

Separating Different Lexemes of The Korean Adjective I-

Geun-Seok Lim

Postdoctoral researcher at the University of Montreal, OLST

geun-seok.lim@umontreal.ca

Abstract

This paper's goal is to separate and describe the lexicographic senses (= lexemes) of the Korean adjective I-. The previous studies of I- are limited to several typical uses of I-, while we believe that we should examine the whole range of I- uses so that all of its lexemes can be examined. The paper proposes typological, semantic and syntactic considerations that can be used to separate the lexemes. Through the application of these considerations and the discussion of the characteristics of I-, this paper shows that I- can have 19 lexemes.

1 Introduction

This paper aims to separate and describe the lexemes of the Korean adjective I-¹ without using a specific methodology of a theory.² There have been a lot of papers related to I- but they were limited only to its typical uses. As we will see, some typical uses can't cover the usage completely. The previous studies were biased toward two important questions³: 1) whether I- is a word or a suffix and 2) on the assumption that I- is a word, what is its part of speech (a verb, an adjective or a new type of part of speech?). But no approach can reach the right conclusion without the sufficient considerations of considering the whole range uses. And we believe that if we consider the whole range of uses of I-, we will not call I- COPULA, SUFFIX or SEOSULGYEOK JOSA ("a case marker of predicate"), which are terms many Korean grammarians want to call I-. To clarify the identity of a linguistic unit, we should show all of its uses and expose the relations among them.

Let's take a look at various examples of uses of I-.⁴

- (1) i saram-i Kim Cheol-Su-(i-)⁵-da.
this person-SUBJ Kim Cheol-Su-«I-»-DECL
'this person is Cheol-Su Kim'
- (2) geu-neun haksang-i-da.
he-THEME student-«I-»-DECL
'he is a student'
- (3) jangmi-neun ppalgansaek-i-da.
rose-THEME red.color-«I-»-DECL
'the rose is red-color'

¹ Usually the Korean adjective I- is translated as BE in English. But in this paper it will not be called COPULA because it has various lexemes which cannot be described and covered within the concept of copula.

² But the basic philosophy of this paper concerning the meaning of a linguistic unit is the same as in Mel'čuk *et al.* (1995).

³ Because of the limitation of pages, representative papers for each issue were not mentioned in this paper. Someone interesting the development of I- argument can refer to K.I. Nam (2004) and H.P. Im (2006).

⁴ The abbreviations are as follows: COM: commutative ending, COORD: coordinate ending, COP: copula, DAT: dative ending, DECL: declarative ending, EXCL: exclamation, GER: gerund ending, «I-»: the Korean adjective I-, MOD: modifying ending, OBJ: objective ending, POST: postposition, PRES: present (prefinal ending), SUBJ: subjective ending, THEME: thematic ending

⁵ When I- comes after a vowel, it is usually truncated (or disappears) in colloquial Korean.

