

# Demonstrative and Bound Variable Anaphora\*

Young-Sik Choi  
(Korea University)

Choi, Young-Sik. 2003. Demonstrative and Bound variable Anaphora. *The Linguistic Association of Korea Journal* 11(2), 247-263. I claim that *ku* in Korean is a demonstrative, following Hoji (1988). It will be shown that the symmetry of *ku* in Korean and *that* in English regarding bound variable construal follows, given the present proposal for *ku* as a demonstrative. I will also claim that a demonstrative cannot have a bound variable construal once it cannot refer to an object that is not visible to both the speaker and the hearer, diverging from Hoji (1988) who claims that degree of deicity is what is essentially responsible for the lack of a bound variable construal of a demonstrative. His proposal poses a nontrivial problem with regard to learnability, since degree of deicity presupposes a complete mastery of deicity of demonstratives in a given language, which is not plausible if knowledge of bound variable construal is part of the grammar. The present proposal for visibility as a criterion for bound variable construal of a demonstrative is based on the demonstrative *ce* which cannot have a bound variable construal unlike *ku* in Korean and *that* in English. The former in contrast to the latter cannot refer to an object that is not visible to both the speaker and the hearer, hence cannot be construed as a bound variable.

**Key words:** visibility, demonstrative, bound, variable

## 1. Introduction

It is a well-known fact that English third person singular pronoun *he*

---

\* I would like to express my most sincere thanks to Jean-Roger Vergnaud for our discussion of the phenomena of bound variable anaphora in Korean. My thanks also go to the anonymous reviewers of *The Linguistic Association of Korea Journal* for their comments.

can have a bound variable construal as shown below in (1-3).

- (1) a. Everyone<sub>i</sub> thinks he<sub>i</sub> is intelligent.  
 b. Everyone<sub>i</sub> likes his<sub>i</sub> mother.
- (2) Someone<sub>i</sub> invited his<sub>i</sub> mother to the party.
- (3) a. Who<sub>i</sub> invited his<sub>i</sub> mother?  
 b. Which student<sub>i</sub> invited his<sub>i</sub> mother?

When it comes to Korean, native speakers seem to have a bound variable construal more readily with certain types of QPs as compared with other types of QPs as shown in (4-7).<sup>1)</sup>

- (4) Nwukwuna<sub>i</sub> ku<sub>i</sub>-uy sensayng-ul coahanta.  
 everyone his teacher-ACC like  
 'Everyone<sub>i</sub> likes his<sub>i</sub> teacher.'  
 (Kang 1988: 195)
- (5) ?Motun haksayng<sub>i</sub>-i ku<sub>i</sub>-uy cito kyoswu-lul coahanta.  
 every student-NOM his-POSS professor-ACC like  
 'Every student<sub>i</sub> likes his<sub>i</sub> professor.'
- (6) ?Taypwupwun-uy haksayng<sub>i</sub>-i ku<sub>i</sub>-uy cito kyoswu-lul  
 most-POSS student-NOM his-POSS professor-ACC  
 coahanta.  
 like  
 '\*Most students<sub>i</sub> like his<sub>i</sub> professor.'
- (7) \*Nwukwunka<sub>i</sub> ku<sub>i</sub>-uy cito kyoswu-lul coahanta.  
 someone his-POSS professor-ACC like  
 'Someone<sub>i</sub> likes his<sub>i</sub> professor.'

---

1) It should be noted that the intended reading of *nwukwunka* (someone) is nonspecific in (7). When the wh-word in (8a) is stressed, it seems that the bound variable reading may marginally obtain.

- (8) a. ?\***Nwu**<sub>i</sub> -ka      ku<sub>i</sub> -uy    cito kyoswu-lul    chotayhayss-ni?  
           who-NOM        his            professor-ACC    invited-QM  
           'Who<sub>i</sub> invited his<sub>i</sub> professor?'
- b. **Enu**    haksayng<sub>i</sub>-i      ku<sub>i</sub>-uy              cito kyoswu-lul  
           which student-NOM    his-POSS        professor-ACC  
           chotayhayss-ni?  
           invited-QM  
           'Which student<sub>i</sub> invited his<sub>i</sub> professor?'

