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0. Introduction

Traditionally Korean adjectives are analyzed as stative verbs (Maling and Kim 1998, Lee 1997). Recently several linguists (Kim 1996, Kim 2002a and b) have reanalyzed them as reduced relative clauses. Since only predicative adjectives can be analyzed as reduced relative clauses, this entails there are no attributive adjectives in Korean. In this paper, however, I will show some evidence for the existence of attributive adjectives. In section 1, I will give a short overview of the properties of Korean adjectives which led some linguists to the idea that Korean adjectives in general are reduced relative clauses. In section 2, I will show some purely attributive adjectives in Korean. In section 3, I will present Cinque’s proposal for the two origins of adjectives in the extended nominal projection. Following this, I will give evidence that Korean adjectives can also have non-intersective meanings, thus qualifying as purely attributive. The final section will also show some adjectives that cannot be analyzed as reduced relative clauses but seem to be purely attributive adjectives.

1. Some properties of Korean adjectives

Korean is a rigid OV language. The verb always is in the final position.
(1)  hakseng-i  chayk-ul  ilkun-ta.\textsuperscript{1}
    Students-Nom  book-Acc  read-Dcl
    ‘the student is reading a book’

Predicative adjectives also occupy the sentence final position.

(2)  na-nun  hayngbokha-ta.
    I  -Top  happy-Dcl
    ‘I am happy’

The morpheme -\textit{ta} indicates declarative force and attaches to the last word of the sentence which is in general the verb. Just by looking at examples like these, one could argue that Korean is a language without an overt copula. However this is not the case, as can be seen in examples with nouns in predicative position.

(3)  na-nun  haksayng-i-ta.
    I  -Top  student-Cop-Dcl
    ‘I am a student’

The morpheme \textit{i} represent the copula in Korean. Precisely because of the lack of the copula in (2), \textit{hayngbokha} (happy) was analyzed as a stative verb. The same adjectives can be used attributively in front of the Noun, but in this case the morpheme -\textit{n} has to be attached to them.

(4)  hayngbokha-n  haksayng
    happy-N  student
    ‘a happy student’

Additional evidence for the verbal character of these adjectives comes from their temporal behaviour. When describing a state in the past Korean adjectives take an additional morpheme representing aspect and past tense.

\textsuperscript{1}  Nom: nominative case, Acc: accusative case, Cop: copula, Dcl: declarative sentence marker, Aff: affix, Pst: past tense, Top: topic, Rel: relative clause marker.
As the English translation suggests ‘hayngbokhaessten’ can be analyzed as a reduced relative clause. In Korean relative clauses apparently occupy the same position as the above attributive adjectives and employ the same morpheme -n.

Kim (1997) and Kim (2002a and b) note that the relativizer -n has the same form as the attributive marker in the cases above. This is claimed to be additional evidence that adjectives in attributive position are reduced relative clauses as the attributive marker is identical to the relativizer.

It is because of these facts that Korean adjectives have been considered to be stative verbs in reduced relative clauses. According to this analysis Korean does not have purely attributive adjectives. I will, however, show some evidence that Korean does have attributive adjectives.

2. Non-predicative adjectives

Given the fact that only predicative adjectives can be analysed as reduce relative clauses, the above hypothesis would predict that pure attributive adjectives do not exist in Korean. An attributive adjective can never function as the main predicate of a clause. A typical example in English is the adjective ‘former’.

---

2. -ten is an allomorph of –n.
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(8) a. a former president
    b. *the president was former
    c. *a president who was former

In the following section, I want to present a group of Korean adjectives which are purely attributive.

2.1. Existence of non-predicative adjectives in Korean

In Korean there is a closed group of nominal modifiers which show the same behaviour as the English adjective ‘former’. It consists of the following elements: say ‘new’, hen ‘old’, cen ‘former’ ye ‘ancient’, sun ‘pure’. They are found only in (prenominal) attributive position and can never constitute the predicate of the clause:

(9) a. cen taytongreynghg
    former president
    ‘a former president’
    b. *taytongreynghg-i cen-ta.
       President-Nom former-Dcl
        ‘the president was former’

(10) a. say cip
     new house
     ‘a new house’
    b. *cip-I say-ta.
       house-Nom new-Dcl
        ‘a/the house is new’

They are sometimes analysed as “adnominal modifiers”, or “attributive determinatives” since they constitute a closed class. But this is also true of class of the

---

3. Some linguists (cfr. Kim 2002a) assume that Korean has a peculiar category of "attributive determinatives" which is a cover term for demonstratives, numerals, and pure attributive adjectives. Together with Mok (2002), I propose that we should not consider them to constitute the same category. As they can occur together in a specific order:
exclusively attributive adjectives in English like ‘principal’, ‘former’, ‘alleged’, etc. Though the class is very small its members are always considered to be adjectives.

