nun masiss-ess-ta.*
    pizza-TOP tasty-PST-DECL
    ‘To tell you about the pizza, it was tasty.’

(231) Context: Pointing at an empty pizza box.

    *pizza-nun masiss-ess-ta.*
    pizza-TOP tasty-PST-DECL
    ‘To tell you about the pizza, it was tasty.’

Similarly, *un/nun(H)-marked DPs are infelicitous in out-of-the-blue contexts, as in (232), and when the referents of the *un/nun(H)-marked DPs are not introduced in prior discourse, as in (233).

(232) Out-of-the-blue context

a. *#pam-cwung-ey kaymi-nun(H) pizza-lul mek-ess-ta.*
    night-during-at ants-TOP pizza-ACC eat-PST-DECL
    ‘Some (familiar) ants ate pizza at night.’

    Inference: There are other pests that may have eaten pizza during the night.

b. *#John-un(H) khu-ta.*
    John-TOP tall-DECL
    ‘As for John, he is tall.’

    Inference: There are others that may be tall.
(233) a.  

\[
\text{ec\ensuremath{\text{ey}}} \quad \text{cenyek-ey} \quad \text{pizza-lul} \quad \text{sa-wa-ss-ta}. \
\]

yesterday even\-\-day-at pizza-ACC buy-\-bring-PST-DECL

‘Yesterday (I) brought home pizza.’

b.  

\[
\text{#pam-cwung-ey} \quad \text{kaymi-nun(H)} \quad \text{pizza-lul} \quad \text{mek-ess-ta}. \
\]

night-during-at ants\-TOP pizza-ACC eat-PST-DECL

‘Some (familiar) ants ate the pizza during the night.’

Inference: There are other pests that may have eaten the pizza during the night.

Both types of \textit{un/nun}-marked DPs are therefore presuppositional, and cannot be given the existential reading. This suggests that they are interpreted in a position external to \(vP\).

\textbf{5.4.2. The generic reading of intransitive sentences with \textit{un/nun}-marked subjects}

The sentences in (234), one with an \textit{un/nun}(L)-marked subject, and the other with an \textit{un/nun}(H)-marked subject, can only be assigned either a generic reading or a presuppositional reading. This suggests that both types of \textit{un/nun}-marked subjects are interpreted outside of \(vP\).

(234) a.  

\[
\text{Sopangkw} \text{an-un(L)} \quad \text{pappu-ta}. \
\]

fireman\-TOP busy-DECL

‘To tell you about firemen in general, they have the tendency to be busy.’

‘To tell you about a fireman (who the speaker is familiar with), he is busy.'

fireman-TOP busy-DECL

‘As for firemen in general, they have the tendency to be busy.’

‘As for a fireman (who the speaker is familiar with), he is busy.

Inference: There are others who might be busy.

Transitive sentences with *un/nun*-marked subject DPs are also given the generic reading, as in (235), and the habitual reading, as in (236).


lion-TOP meat-ACC eat-PRS-DECL

‘To tell you about lions, they have the tendency to eat meat.’


lion-TOP meat-ACC eat-PRS-DECL

‘As for lions, they have the tendency to eat meat.’

Inference: There are other animals that may have the tendency to eat meat.


John-TOP cigarette-ACC smoke-PRS-DECL

‘To tell you about John, he has the tendency to smoke habitually.’


John-TOP cigarette-ACC smoke-PRS-DECL

‘As for John, he has the tendency to smoke habitually.’

Inference: There are others who may have the tendency to smoke.
In sum, that simple intransitive sentences with un/nun-marked DPs are allowed the generic reading suggests that un/nun-marked DPs are located outside of the vP.

5.4.3. Summary

That both types of un/nun-marked DPs are not allowed the existential reading, and that intransitive sentences with un/nun-marked DPs as their subjects are given the generic reading suggests that both types of un/nun-marked DPs are interpreted at least outside of the vP.

5.5. The Asymmetry in the linear word order

5.5.1. The asymmetry between un/nun-marked DPs and i/ka(H)-marked DPs

The asymmetry in the linear word order between un/nun-marked DPs and i/ka-marked DPs suggests that un/nun-marked DPs are not only interpreted outside of the vP, but are located outside of the vP at the surface.

Since i/ka does not appear on objects, i/ka-marked DPs cannot co-occur with un/nun-marked subjects within a clause. However, un/nun-marked objects (both un/nun(H) and un/nun(L)-marked objects) may appear with i/ka(H)-marked subjects in transitive sentences. When un/nun(H)-marked objects appear with i/ka(H)-marked subjects, un/nun(H)-marked objects must appear to the left of i/ka(H)-marked subjects, as in (237). The same also stands when un/nun(L)-marked DPs appear with i/ka(H)-marked DPs, as in (238).