- (4) i-hoisa gisul-eun gukjejeok-i-da.
this-company technology-THEME international-«I»-DECL
'this company's technology is international (or quite good)'
- (5) Cheol-Su-ga jebeop-i-da.
Cheol-Su-THEME quite-«I»-DECL
'Cheol-Su is quite good at his job/study/etc'
- (6) jeongchi-pan-i gagwan-i-da.
politics-situation-THEME spectacle-«I»-DECL
'(lit.) the situation of politics is spectacular / (implication) The situation of politics is disgusting'
- (7) geu-neun yojeum buleo gongbu-e yeolsim-i-da
he-THEME nowadays French language study-DAT hard-«I»-DECL
'nowadays he is hard in studying French'
- (8) na-neun geu-gyeoljeong-e bandae-(i-)da
I-THEME that-conclusion-DAT objection-(«I»-)DECL
'I object to that conclusion / Me, there is objection to that conclusion'
- (9) Cheol-Su-neun Yeong-Hui-wa nammae-(i-)da.
Cheol-Su-THEME Yeong-Hui-COM brother and sister-(«I»-)DECL
'Cheol-Su and Yeong-Hui are brother and sister'
- (10) na-neun jigeum jip-i-da.
I-THEME now home-«I»-DECL
'now I am at home.'
- (11) Oneul-eun samwol o-il-i-da.
today-THEME March 5-day-«I»-DECL
'today is March 5th'
- (12) ppang-eul meok-eun geos-eun Cheol-Su-(i-)da.
bread-OBJ eat-MOD entity-MOD Cheol-Su-(«I»-)DECL
'it is Cheol-Su who ate the bread'
- (13) na-neun Jajang-i-da.
I-THEME Jajang-«I»-DECL
'(lit.) I am Jajang(Korean food) /(implication) I prefer Jajang, or I'll eat/prepare/cook/etc Jajang'
- (14) san-i ontong nun-i-da.
mountain-SUBJ entirely snow-«I»-DECL
'the mountain is entirely covered by snow'
- (15) wa! jjang-i-da.
EXCL chief/very much-«I»-DECL
'wow, it's great'
- (16) wa! nun-i-da.
EXCL snow-«I»-DECL
'wow, there is snow'
- (17) nu-eoseo Tteok-meok-gi-(i-)da.
lie-CONN Tteok-eat-GER-(«I»-)DECL
'(lit.) [It] is Eating Tteok(Korean food) in the position of lying /(implication) It's so easy'
- (18) na-neun bap-eul meok-neun jung-i-da.
I-THEME rice-OBJ eat-MOD middle-«I»-DECL
'I am eating rice'
- (19) na-neun jip-e doraga-l geos-i-da.
I-THEME house-DAT go back-MOD thing-«I»-DECL
'I will go back home'

The main examples mentioned in the various papers on 'I-' are (1)-(3). The others were ignored; although some papers dealt with some of (4)-(15), it was done sporadically and never explained the relation

between them. ‘i-’s in (4)-(9) can be said that they have the same meaning with (3), or ‘property’, if only the lexical meaning is considered somehow. But if we examine the grammatical meaning and the characteristics of the syntactic behavior, we will get to know they should be distinguished. ‘i-’ in (10) has the meaning ‘to localize a thing in a place’ and ‘i-’ in (11) is the meaning ‘to localize a thing in a time’. (12) is the example of cleft sentence. ‘i-’ in (13) has an intangible meaning but we can say it has the meaning, roughly speaking, ‘to prefer a thing’. ‘i-’ in (14) has the meaning ‘to be covered with’. ‘i-’s in (15)-(17) have only one argument and have different meanings. ‘i-’s in (18) and (19) are used in the constructions of grammatical collocation and grammatical idiom.⁶ Anyway distinguishing the lexemes of I- should be done before the explanation of the relation.

2 Some considerations for lexeme separation

In order to distinguish the lexemes of I-, we will use three types of considerations — typological, semantic and syntactical. These three types of considerations were chosen because 1) the lexemes of the Korean adjective I- are found in other languages, 2) I- has various lexical and grammatical meanings and 3) the difference between lexemes, we believe, should be verified by the difference in syntactic behavior.

2.1 Typological considerations

There are languages that have more than one copula. If, when a typological consideration dividing the copulas is applied to the Korean I- it makes any semantic or syntactic difference of the examples, then the dividing consideration should be regarded as an important one. And the dividing criteria should be proved by syntactic considerations.

A detailed typological description of the copula is given in Pustet (2003). Some of the examples she mentioned are chosen for our discussion of I-; which will help us to discriminate between lexemes of I-.

[1] identificational vs. ascriptive: é vs. hécha in Lakota

The criterion that differentiates between these two lexemes⁷ is that of uniqueness vs. non-uniqueness of extra-linguistic referents of predicate phrases in the universe of discourse.

[2] semantic class vs. property concept: khi vs. pen in Thai

In Thai the nouns combining with different copulas have different meanings: (20).

- (20) a. nî: khi: sǎ:ml̩a:m
 this COPa triangle
 ‘this is a triangle’
 b. (kracok’) nî: pen sǎ:ml̩a:m
 mirror this COPb triangle
 ‘this (mirror) is triangular’

[3] nominal vs. adjectival vs. verbal vs. quantificational, temporal and participial : ye...ye, ka, b ε , dòn in Bambara

Different copulas are chosen according to the part of speech of the lexical unit which combines with it. See Bambara’s examples in (21).