The generalization that emerges from the paradigm above in (1-8) is that bound variable construal of *ku* in Korean can obtain when the antecedent is a definite QP or a *which*-NP, whereas in English the construal obtains without any restriction on the QP type of the antecedent (see Barwise & Cooper 1981, Keenan 1987, Heim & Kratzer 1998, and Larson & Segal 1995 for the discussion various QP types in the tradition of generalized quantifiers).

The question that somehow failed to receive a due amount of attention is thus why it is that Korean *ku* and its alleged English counterpart *he* shows a nonparallel pattern regarding bound variable construal. If Korean *ku* in (4-8) is a pronoun and is indeed the counterpart of *he* in (1-3) in English, that the same expressions in both languages exhibit a nonparallel pattern regarding the bound variable construal is certainly a blow to the assumption in the generative grammar that semantic interpretation is not a locus for variation (also see Hong 1985, Hoji 1988, Kang 1988, Suh 1990, among many others for the discussion of *ku*).

The organization of the paper is as follows: I will review Hoji (1988)'s proposal that *ku* is a demonstrative in section 2. I will claim in section 3 that the nonparallel pattern regarding the bound variable construal of *ku* in Korean and *he* in English has to do with the status of *ku* as a demonstrative, which corresponds to English *that*. It will be shown that the generalization holding for bound variable construal for *ku* in Korean directly extends to English *that*, further supporting the present thesis that *ku* is a demonstrative.

I will claim in section 4 that a demonstrative cannot have a bound variable construal if it cannot refer to an object that is not visible to both the speaker and the hearer, crucially based on the behavior of the demonstrative *ce* in Korean, which indeed cannot refer to an object not visible to both the speaker and the hearer. Section 5 is the conclusion.

## 2. Demonstratives in Korean

As a starting point of our discussion here, I will briefly review the claim made by Hoji (1988), which addressed the issue of parametric variation in bound variable anaphora in Korean and Japanese in terms of demonstrative system, which I think is essentially correct. The Korean demonstratives *i* (this), *ku* (that), and *ce* (that) are illustrated below in (9).

- (9) a. *i kes*        'this thing'  
       b. *ku kes*        'that thing'  
       c. *ce kes*        'that thing'

*i kes* in (9a) is a combination of demonstrative *i*(this) and *kes* (thing) and it refers to an object close to the speaker. *ce kes* in (9b), which is a combination of *ce* (that) and *kes* (thing), refers to an object far from both the speaker and the hearer. *ku kes* in (9c), which is a combination of *ku* (that) and *kes* (thing), refers to an object close to the hearer. *ku kes* can also refer to an object, which is not visible both from the speaker and the hearer. Thus the demonstrative *ku* is on a par with English *that* in that both can refer to an entity that is or is not visible to both the speaker and the hearer. Korean, however, seems to have a richer demonstrative system as compared with the one in English, which does not have a demonstrative which exclusively refers to an entity that is visible to both the speaker and the hearer.

Hoji's claim is supported by the independent observation made by Kang (1988: 196), according to which historically the introduction of *ku* (he) with meaning akin to *he* in English is fairly recent in Korean and

it is from *ku* + *N* which has been used as a referring expression.

Hoji further contends that *ku* can have a bound variable construal, following the intuition as reported by Kang (1988) and Suh (1990), suggesting that its availability of bound variable construal is directly related to the fact that *ku* is less deictic than *ce* in Korean, which cannot have a bound variable construal at all, assuming that deicticity is more or less synonymous with having independent reference.

The question that arises regarding his proposal is what degree of deicticity an expression should have such that it does (not) yield a bound variable construal. To the extent that the degree of deicticity is the crucial factor in determining the availability of bound variable construal, his proposal invites a nontrivial question in terms of learnability. Given that degree of deicticity is a relative notion, a child acquiring the bound variable construal will invariably be subject to the almost unattainable task of having to have a complete list of degree of deicticity across languages to master the bound variable construal. Thus if knowledge of bound variable construal is part of the grammar, Hoji's proposal is untenable.

As an alternative for the notion of degree of deicticity in Hoji, I suggest that a demonstrative cannot have a bound variable construal once it cannot refer to an object that is not visible to both the speaker and the hearer, crucially based on *ce* (that) in Korean, which cannot refer to an object not visible both to the speaker and the hearer and hence cannot have a bound variable construal, as will be discussed in section 4.