John-NOM apple-TOP eat-PST-DECL

apple-TOP  John-NOM  eat-PST-DECL

‘As for apples, it was John who ate it.

Inference: There are other foods that other may have eaten.

No others ate apples.


John-NOM  apple-TOP  eat-PST-DECL


apple-TOP  John-NOM  eat-PST-DECL

‘To tell you about apples, it was John who ate it.

Inference: No others ate apples.

The same asymmetry between un/nun-marked DPs and i/ka(H)-marked DPs is observed in embedded clauses;

(239) a.  *Tom-i(L)  [  John-i(H)  sakwa-nun(H)  mek-ess-tako]

Tom-NOM  John-NOM  apple-TOP  eat-PST-COMP

malhay-ss-ta

say-PST-DECL
b. *Tom-i(L) [ John-i(H) sakwa-nun(L) mek-ess-tako ]

Tom-NOM John-NOM apple-TOP eat-PST-COMP

malhay-ss-ta

say-PST-DECL

‘Tom said that, to tell you about apples, it is John who ate them.’

Inference: No others ate apples but John.

(240) a. *Tom-i(L) [ John-i(H) sakwa-nun(L) mek-ess-tako ]

Tom-NOM John-NOM apple-TOP eat-PST-COMP

malhay-ss-ta

say-PST-DECL

b. Tom-i(L) [ sakwa-nun(L) John-i(H) mek-ess-tako ]

Tom-NOM apple-TOP John-NOM eat-PST-COMP

malhay-ss-ta

‘Tom said that, as for apples, it is John who ate them.’

Inference: No others ate apples but John.

If we take this asymmetry to reflect structural asymmetry, we arrive at the following generalization:

(241) un/nun-marked DPs > i/ka(H)-marked DPs

Assuming that i/ka(H)-marked DPs are located outside of the vP, that un/nun(H)-marked DPs and un/nun(L)-marked DPs are located above i/ka(H)-marked DPs will ensure that both types of
un/nun-marked DPs are located above vP.

5.5.2. The asymmetry between un/nun(H)-marked DPs and un/nun(L)-marked DPs

The asymmetry in the linear word order between un/nun(H)-marked DPs and un/nun(L)-marked DPs suggests that there is structural asymmetry between the two types of un/nun-marked DPs. Since i/ka(L)-marked DPs and i/ka(H)-marked DPs cannot appear simultaneously within the same clause, the relative position between the two types of i/ka-marked DPs could not be observed directly. However, un/nun(L)-marked DPs and un/nun(H)-marked DPs may appear simultaneously within the same clause.105

When un/nun(L)-marked DPs appear with un/nun(H)-marked DPs, un/nun(L)-marked DPs must always appear to the left of un/nun(H)-marked DPs, as shown in (242a). un/nun(H)-marked DPs cannot appear to the left of un/nun(L)-marked DPs, as in (242b). This holds even when the object carries un/nun(L)-marking and the subject carries un/nun(H)-marking, as shown in (243). (243b)

105 In Korean, both arguments of a transitive sentence can be marked by un/nun. While both arguments marked by un/nun can be prosodically prominent, as in (ia), only one of the arguments marked by un/nun can be prosodically neutral, as in (ib). Sentences become ungrammatical when both arguments of a transitive sentence are marked by un/nun(L), as in (ic). I do not have an explanation for why the distribution of un/nun(L)-marked DPs are more restrictive than the distribution of un/nun(H)-marked DPs.

(i)a. John-un(H) sakwa-nun(H) mek-ess-ta.
     John-TOP   apple-TOP   eat-PST-DECL
     ‘As for John, he ate (at least) an apple.’
     Inference: There are other individuals that may have eaten other foods.

     John-TOP   apple-TOP   eat-PST-DECL
     ‘To tell you about John, he ate (at least) an apple.’
     Inference: There are other foods that John might have eaten.

     John-TOP   apple-TOP   eat-PST-DECL
is ungrammatical as the *un/nun(L)-marked object sakwa ‘apple’ appears to the right of the
*un/nun(H)-marked subject John.

(242) a.  

\[ \text{John-un(L) sakwa-nun(H) mek-ess-ta.} \]

John-TOP apple-TOP eat-PST-DECL

‘To tell you about John, as for apples, he ate them.’

Inference: There are other foods that John may have eaten.

b. *\[ \text{Sakwa-nun(H) John-un(L) mek-ess-ta.} \]

apple-TOP John-TOP eat-PST-DECL

(243) a.  

\[ \text{Sakwa-nun(L) John-un(H) mek-ess-ta.} \]

apple-TOP John-TOP eat-PST-DECL

‘To tell you about apples, as for John, he ate them.’