3. Non-intersective adjectives

Adjectives can usually have two different interpretations depending on their position internal to the DP. I want to present here some examples from English and Italian.

**English**

(11) Peter is an **old** friend. (ambiguous)
   a. Peter is old. (intersective)
   b. The friendship is old. (non-intersective)

The examples above exhibit the order Dem>Num>A>N, which Cinque (2000, 2005) takes to be the universal order of merge of these elements.
Adjectives like *old* and *beautiful* in English (examples 11 and 12) as well as adjectives like *grande* and *buono* in Italian (examples 13 and 14) are ambiguous between an intersective and a non-intersective interpretation. With respect to these ambiguities, Cinque (1994, 2005b) proposes that these adjectives have two different origins: either sitting in specifiers of functional projections directly associated with the class of adjective (direct modification adjectives) or in a position higher up in the extended nominal projection that is reserved for reduced relative clauses (indirect modification adjectives).

Cinque proposes the following generalizations:
1. Indirect modification adjectives have the same readings of predicative adjectives in relative clause.
2. Direct modification adjectives have only the “adverbial”, non-intersective reading.
3. The APs which have a reduced relative clause source precede direct modification adjectives.
4. Only direct modification allows idiomatic interpretations.
3.1. Non-intersective adjectives in Korean

If all adjectives in Korean were to be analyzed as reduced relative clauses then Cinque’s generalisation would predict that they could only modify their nouns indirectly, having only an intersective interpretation. That this is not the case can be seen in the Korean equivalent of example (13), *Peter è un attore grande*:

(15) Peter-nun **ku-n** payu-i-ta. (ambiguous)
    Peter-Top big-n actor-Cop-Dcl
    a. Peter is big/tall. (intersective)
    b. Peter is great as an actor. (non-intersective)

The adjective *ku-n* in example (15) is ambiguous between having an intersective and a non-intersective interpretation. In the intersective interpretation it has two possible meanings: tall and heavy/big.

(16) a. Peter-nun [ki-ka **ku**]-n payu-i-ta.
    Peter-Top height-Nom tall-N actor-Cop-Dcl
    ‘Concerning Peter, he is a tall actor.’
    b. Peter-nun [momcip-i **ku**]-n payu-i-ta.
    Peter-Top body-Nom big-N actor-Cop-Dcl
    ‘Concerning Peter, he is a big actor.’

If all Korean adjectives were to derive from a relative clause they should only have intersective interpretations. However, the adjective *ku-n* can have a non-intersective interpretation, independent of the existence of the suffix *–n*. Note, that this suffix becomes obligatory if the adjective is in prenominal position as shown in the following examples⁴:

---

⁴. Chinese makes use of suffix *–de*, similar to the Korean *–n*, the difference being that unlike the Chinese *–de*, Korean *–n* is obligatory.

(i) a. xiaó-*de* lū-*de* hua-ping
    small-DE green-DE vase
    ‘a small green vase’

    b. xiaó lū hua-ping
    small green vase
    ‘a small green vase’

    (from Sproat & Shih 1991)
(17) a. **ku-*\(\text{n}\)** payu
    big-N actor
    ‘a great actor’

b. payu-ka **ku-(\(\text{n}\))**-ta.
    actor-Nom big-Dcl
    ‘an/the actor is great’

There is also a contrast between intersective and non-intersective adjectives with respect to temporal inflection:

(18) a. Peter-nun **ku-ess-ten** payu-i-ess-ta. (only intersective)
    Peter-Top great-Pst-Ten actor-Cop-Pst-Dcl
    ‘Peter was an actor who was big/ *who was great’

b. Peter-nun **ku-n** payu-i-ess-ta. (ambiguous)
    Peter-Top great-N actor-Cop-Pst-Dcl
    ‘Peter was a great actor/an actor who is big’

In example (18) we see that the past morpheme *ess* is not possible with every interpretation. It seems that the origin of the adjective determines whether it is possible for the past morpheme to attach to the adjective. In example (18a) where the morpheme –*ess* has attached there is no ambiguity any more between an intersective and a non-intersective interpretation. Only the intersective interpretation is now available. In (18b), however, where the suffix has not attached, the ambiguity remains.