### 3. Demonstrative *Ku* and Bound Variable Construal

It was observed in section 2 that *ku* can have a bound variable construal with a definite QP type or *which*-NP as its antecedent. The relevant data are repeated in (10–14).

- (10) Nwukwuna<sub>i</sub>    ku<sub>i</sub>-uy                    sensayng-ul    coahanta.  
       everyone    his-POSS                    teacher-ACC    like  
       'Everyone<sub>i</sub> likes his<sub>i</sub> teacher.'  
       (Kang 1988: 195)

- (11) ?Motun haksayng<sub>i</sub>-i ku<sub>i</sub>-uy cito kyoswu-lul coahanta.  
 every student-NOM his-POSS professor-ACC like  
 'Every student<sub>i</sub> likes his<sub>i</sub> professor.'
- (12) ?Taypwupwun-uy haksayng<sub>i</sub>-i ku<sub>i</sub>-uy cito kyoswu-lul  
 most-POSS student-NOM his-POSS professor-ACC  
 coahanta.  
 like  
 '\*Most students<sub>i</sub> like his<sub>i</sub> professor.'
- (13) \*Nwukwunka<sub>i</sub> ku<sub>i</sub>-uy cito kyoswu-lul coahanta.  
 someone his-POSS professor-ACC like  
 'Someone<sub>i</sub> likes his<sub>i</sub> professor.'
- (14) a. ?\*Nwu<sub>i</sub>-ka ku<sub>i</sub>-uy cito kyoswu-lul chotayhayss-ni?  
 who-NOM his-POSS professor-ACC invited-QM  
 'Who<sub>i</sub> invited his<sub>i</sub> professor?'  
 b. **Enu**<sub>i</sub> haksayng-i ku<sub>i</sub>-uy cito kyoswu-lul  
 which student-NOM his-POSS professor-ACC  
 chotayhayss-ni?  
 invited-QM  
 'Which student<sub>i</sub> invited his<sub>i</sub> professor?'

Given the proposal for the *ku* as a demonstrative and the availability of a bound variable construal, one should expect that the same holds for English demonstrative *that*, regarding bound variable construal.

- (15) Every logician<sub>i</sub> was walking with a boy near that logician<sub>i</sub>'s house.  
 (Evans 1977: 491)
- (16) ?\*Some logician<sub>i</sub> was walking with a boy near that logician<sub>i</sub>'s house.
- (17) a. \*Who<sub>i</sub> recommended that linguist<sub>i</sub>'s student for a lucrative

- project?  
 b. Which linguist<sub>i</sub> recommended that linguist<sub>i</sub>'s student for a  
 lucrative project?  
 (Hoji 1995)

In fact, the demonstrative *that* in English can also have a bound variable construal with a definite QP type or a *which*-NP as its antecedent. What is the common property of the two demonstratives in Korean and English such that they can have a bound variable construal? I suggest that the ability of these demonstratives to refer to an entity that is not visible to both the speaker and the hearer is crucially responsible for the reading. That both demonstratives can refer to an entity not visible both the speaker and the hearer is illustrated by the following: Suppose A and B are talking about *John* who is away from them such that they cannot see him. A as the speaker can still ask John's wellbeing by saying the following in (18-19):

(18) How is that guy doing?

(19) Ku        chinkwu    yocum        **ettesskey**        cinay-ni?  
           that        guy            lately        how            doing-QM  
           'How is that guy doing?'

Thus it is not a surprise that *that* in English and *ku* in Korean can have a bound variable construal with the same type of QPs as antecedents as shown above in (10-17), given the fact that both are demonstratives that can refer to an entity not visible to both the speaker and the hearer.

Interestingly, the demonstrative *ku* in Korean can also have a bound variable construal with a definite QP type with a different domain of quantification too, namely, quantification over time. The following examples in (20-21) involving conditional construction with an indefinite *nwukwu* (someone) in the antecedent and *ku* in the consequent have a covarying interpretation of *ku*:

(20) John<sub>j</sub>-i    **nwukwu**<sub>i</sub>-lul    manna-myen (pro)<sub>j</sub>    nul    ku<sub>i</sub>-lul  
 J-NOM    who-ACC    meet-if    always    he-ACC  
 cip-ulo    chotayhanta.  
 house-to    invite  
 for every x, x an individual if John meets x, he invites x to his place.