- (21) a. n̩n ye námása ye
 this COPa banana COPa
 ‘this is a banana’

⁶ grammatical collocation and grammatical idiom are my own term to refer to specific Korean constructions which look like a collocation and an idiom, respectively.

⁷ Poustet(2003:29) used the word “type” but in our context it is a “lexeme”.

- b. so ka sùrun
 house COPb small
 ‘house is small’
- c. ne b ε taa
 1SB COPc leave
 ‘I am leaving’
- d. caman dòn
 many COPd
 ‘there are many’

[4] normal nominal vs. nominal of place and time : $\acute{e}$ vs. $\acute{a}$ in Nuer

In some languages different copulas combine with the different types of nominal. Especially place and time nominals have their own copula.

Pustet introduces further examples of multi-copulas. But only preceding examples are useful to divide lexemes of I-. From her distinctions we can use 4 considerations; we will check out 1) whether the meaning of I- is identificational or ascriptive, 2) class or property if the meaning is a ascriptive, 3) the part of speech of a lexical unit combining with I-, 4) the type of nominal. See 3.1 for the results of applying the typological approach to I-.

2.2 Semantic considerations

As mentioned above, most papers which dealt with I- have focused on mainly (1)-(3). So it is quite natural many grammarians consider I- as a empty unit which doesn't have any specific lexical meaning. But if we want to account for all the lexemes of I-, we should not say that I- is a semantically empty unit. Because many lexemes have lexical meanings. In this section we will use three semantic considerations for distinguishing the lexemes of I-.

[1] lexical meaning vs. grammatical meaning

First of all, we should check out whether the examples of I- have lexical meanings or just grammatical meanings. But the distinction between lexical and grammatical meaning is not strictly dichotomous as many other linguistic phenomena. Furthermore, the judgment of lexical meaning can be different depending on the different theoretical bases researchers stand on. So here we will use the following consideration: If a lexeme of I- is more concrete in comparison with other lexemes, then we will consider it as having a lexical meaning.

[2] semantic actants

The number and constraints on semantic actants of I- are various. Most grammarians normally take it for granted that I- has two semantic actants and that the characteristics of the actants of each lexeme are quite similar or even the same. But we have counterexamples which will be shown in 3.2.

[3] substitutability

Finally, we can replace ‘i-’s with other words based on our intuition. In this paper we will substitute I- only with synonyms for the sake of simplicity but theoretically synonymous expressions can be tested for this purpose. Anyway the closer the meanings of ‘i-’s are, the more synonymous expressions or synonyms they will share.

2.3 Syntactic considerations

We have discussed the typological and semantic considerations for dividing the lexemes of I-. But there are still several loopholes.⁸ In order to make up those weak points and expose the differences of each lexeme, we will use two main considerations. First one is that if a specific syntactic characteristic occurs if

⁸ First, typological consideration has already connected to semantic and syntactic considerations. So we need to develop the typological consideration into more detailed syntactic consideration. Second, it is very difficult to describe the difference of each lexeme's meaning when the meanings are very close without using a sophisticated meta-language.

and only if the combination between preceding element and the specific lexeme ‘i-’ is given, we can regard the use as one lexeme. Second is that all the typological and semantic differences must be attested parallel by different syntactic behavior.⁹

We will test eight features to expose the particularities of each lexeme.

[1] dropping of I-

The possibility of dropping is quite different for different lexemes of I-. We admit that we should use statistic data extracted from spoken corpora. But in this paper we will just follow our intuition. So we will give “3” points when the probability of dropping I- is high; “2” when average, “1” when low, “0” if “impossible”.

[2] switching between X and Y

If a lexeme of I- has two arguments(X and Y), then we will switch the position of the two arguments. Some lexemes allow for a switch, others do not but the meaning changes.

[3] adding a modifier: from ‘X Y-COP’ to ‘Y-COP-MODIFIER X’

If a lexeme of I- has two arguments, we will transform a predicate construction into a modifying one. Some lexemes do not allow for this conversion and some do but the meaning changes. If the modification is possible, we will write “Yes”, otherwise “No”.