Now, let’s have a look at the analogous cases of examples (11), *Peter is an old friend* and (12) *She is a beautiful dancer*. The corresponding Korean adjectives *nulku-n*, ‘aged’ and *alumtau-n* ‘beautiful’ do not show this ambiguity. They have only an intersective interpretation in example (19). Therefore one could infer that all adjectives in Korean are predicative adjectives inside a reduced relative clause. But this is not the case. There are other adjectives in Korean which express non-intersective meanings (see example (20)a, c, e), and are incompatible with the past tense morpheme *ess* (see the corresponding example (20)b, d, f):

(19) a. Peter-nun **nulku-n** chinku-i-ta. (only intersective)
    Peter-Top old-N friend-Cop-Dcl
    ‘Peter is an aged friend’
b. Olga-nun **alumtau-n** dancer-i-ta.  
Olga-Top beautiful-N dancer-Cop-Dcl  
‘Olga is a dancer and she is beautiful’

c. **chakha-n** kongkeyksu-nun kulen il-ul celtay an han-ta.  
(only intersective)  
Good-hearted-N forward-Top such thing-Acc never Neg do-Dcl  
‘A good-hearted forward would never do such a thing’

(20) a. Peter-nun **olay-n** chinku-i-ta.  
Peter-Top longtime-N friend-Cop-Dcl  
‘Peter is an old friend’

Peter-Top longtime-Pst-Ten friend-Cop-Dcl  
‘Peter is old, and he is a friend’

c. Olga-nun **mesci-n** dancer-i-ta.  
Olga-Top wonderful-N dancer-Cop-Dcl  
‘Olga is an wonderful dancer’

d. ??Olga-nun **mesci-ess-ten** dancer-i-ta.  
Olga-Top wonderful-Pst-ten dancer-Cop-Dcl

e. **cohu-n** kongkeyksu-nun kulen il-ul celtay an han-ta.  
(only non-intersective)  
good-n forward-Top such thing-Acc never Neg do-Dcl  
‘A forward good at playing forward would never do such a thing’

good-Pst-ten forward-Top such thing-Acc never Neg do-Dcl

In Korean the relevant non-intersective meanings are expressed by means of the adjectives **olay-n** ‘longtime’, resp. **mesci-n** ‘wonderful’ and **cohu-n** ‘good’. As seen in the above cases they can be accompanied by the suffix –n. This is clear evidence that this suffix cannot be interpreted as a relative clause marker. Therefore, the presence of –n does not allow us to always analyse the adjective as a reduced relative clause. Furthermore, one can establish also in Korean an unmarked order between intersective and non-intersective adjectives. This order becomes evident in the cases where we have two identical adjectives, one generated as a reduced relative clause and the other in a
functional projection. Then the first has to be the intersective one. Take the English and Italian examples in (21)\(^5\):

(21)  a. a beautiful beautiful dancer  
     b. an old old friend  
     c. un attaccante buono buono  
        ‘a good good forward’

The interpretation of the adjectives ‘beautiful’, ‘old’ and ‘buono’ depend on their relative position. The adjective that is inserted in a structurally lower position has to be interpreted non-intersectively, while the intersective one is inserted in a higher position in a reduced relative clause. In the English case this results in the surface order intersective adjective – non-intersective adjective – noun, while in Italian we get the surface order noun – non-intersective adjective – intersective adjective\(^6\).

The same holds for the above Korean adjectives\(^7\):

\(^5\). Cinque (2005b) proposes the following order:

English (Germanic): AP from reduced RC > “direct modification” AP > N > AP from reduced RC
Italian (Romance): “direct modification” AP > N > “direct modification” AP > AP from reduced RC.

\(^6\). See Cinque (2005b) for discussion.

\(^7\). In Korean, non-predicative adjectives always precede other types of adjectives (cfr. Note 3 – see Mok 2002):

(i)  a. yeppu-n say cip  
     beautiful-N new house  
     b. *say yeppu-n cip  
        new beautiful-N house  
        ‘a/the new beautiful house’

(ii)  a. wytayha-n cen tatongryung  
      great-N former president  
      b. *cen wytayha-n tatongryung  
         former great-N president  
         ‘a/the great former president’
As we see in example (22), we find a fixed order between the two types of adjectives. The intersective adjectives always precede the non-intersective ones. But also note, that both adjectives take the suffix \(-n\). In the case of two reduced relative clauses in the form of adjectives we would not expect ordering restrictions. This is another reason to abandon a unified interpretation of the suffix \(-n\) as a relative clause marker.