(21) John<sub>j</sub>-i    **nwukwu**<sub>i</sub>-lul    manna-myen (pro)<sub>j</sub>    taychaylo    ku<sub>i</sub>-lul  
 J-NOM    who-ACC    meet-if    mostly    he-ACC  
 cip-ulo    chotayhanta.  
 house-to    invite  
 for most x, x an individual if John meets x, he invites x to his place.

Assuming the co-varying interpretation of *ku* (he) is a bound variable reading, with the adverbial quantifier binding it at LF as in (21) it suggests that *ku* (he) in Korean can be construed as a bound variable anaphora (see Lewis 1975, Heim 1982 for adverbs of quantification).<sup>2)</sup>

(22) [ Always/most ]<sub>j</sub>    if-clause    [ main clause .... ku<sub>j</sub> ]

Interestingly the covarying interpretation does not obtain when the binder is an existential QP over time as shown below in (22).

(23) John<sub>j</sub>-i    **nwukwu**<sub>i</sub>-lul    manna-myen (pro)<sub>j</sub>    kakkum    ku<sub>i</sub>-lul  
 J-NOM    who-ACC    meet-if    sometimes    he-ACC  
 cipu-lo    chotayhanta.  
 house-to    invite  
 'There is a particular individual x such that if John meets x he sometimes invites x to his place.'

---

2) Of course, that is not the only reading for the sentences in (20-21). They also have the following readings, respectively.

There is a particular x, x an individual such that if John meets x, he always invites x to his place.

There is a particular x, x an individual such that if John meets x, he mostly invites x to his place.



#'for some x, x an individual if John meets x, he sometimes invites x to his place.'

The data above in (20-21) and (23) suggest that essentially the same generalization for bound variable construal *ku* holds for QPs quantifying over time too, in that the bound variable construal of *ku* can obtain only with a certain type of QP, namely, a definite QP type over time, *nul* (always) and *taychaylo* (mostly) but not *kakkum* (sometimes). Now let us have a look at another instance of demonstrative *ku*, i.e., *ku kos* (the place), which is a combination of *ku* (the) and *kos* (place).<sup>3</sup> As shown below, it can have a bound variable construal with a definite QP type.

(24) a. Motun hoysa-uy hyenci pepin<sub>i</sub>-i  
 every company local subsidiary-NOM  
 ku kos<sub>i</sub>-uy pwulpep kunlocatul-ul haykohaysssta.  
 that place-POSS illegal workers-ACC fired  
 'Every company's local subsidiary<sub>i</sub> fired its<sub>i</sub> illegal workers.'

b. Motun tayhak-uy hyenci pwunkyo<sub>i</sub>-ka  
 every university-POSS local extension-NOM  
 ku kos<sub>i</sub> enehakkwa-lul phyesoyhassta.  
 that place linguistics dept-ACC demolished  
 'Every university's local extension<sub>i</sub> demolished its<sub>i</sub> linguistics department.'

(25) a. Taypwupwun hoysa-uy hyenci pepin<sub>i</sub>-i  
 most company local subsidiary-NOM  
 ku kos<sub>i</sub>-uy pwulpep kunlocatul-ul haykohaysssta.  
 that place-POSS illegal workers-ACC fired  
 '\*Most company's local subsidiaries<sub>i</sub> fired its<sub>i</sub> illegal workers.'

b. Taypwupwun tayhak-uy hyenci pwunkyo<sub>i</sub>-ka  
 most university-POSS local extension-NOM

---

3) *Ku Kos* (that place) is singular denoting expression. For the original discussion for a similar expression in Japanese, see Hoji (1995).

ku kos<sub>i</sub>    enehakkwa-lul                    phyesoyhassta.  
 that place linguistics dept-ACC    demolished  
 '\*Most university's local extensions<sub>i</sub> demolished its<sub>i</sub> linguistics  
 department.'