[4] restriction on combinations with TAM(tense-aspect-modality endings)

The restriction in combination with TAM is quite different for differing lexemes of I-. We will give “3” points when the restriction in combining with TAM is high; “2” when average, “1” when low, “0” when “no restriction”.

[5] restriction in inserting the honorific prefinal-ending -SI-

The possibility of inserting the honorific ending -SI- is different for differing lexemes of I-. We will give “3” points when the restriction in inserting the honorific prefinal-ending -SI- is high; “2” when average, “1” when low, “0” when “no restriction”.

[6] arranging Ys in a row by using a coordinate ending -GO

We will test the expandability of the argument Y. If possible we will assign “Yes”, otherwise “No”.

[7] negation

We will try to convert the examples into negative sentences and fill up the check list of each lexeme with the negative forms; different lexemes of I- react differently to this test.

[8] modification by an adjective or an adverb

We will check whether the construction composed of I- and the preceding linguistic unit can be modified by an adjective or an adverb. And if necessary, we will write the modifying words in the check list.

3 Applying considerations

3.1 Applying typological considerations

Firstly, let’s look at ‘identificational’ vs. ‘ascriptive’. Among the examples of (1)-(19), only (1) and (12) can be described as ‘identificational’; most examples are ‘ascriptive’ and some cannot be divided by this consideration. The Y of (1) can be identified by hearer without ambiguity. But ‘i-’ within the cleft sentence like (12) cannot always be combined with identificational Y. See (22), ‘bae-ga gopa-seo’ cannot be referred to as (1).

- (22) geu-ga bab-eul meok-eun geos-eun bae-ga gopa-seo-(i-)da.
he-SUBJ rice-OBJ eat-MOD thing-THEM belly-SUBJ hungry-CONN-(«I-»-)DECL
‘the reason why he ate the rice is that he was hungry’

⁹ The reason why we did not mention morphology is that the grammatical differences between the lexemes of I- have nothing to do with the morphology. For instance, the conjugation of tense should be dealt with in syntax, not in morphology. But it is not within the main discussion topic in this paper, so the further discussion will be skipped.

Furthermore the semantic and syntactic properties of (1) and (12) are quite different. Here we can have two categories but they should be subdivided. For instance, the types of ‘ascriptive’ are too heterogeneous to maintain one category.

Secondly, the distinction between ‘class’ and ‘property’ is quite useful. ‘haksaeng’ of (2) is the name of a class and ‘ppalgansaek’ of (3) is the name of a property. The difference of the two types is that the former has a possibility for dichotomy but the latter has a degree of the property. This semantic difference makes a syntactic difference. But this distinction between ‘class’ and ‘property’ is not always clear. The syntactic difference of the two lexemes and difficulty of distinction between ‘class’ and ‘property’ will be shown in 3.3.

Thirdly, in terms of typological perspective, the parts of speech of Ys are various: nominal, adjectival, verbal, quantificational, temporal and participial. In Korean, normally a noun can be put in the position of Y but an adjective and a verb cannot. But there are some lexemes which can admit to combine with other elements, not only a noun. This will be mentioned in 3.3.

Fourthly, we can use the division of “normal nominal” vs. “nominal of place and time”. But before applying the consideration to the Korean I-, we need to check the relation of inclusion; that is, “normal nominal” can include “nominal of place and time”. See (1) and (24).

- (1) i saram-i Kim Cheol-Su-(i-)¹⁰-da.
 this person-SUBJ Kim Cheol-Su-(«I-»)-DECL
 ‘this person is Cheol-Su Kim’
 (23) yeogi-ga Seoul-i-da.
 here-SUBJ Seoul-«I-»-DECL
 ‘here is Seoul’

The argument Y of (23) is a noun of place but the lexeme of I- of (23) is the same as (1), not the same as (10). If we test the semantic characteristics and syntactic behavior of I- of (23), we come to know that it is exactly the same as (1).

3.2 Applying semantic considerations

As mentioned in 2.2, we will investigate the meaning of I-. Firstly, the most typical grammatical ones, of the 19 uses, are (1) and (2). Because the meaning is the most general and it simply connects the two arguments without adding a specific meaning. On the contrary, the examples of (13) and (14) add a more specific meaning. For instance, ‘i-’ of (14) has the meaning ‘be full of / be covered with’.