3.2. Direct modification in Korean

In Korean, a pro-drop language, there is co-reference between a noun and an empty element of a relative clause that modifies it. In the following example we have the head noun namca (man) and a relative clause headed by an intransitive verb.

(23) \[e_{i} \text{ ece } \text{ ttena}\text{-n namca, } \quad (e = \text{empty category})\]
\[\text{[ yesterday left ]-Rel man}\]
‘a/the man who left yesterday’

The same is true for adjectives that derive from a reduced relative clause:

Therefore, the hierarchy of Korean adjectives seems to be the following:
Intersective APs > Non-intersective APs > Non-predicative APs > N
The noun yeça ‘woman’ and its modifying adjective yeppu- ‘pretty’ can also appear in a subject-predicate relationship:

(25) yeça-ka yeppu-ta.
    woman–Nom pretty-Dcl
    ‘a/the woman is pretty’

But in Korean there are also examples of AdjP–NP constructions (26), usually idiomatic expressions that do not allow for subject-predicate pairs (27).

(26) a. mukeu-n chimmuk
    heavy-N silence
    ‘an awkward silence’
b. sayppalga-n kecinmal
    red-N lie
    ‘whopping lie’
c. kemu-n ton
    black-N money
    ‘a black money’

    silence-i heavy-Dcl
    ‘a/the silence is awkward’
b. *kecinmal-i sayppalga-ta.
    lie–Nom red-Dcl
    ‘a/the lie is whopping’
c. *ton-i kem-ta.
    money-Nom black-Dcl
    ‘a/the money is black’
These examples show that the adjectives in (26) are not used predicatively and therefore cannot be analyzed as reduced relative clauses. Further evidence comes from the following examples that show that the adjectives in question cannot employ the past morpheme ess:

(28) a. *muke-ess-ten chimmuk
  heavy-Pst-Ten silence
  ‘an awkward silence’

b. *sayppalga-ss-ten kecinmal
  red-Pst-Ten lie
  ‘whopping lie’

c. *kemmu-ess-ten ton
  black-Pst-Ten money
  ‘a black money’

Hence, the adjective ku-n ‘big’ can be ambiguous in the following way:

---

8. Cinque (2005b) proposes that idiomatic readings are only possible with direct modification APs

(i) a. A white lie
   b. ??A lie white and without malice
   c. ??A lie which is white

(ii) a. A red herring
    b. ??A herring red in character
    c. ??A herring (which) is red (on the intended meaning)

9. A similar example can be found in Serbian/ Croatian/ Bosnian. These languages have two types of adjectives: short- form and long- form adjectives. Syntactically both types can appear prenominally as in (i), but in predicate position, only the short-form adjectives can appear, as in (ii) (Cinque 2005b):

(i) a. nov kaput
    new (short) coat
    ‘a/the new coat’

b. novi kaput
   new (long) coat
   ‘a/the new coat’
In example (29a) the adjective has an intersective interpretation. But in (29b) it has an idiomatic interpretation. According to Cinque (2005b), idiomatic interpretations are allowed only by direct modification. Therefore, the adjective in (29b) would be supposed to have an attributive origin.

4. Concluding remarks

In the present work I have argued that Korean adjectives, which traditionally were analyzed as stative verbs and more recently as deriving from reduced relative clauses, cannot all be so analyzed. There exist both direct and indirect modification adjectives as well as adjectives with both types of interpretation, depending on their structural

(ii) a. Njegov kaput je nov/*novi
his coat is new (short)/*new (long)

Long form adjectives have attributive origin (direct modification), but short-form adjectives have relative clause origin (indirect modification). And when they appear prenominally, only long-form adjectives allow for idiomatic readings:

(iii) a. slijepi (long) miš (idiomatic)
blind mouse
‘a bat’
b. slijep (short) miš
blind mouse
‘a blind mouse’
position in the extended noun phrase. This makes a unified interpretation of the (adjectival) suffix –n as a reduced relative marker impossible. Differently from what is generally thought, it seems that Korean is less different from languages like English or Italian.
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