That the relation between the antecedent and *ku kos* (the place) is a bound variable is confirmed by the weak crossover effects (Postal 1971, Chomsky 1976) as shown in (26) below with *every*-QP in construction with the demonstrative *ku*, for example.

- (26) a. \*Ku kos<sub>i</sub>-uy pwulpep    kunloca-tul-i  
 its-POSS    illegal                    worker-PL-NOM  
 motun hoysa-uy                    hyenci pepin<sub>i</sub>-ul                    kopalhayssta.  
 every company-POSS local    subsidiary-ACC sued  
 'Its<sub>i</sub> illegal workers sued every company's local subsidiary<sub>i</sub>.'
- b. \*Ku kos<sub>i</sub>    enehakkwa-uy                    kyoswu-ka  
 that place    linguistics dept-POSS    professor-NOM  
 motun tayhak-uy                    hyunci pwunkyo<sub>i</sub>-lul                    kopalhayssta.  
 every university-POSS local    extension-ACC sued  
 'Its<sub>i</sub> linguistics professor sued every university's local  
 extension<sub>i</sub>.'

*ku kos* (that place) can have a bound variable construal with a definite QP type only can be further supported by the following conditional: The examples as in (27-29) were discussed in Choi (2002). The original examples, however, do not include *ku kos* (that place).<sup>4)</sup>

- (27) (?)John<sub>j</sub>-i    **eti**<sub>i</sub>-lo                    oycwulha-myen (pro<sub>j</sub>)    nul  
 J-NOM    where-to    go out                                    always

---

4) The sentences in (27-28) also have the following readings respectively:  
 There is a particular x, x a place, if John goes out to x, he always returns late from x.  
 There is a particular x, x a place, if John goes out to x, he mostly returns late from x.

ku    kos<sub>i</sub>-ulopwuthe    nusskey    tolaonta.  
 that place-from            late            return  
 'for every x, x a place if John goes out to x, he returns home  
 late from x.'

- (28) (?)John<sub>j</sub>-i    **eti**<sub>i</sub>-lo    oycwulha-myen (pro<sub>j</sub>)    taychaylo  
           J-NOM    where-to    go out                            mostly  
 ku    kos<sub>i</sub>-ulopwuthe    nusskey    tolaonta.  
 that place-from            late            return  
 'for most x, x a place if John goes out to x, he returns home  
 late from x.'

- (29) (?)John<sub>j</sub>-i    **eti**<sub>i</sub>-lo    oycwulha-myen (pro<sub>j</sub>)    kakkum  
           J-NOM    where-to    go out                            sometimes  
 ku    kos<sub>i</sub>-ulopwuthe    nusskey    tolaonta.  
 that place-from            late            return  
 'There is a particular place x such that if John goes out to x  
 he sometimes returns late from x.'  
 #'for some x, x a place if John goes out to x, he returns home  
 late from x.'

The same seems to hold in English, too. The definite QP *always*, which quantifies over time can also induce a co-varying construal of the demonstrative *that* in contrast to the existential QP over time, *sometimes* as illustrated below.

- (30) a. If John meets some student<sub>i</sub> he always invites that student<sub>i</sub> to  
           his place.  
       b. If John meets some student<sub>i</sub>, he sometimes invites that student<sub>i</sub>  
           to his place.

To summarize our discussion thus far, Korean *ku* (he) behaves like *that* in English when it comes to the bound variable construal. Thus the symmetry of bound variable construal of the two demonstratives in

Korean and English in various constructions is not a mere accident, given the present proposal that *ku* is from the demonstrative system in Korean.

#### 4. Demonstrative *ce* and Bound Variable Construal

As noted in section 2, *ce* in Korean cannot have a bound variable construal unlike *ku* in Korean and *that* in English. The point is illustrated by the following examples in (31–34) with *ce*.