Secondly, we will examine the number of actants and the characteristics of them. Some lexemes of I- have two actants, some just inherit actants from the linguistic unit which combines with I-, some have only one actant. The explanation of I- having two actants will be skipped. Let’s look at (8). At first glance, I- of (8) seems to have 3 actants. But this mistaken observation can be corrected by the fact that BANDAE of (8) has two semantic actants as we can confirm in (24). So we can say that I- of (8) has inherited the two syntactic actants from the predicate noun BANDAE. In this paper we will consider ‘i-’ of (8) as a support verb.¹¹

- (8) na-neun geu-gyeoljeong-e bandae-(i-)da
 I-THEME that-conclusion-DAT objection-(«I-»)-DECL
 ‘I object to that conclusion / Me, there is objection to that conclusion’

¹⁰ When I- comes after a vowel, it is usually truncated (or disappeared) in colloquial Korean.

¹¹ In completing this paper, Prof. Mel’cuk gave me a great deal of advices. It was much appreciated. He told me ‘i-’ of (8) look similar to (16), or might even have the same meaning. I admit the lexical meaning of I- of (8) is quite similar to (16), but the grammatical meaning is different with (16). But this topic is not important to this paper. Someday I hope to have an opportunity to discuss further about the Korean support verb I-.

- (24) geu-gyeoljeong-e daeha-n¹² na-eui bandae.
that-conclusion-DAT to face-Mod na-GEN objection
‘my objection to the conclusion’

The most interesting example of I- is (16) which has only one actant. In that sentence the speaker just says ‘there is snow’. If we give two actants to I- of (16) and change (16) as (25), then the meaning will be different.

- (16) wa! nun-i-da.
EXCL snow-«I-»-DECL
‘wow, there is snow’
(25) igeos-i nun-i-da.
this-SUBJ snow-«I-»-DECL
‘this is snow’

Thirdly, we will replace I- with other words more or less synonymous with I- in the given context. We will give each word its own number to distinguish it; 1 for MAT-(‘be right’), 2 for DONGILHA-(‘be identified’), 3 for HA-(‘do’), 4 for ITT-(‘exist’), 5 for DOI-(‘become’).

The result of applying typological and semantic consideration to I- will be shown in following table.

(26) The result of applying typological and semantic consideration

	1-1	1-2	1-3	1-4	2-1	2-2	2-3
1	Id	△	Noun	Noun	Gra	2	1, 2
2	As	Class	Noun	Noun	Gra	2	1, 5
3	As	Property	Noun	Noun	Gra	2	1, 5
4	As	Property	Modifying noun	Modifying noun	Gra	Inherit	X
5	As	Property	Adverb	Adverb	Gra	Inherit	X
6	As	Property	Unique morpheme	Unique morpheme	Gra	Inherit	1
7	As	Property	Root	Root	Lex	Inherit	X
8	As	Property	Predicate noun	Predicate noun	Lex	Inherit	1, 5
9	As	Property	Relation Noun	Relation noun	Lex	Inherit	1
10	△	△	Noun	Noun	Lex	2	4
11	△	△	Noun	Noun	Lex	2	1, 4
12	(Id)	△	Noun	Noun	Gra	2	1, 2?
13	△	△	Noun	Noun	Lex	2	many words ¹³
14	△	△	Noun	Noun	Lex	2	4
15	As	Property	Adverb	Adverb	Lex	1	X
16	△	Normal N	Noun	Noun	Lex	1	4
17	As	Property	Noun phrase	Noun phrase	Lex	1	X
18	△	△	(Bound) Noun	(Bound) noun	Gra	X	X
19	△	△	Bound Noun	Bound noun	Gra	X	X

¹² “e daeha-n” is a multiple-word which has grammatical meaning ‘about’.

¹³ I- of (13) can be substituted by many words according to the context.

3.3 Applying syntactic considerations

As mentioned in 2.3, some syntactic characteristics just show in specific combinations between I- and the preceding element of I-. I- of (7) is combined with a root of a word without an affix. The preceding element, or YEOLSIM-, can be a syntactic unit only when it combines with I- as (7). But it can not be used without the suffix –HI when it does not combine with –I (see 27).