Inference: There are others who may have eaten apples.

b. *\[ \text{John-un(H) sakwa-nun(L) mek-ess-ta.} \]

John-TOP apple-TOP eat-PST-DECL

The same asymmetry between *un/nun(L)-marked DPs and *un/nun(H)-marked DPs is observed in
embedded clauses;
(244) a.  

Tom-i(L)  [ John-un(L)  sakwa-nun(H)  mek-ess-tako]  

Tom-NOM  John-TOP  apple-TOP  eat-PST-COMP  

malhay-ss-ta  

say-PST-DECL  

‘Tom said that John ate apples at least.’  

Inference: There are other foods that John may have eaten.  

b.  *

Tom-i(L)  [ sakwa-nun(H)  John-un(L)  mek-ess-tako ]  

Tom-NOM  apple-TOP  John-TOP  eat-PST-COMP  

malhay-ss-ta  

say-PST-DECL  

(245) a.  

Tom-i(L)  [ sakwa-nun(L)  John-un(H)  mek-ess-tako ]  

Tom-NOM  apple-TOP  John-TOP  eat-PST-COMP  

malhay-ss-ta  

‘Tom said that John ate apples at least.’  

Inference: There are other who may have eaten apples.  

b.  *

Tom-i(L)  [ John-un(H)  sakwa-nun(L)  mek-ess-tako ]  

Tom-NOM  John-TOP  apple-TOP  eat-PST-COMP  

malhay-ss-ta  

say-PST-DECL  

If we take this asymmetry to reflect structural asymmetry, we arrive at the following
(246) \( \text{un/nun}(\text{L}) \)-marked DPs > \( \text{un/nun}(\text{H}) \)-marked DPs

5.6. Summary

In this chapter, I have extended my analysis to \( \text{un/nun} \)-marked DPs. That the generic reading and the presuppositional reading is available to both types of \( \text{un/nun} \)-marked DPs suggest that \( \text{un/nun} \)-marked DPs are interpreted external to the \( vP \). Linear word order suggests that \( \text{un/nun} \)-marked DPs are not only interpreted outside of the \( vP \) but also located outside of the \( vP \) at the surface.

\[ ^{106} \]

The observation that non-contrastive \( \text{un/nun}(\text{L}) \)-marked DPs and contrastive \( \text{un/nun}(\text{H}) \)-marked DPs show asymmetry in the linear word order is by no means novel. Based on the observation that the two types of \( \text{un/nun} \)-marked DPs can be distinguished semantically (non-contrastive vs. contrastive), syntactically (high vs. low), and phonologically (neutral vs. prominent) it was often argued that \( \text{un/nun}(\text{H}) \)-marked DPs and \( \text{un/nun}(\text{L}) \)-marked DPs are two different lexical items occupying two different positions in the left periphery; \( \text{un/nun}(\text{H}) \) appears lower in the structure and is a marker of contrastiveness, while non-contrastive \( \text{un/nun}(\text{L}) \) is a marker of topicality (Choe 1995; Lee 1999; Choi 2004; Jun 2005; 2006; Lee 2005; Park 2007).
Chapter 6

Conclusion

6.1. \( vP \)-internal vs. \( vP \)-external \( i/ka \)-marked DPs

In this thesis, based on the differences in the genericity and the existentiality of \( i/ka \)-marked DPs and sentences with \( i/ka \)-marked subjects, I have argued that \( i/ka(H) \)-marked DPs are interpreted external to the \( vP \), while \( i/ka(L) \)-marked DPs are interpreted internal to the \( vP \). Based on the argument that A-moved DPs in Korean do not undergo reconstruction at LF, I have proposed that the difference in the position of interpretation is a reflection of the difference in the surface position; \( i/ka(L) \)-marked DPs are located within the \( vP \) at the surface, while \( i/ka(H) \)-marked DPs have moved out. Assuming that the nominative Case is assigned at [Spec, \( vP \)], the position for \( i/ka(L) \)-marked DPs will be [Spec, \( vP \)], as any movement out of [Spec, \( vP \)] will be to a \( vP \)-external position. However, the position of \( i/ka(H) \)-marked DPs remains uncertain. Since \( vP \)-external subject position for English and German have been argued to be [Spec, IP], [Spec, IP] seems to be a plausible landing site for \( i/ka(H) \)-marked DPs. However, I will leave open the exact landing site of \( i/ka(H) \)-marked DPs, due to the lack of conclusive evidence.