- (31) a. \*Motun hyenci pepin<sub>i</sub>-i ce kos<sub>i</sub>-uy  
 every local incorporation-NOM that place-POSS  
 pwulpep kunlocatul-ul haykohayssta.  
 illegal workers-ACC fired  
 'Every company's local subsidiary<sub>i</sub> fired its<sub>i</sub> illegal workers.'
- b. \*Motun tayhak-uy hyenci pwunkyo<sub>i</sub>-ka  
 every university-POSS local extension-NOM  
 ce kos<sub>i</sub> enehakkwa-lul phyesoyhassta.  
 that place linguistics dept-ACC demolished  
 'Every university's local extension<sub>i</sub> demolished its<sub>i</sub> linguistics department.'
- (32) a. \*Taypwupwun hoysa-uy hyenci pepin<sub>i</sub>-i  
 most company local subsidiary-NOM  
 ce kos<sub>i</sub>-uy pwulpep kunlocatul-ul haykohayssta.  
 that place-POSS illegal workers-ACC fired  
 '\*Most company's local subsidiaries<sub>i</sub> fired its<sub>i</sub> illegal workers.'
- b. \*Taypwupwun tayhak-uy hyenci pwunkyo<sub>i</sub>-ka  
 most university-POSS local extension-NOM  
 ce kos<sub>i</sub>-uy enehakkwa-lul phyesoyhassta.  
 that place-POSS linguistics dept-ACC demolished  
 '\*Most university's local extensions<sub>i</sub> demolished its<sub>i</sub> linguistics department.'

- (33) \*John<sub>j</sub>-i      **eti**<sub>i</sub>-lo      oycwulha-myen (pro<sub>j</sub>)      nul  
 J-NOM      where-to      go out      always  
 ce      kos<sub>i</sub>-ulopwuthe      nusskey      tolaonta.  
 that place-from      late      return  
 'for every x, x a place if John goes out to x, he returns home  
 late from x.'

- (34) \*John<sub>j</sub>-i      **eti**<sub>i</sub>-lo      oycwulha-myen (pro<sub>j</sub>)      taychaylo  
 J-NOM      where-to      go out      mostly  
 ce      kos<sub>i</sub>-ulopwuthe      nusskey      tolaonta.  
 that place-from      late      return  
 'for most x, x a place if John goes out to x, he returns  
 home late from x.'

The above examples in (31-34) do not have a bound variable construal of *ce* at all. Now let us turn to the question of why *ce* (that) does not admit bound variable reading at all in contrast to *ku* in Korean and *that* in English.

I maintain that it has to do with the fact that the demonstrative *ce* can refer to an object that is only visible to both the speaker and the hearer, hence no room for suppressing the referentiality of the demonstrative unlike *ku* and *that*, both of which can refer to an object that is not visible to both the speaker and the hearer. That is the crucial difference between *ce* on the one hand and *ku* and *that* on the other. That the former in contrast to the latter cannot refer to an object which is not visible to both the speaker and the hearer is clear given the following situation: Suppose A and B are talking about John who is away from them such that they cannot see him. Given this situation, the speaker A cannot ask John's wellbeing by saying the following in (35) with *ce*:

- (35) \*Ce      chinkwu      yocum      **ettesskey**      cinay-ni?  
 that      guy      lately      how      do-QM  
 'How is that guy doing?'

The present proposal for a necessary correlation of visibility with the availability of bound variable construal seems to find additional cross linguistic support. In Japanese, the demonstrative expression *kare* (he), which used to be widely claimed not to have a bound variable construal is recently reported by an increasing number of researchers to be able to have a bound variable reading as in (36) (see Hoji 1988, Hoji 1991, Takubo 1996 among others).

- (36) a. ?**Dono** kakusei<sub>i</sub>-mo [sensyuu kare<sub>i</sub>-o  
 which-GEN student-MO last week he-ACC  
 suisensits sensei-ni] ore-o okutta.  
 recommended teacher-DAT present-ACC sent  
 'Every student<sub>i</sub> sent a present to the teacher who recommended  
 him<sub>i</sub> last week.'
- b. **Dono** noberusyoo zyusyoo sakka<sub>i</sub>-mo kare<sub>i</sub>-no  
 which-GEN Nobel prize winning author-MO he-GEN  
 hisyo-o turetekita.  
 secretary-ACC brought.  
 'Every Nobel prize winning author<sub>i</sub> brought his<sub>i</sub> secretary.'  
 (Hoji, Kinsui, Takubo & Ueyama 2002)

Given that *kare* can refer to an individual not visible to both the speaker and the hearer as shown in (37), it is not a surprise that it can have a bound variable construal once its referentiality can be suppressed under the appropriate context. Suppose John wants to know where Bill is. He can address Mary who he believes knows where he is at the moment by asking the following:

- (37) Kare-wa do-ko-da?  
 he-TOP which place-COPULA  
 'Where is he?'