- (7) geu-neun yojeum buleo gongbu-e yeolsim-i-da
 he-THEME nowadays French language study-DAT hard-«I-»-DECL
 ‘nowadays he is hard in studying French’
- (27) geu-neun gongbu-reul *yeolsim/yeolsim-hi ha-da
 he-THEME study-OBJ hard do-DECL
 ‘he studies hard French’

We cannot show the whole process of applying 2.2 in detail because of the page limit. So we will show several applications of syntactic consideration.

First, we will check the probability of I-’s omission.¹⁴ Some lexemes allow for the drop of I- but some never do: see (28) where I- can not be dropped. (28) comes from (4).

- (28) *I hoisa gisul-eun gukjejeok.
 this company technology-THEME international

And then we will switch the two arguments if I- has two semantic actants. Some lexemes allow the switch but the meaning changes.¹⁵ (29) is the switched sentence from (2). The sentence of (29) is acceptable but the meaning changes. I- of (29) seems quite similar to that of (1); the difference is in the communicative structure (Theme/Rheme inversion).

- (29) haksang-i geu-(i-)da.¹⁶
 student-SUBJ he-«I-»-DECL
 ‘the student is he’

We also examine the restriction of honorific prefinal-ending -SI-. Some examples, for example (16), have the restriction of combining with -SI-. ‘i-’ of (16) is usually used when a speaker is not expecting the present of someone or something in that place and in that time but suddenly the person or the thing appears. So basically ‘i-’ of (16) can combine with any respectable noun. But as we see in (30) where we used respectable noun SEONSAENG-NIM(‘teacher’), it is not acceptable.

- (30) ??wa! seonsaengnim-i-si-da.¹⁷
 EXCL teacher-«I-»-SI-DECL
 ‘wow, there is (our) teacher’

¹⁴ In this paper we cannot discuss at length the omission but we can take a short look at the different meanings when I- is omitted. See (1’) which comes from (1). We haven’t mentioned the ambiguity of (1) so far, but actually (1) can be interpreted as ‘identificational’ or ‘ascriptive’; usually ‘identification’, rarely ‘ascriptive’. But when I- is omitted as (1’), the meaning of the sentence is only as ‘identificational’. So we need to be careful when dealing with the omission.

(1) i saram-i Kim Cheol-Su-(i-)da.
 this person-SUBJ Kim Cheol-Su-«I-»-DECL
 ‘this person is Cheol-Su Kim’ / ‘this person’s name is Cheol-Su Kim.’

(1’) i saram-i Kim Cheol-Su
 this person-SUBJ Kim Cheol-Su
 ‘this person is Cheol-Su Kim’

¹⁵ “Pos(m.c.)” in the check list stands for the case, or when the switch is possible but the meaning changes.

¹⁶ This is not a completely acceptable sentence but still can be understood.

Finally the modifications of an adjective and an adverb are also dealt with. Some constructions which combine with I- can be modified only by an adjective, some by an adverb, and some by both an adjective and an adverb. For instance, (31)-(33) can be modified by adjectives. But the modification adverbs are quite different. The predicate construction of (31), which comes from (2), cannot be modified by adverbs, whereas the predicate constructions of (32) and (33), which come from (1) and (3), can be modified by adverbs. (32) and (33) still take different adverbs for their modifying unit.

- (31) geu-neun *maeu/*baro haksaeŋ-i-da.
 he-THEME very/just student-«I-»-DECL
 ‘he is a very/just student’
- (32) i saram-i *maeu/baro Kim CheolSu-(i-)da.
 this person-SUBJ very/just Kim CheolSu-(«I-»-)DECL
 ‘this is the person, Cheol-Su Kim’
- (33) jangmi-neun maeu/*baro ppalgansaek-i-da.
 rose-THEME very/just red color-«I-»-DECL
 ‘(lit.) The rose is very red-color’

The reason why (31) cannot have adverb-modifying, and (32) and (33) have different adverbs is that the semantic sorts of nouns of (31)-(33) which combine with I- are different. HAKSAENG of (31) refers to a class, Kim Cheol-Su of (32) refers to a specific person, and PPALGANSÆK of (33) denotes a property, respectively. But this distinction is not always clear-cut. For example, the noun BUJA is usually considered to denote a class. So we will guess that (34) is similar to (31). But as we see in (35), the construction “buja-(i)-da” can be modified by the adverb “maeu”. So we can say that the I- of (34) can be interpreted as the lexeme of (3) as well as the lexeme of (2).