6.2. Case marker analysis of \( i/ka \)

That \( i/ka(L) \)-marked DPs and \( i/ka(H) \)-marked DPs are interpreted/located at two different syntactic
positions add support to the Case marker analyses of i/ka.
While i/ka has been generally analyzed as a Case marker, some have argued that i/ka is not always a Case marker as i/ka-marked DPs at times appear with the exhaustive reading. To account for the exhaustive reading given to i/ka-marked DPs, Yoon (2004) and Choi (2005) argues that the exhaustive reading is attained by movement. That i/ka(L)-marked DPs at [Spec, vP] are not given any additional meaning, while i/ka(H)-marked DPs that have moved out of [Spec, vP] are given the exhaustive reading add support to the argument that the exhaustive reading is attained by movement and not inherent to the nominal particle i/ka (cf. Yoon 2004; Choi 2005). Since the exhaustive reading is not inherent to the particle, i/ka may remain semantically empty, which fortifies its position as the nominative Case marker.

6.3. Prosodic prominence

Another question that remains unanswered is how i/ka(H)-marked DPs and un/nun(H)-marked DPs are given prosodic prominence. With i/ka-marked DPs we find a correlation between vP-external DPs and prosodic prominence; exhaustive i/ka(H)-marked DPs are located/interpreted vP-externally, while neutral i/ka(L)-marked DPs are interpreted vP-internally. However, both prosodically prominent and neutral un/nun-marked DPs are located/interpreted external to the vP. In other words, it is not the case that prosodic prominence is simply given to all DPs that are interpreted/located vP-externally.
Prosodic prominence is not given to un/nun and i/ka-marked DPs interpreted/located at a relatively higher position either. While i/ka(H)-marked DPs are located above i/ka(L)-marked DPs, linear word order suggests that un/nun(H)-marked DPs are located below un/nun(L)-marked DPs.
However, a generalization is that prosodically prominent DPs are always located outside of the vP; both *i/ka*(H)-marked DPs and *un/nun*(H)-marked DPs are located/interpreted vP-externally.

One possibility is that prosodic prominence is associated with selection from pre-established sets. Both exhaustive *i/ka*(H)-marked DPs and contrastive *un/nun*(H)-marked DPs involve selection from pre-established sets. The difference is that *i/ka*(H)-marked DPs involve exhaustive selection, while *un/nun*(H)-marked DPs do not. Thus, assuming that DPs that involve selection from a pre-established set form a natural class, and if such DPs are given prosodic prominence, exhaustive *i/ka*(H)-marked DPs and contrastive *un/nun*(H)-marked will be given prosodic prominence. However, such an analysis would first need to explain how an apparent semantic feature has consequences on the PF-output.

If prosodic prominence is indeed assigned to *i/ka* and *un/nun*-marked DPs in the above fashion, it would explain why prosodically prominent DPs are always located/interpreted vP-externally. Assuming that presuppositionality is associated with vP-external DPs, prosodically prominent DPs must be located outside of the vP, as they are inherently presuppositional (presuppose the existence of a set that includes the referent of the DP).

**6.4. Comparative study**

The analysis may be extended to Japanese DPs. Like Korean DPs, we find that nominative Case marked DPs in Japan may be given the exhaustive reading, while topic marked DPs may be given the contrastive reading (Kuno 1972).
(247) a. *Ame-ga fut-teimasu*
   
   rain-NOM fall-PRS
   
   ‘It is raining.’ (Non-exhaustive)

   
   John-NOM student-be
   
   ‘It is John who is a student.’ (Exhaustive)

   
   John-TOP student-be
   
   ‘To say about John, he is a student.’ (Non-contrastive)

b. *Ame-wa fut-teimasu-ga yuki-wa fu-teima-sen*
   
   rain-TOP fall-PRS-but snow-TOP fall-PRS-NEG
   
   ‘It is raining but it is not snowing.’ (Contrastive)

According to Miyajima (2008), nominative Case-marked DPs in Japanese are given the exhaustive reading when they appear in categorical sentences (sentences that involve categorical judgment (Kuroda 1972)), as in (247b), nominative Case-marked DPs with non-exhaustive readings appear on thetic sentences (sentences that involve thetic judgment), as in (247a). Assuming that subjects of categorical sentences are presuppositional (Kuroda 1972; 1992; Ladusaw 1994), exhaustive ga-marked DPs in Japanese will be located outside of the vP, which is consistent with our analysis of Korean *i/ka*-marked DPs. Contrastive topic marked DPs in Japanese are said to appear as subjects of thematic sentences, as in (248b). However, while the predicate in (248b) may not force the presuppositional reading of the subject, our analysis would predict that the contrastive *wa* marked-DPs in (248b) are presuppositional.
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