The Japanese *kare* (he) thus further supports our claim that the notion 'visibility' of a demonstrative is indeed what is responsible for

the bound variable construal. The present proposal thus is superior to Hoji (1988) in that it does not have the technical problem of determining what degree of deicity is responsible for the lack of the bound variable construal nor does it encounter the problem of learnability since the child when exposed to the data will instantly acquire bound variable construal of a particular demonstrative, given the criteria of visibility as part of his knowledge of language.

## 5. Conclusion

I claimed that *ku* in Korean is a demonstrative, following Hoji (1988). I tried to show that the symmetry of *ku* in Korean and *that* in English regarding bound variable construal follows, given the present proposal for *ku* as a demonstrative. I also claimed that a demonstrative cannot have a bound variable construal once it cannot refer to an object that is not visible to both the speaker and the hearer, diverging from Hoji (1988) who claims that degree of deicity is what is essentially responsible for the lack of a bound variable construal of a demonstrative. His proposal, however, poses a nontrivial problem with regard to learnability, since degree of deicity presupposes a complete mastery of deicity of demonstratives in a given language, which is not plausible if knowledge of bound variable construal is part of the grammar. The present proposal is based on the demonstrative *ce* which cannot have a bound variable construal unlike *ku* in Korean and *that* in English. The former in contrast to the latter cannot refer to an object that is not visible to both the speaker and the hearer, hence supporting the present proposal for visibility of a demonstrative as a criterion for the availability of bound variable construal.

## References

- Barwise, Jon, & Robin Cooper. (1981). Generalized quantifiers and natural language. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 4, 159–219.

- Choi, Young-Sik. (2002). *Asymmetry of Scope Taking in Wh-Questions*, Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, Los Angeles.
- Chomsky, Noam. (1976). Conditions on Rules of Grammar. *Essays on Form and Interpretation*, (pp163-210) New York: North-Holland.
- Chomsky, Noam. (1981). *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Chomsky, Noam. (1995). *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Evans, Gareth. (1977). Pronouns, Quantifiers, and Relative Clauses, *Canadian Journal of Philosophy* (I), 467-536.
- Heim, Irene & Angelika, Kratzer. (1998). *Semantics in Generative Grammar*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Heim, Irene. (1982). *The Semantics of definite and Indefinite Noun Phrases*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Hoji, Hajime. (1995). Demonstrative Binding and Principle B. In *Proceedings of North East Linguistic Society*, 255-271.
- Hoji, Hajime. (1988). On the so called overt pronouns in Japanese and Korean. *Proceedings of the 7th International Conference on Korean Linguistics*, 61-77.
- Hoji, Hajime, Satoshi Kinsui, Yukinori Takubo, & Ayumi Ueyama. (2002). Demonstratives bound variables and Reconstruction Effects. Unpublished manuscript.
- Hong, Sungshim. (1985). *A and A Binding in Korean and English: Government and Binding Parameters*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut.
- Kang, Myung-Yoon. (1988). *Topics in Korean Syntax: Phrase Structure, Variable and Movement*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, MA.
- Larson, Richard & Gabriel Segal. (1995). *Knowledge of Meaning*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Lewis, David. (1975). Adverbs of Quantification. In Edward Keenan (Ed.), *Formal Semantics of Natural language*, Cambridge



University Press.

Postal, Paul. (1971). *Cross-over phenomena*. New York: Holt, Reinhart and Winston.

Suh, Jin-Hee. (1990). *Scope Phenomena and Aspects of Korean Syntax*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, Los Angeles.

Takubo, Yukinori. (1996). The semantics and the Semantic change of the Japanese Distal demonstrative Kare, Japanese/Korean Conference, UCLA.

Young-Sik Choi

Department of English Language and Literature

1-5 Anam, Sungbuk, Seoul 136-701, Korea

Phone: 82-2-2201-6047

Email: youngsic2002@yahoo.co.kr

Received: 30 March 2003

Accepted: 12 May 2003

Revised: 30 May 2003