- (34) geu-neun buja-(i-)da
 he-THEME rich person-«I-»-DECL
 ‘he is a rich person’
- (35) geu-neun maeu buja-(i-)da
 he-THEME very rich person-«I-»-DECL
 ‘(lit) he is a very rich person’

It may be said that the modifying of MAEU is relevant just to the semantic type of the modified noun, or BUJA. But we should not overlook the fact that without the help of I-, BUJA cannot be modified by any adverb. See (36) and (37).

- (36) *geunyeo-neun maeu buja namja-reul johaha-n-da
 she-THEME very rich man-OBJ like-PRES-DECL
 *‘she likes very rich man’
- (37) geunyeo-neun maeu buja-i-n namja-reul johaha-n-da
 she-THEME very rich-«I-»-MOD man-OBJ like-PRES-DECL
 *‘she likes the man who is very rich’

(38) The result of applying typological and syntactic considerations.

	3-1	3-2	3-3	3-4	3-5	3-6	3-7	3-8
1	3	Pos	Pos(m.c.)	0	0	Yes	ani-	Adj, adv
2	2	Pos(m.c.)	Pos	0	0	Yes	ani-	Adj

¹⁷ But if people remove the exclamation WA and use this sentence to express the meaning like (2) or (3), then it can be an acceptable utterance.

3	2	Pos(m.c.)	Pos	0	0	Yes	ani-	Adj, adv
4	0	n/a	n/a	0	0	Yes	-ji anh-	Adv
5	0	n/a	n/a	0	1	Yes	Impos	Adv
6	1	n/a	n/a	0	1	Yes	Impos	Adv
7	0	n/a	n/a	0	0	Yes	-ji anh-	Adv
8	1	n/a	n/a	0	0	Yes	ani-	Adj, adv
9	1	n/a	n/a	0	0	Yes	ani-	Adj
10	2	Pos(m.c.)	Pos	2	0	No	ani-	Adj
11	2	Pos(m.c.)	Pos	0	2	Yes	ani-	Adj
12	1	Impos	Impos	0	0	Yes	ani-	Adj, adv
13	3	Pos(m.c.)	Pos(m.c.)	2	1	No	ani-	Adj
14	1	Impos	Impos	1	3	No	Impos	Adj, adv
15	2	n/a	n/a	0	2	No	Impos	Adv
16	2	n/a	n/a	3	3	No	Impos	Adj
17	2	n/a	n/a	0	3	Yes	ani-	Adv
18	1	n/a	n/a	1	1	n/a	ani-	n/a
19	0	n/a	n/a	1	3	n/a	ani-	n/a

4 Conclusions

At this point we have examined the whole set of examples which were given in the beginning of this paper. We conclude that every ‘i-’s in these examples can be described as a separate lexicographic lexeme. It is possible for some of the lexemes to be united for particular purpose but this is a topic for the next study: first, we have to distinguish all lexemes with the utmost accuracy.

References

- Nam, Kil Im. 2004, *hyeondae gukeo ida gumun yeon-go* (The study of the *ida* construction in Modern Korean), Hanguk munhwasa.
- Mok, Jeong Su. 2006, *ida-reul gineungdongsaro bunseokhaeya haneun myeotgaji iyu* (Some arguments for defending ‘ida’ as a support verb, *Eomunyeongu* 136, Eomunyeonguhoi.
- Im, Hong Pin. 2006, *jeongche balkimeui hyeongyongsa ida munjewa yeone* (The problem of identifying adjective ida and collocation), *Eonmunhak yeongueui neolbiwa gipi*, Yeokrak.
- Lim, Geun-Seok. 2006, *Hangukeo yeoneo yeongu* (A study on Korean collocation), Ph. D. Dissertation, Seoul National University.
- Lim, Dong Hoon, *idagumuneui jesimunjeok seonggyeok* (The Theticity of Korean *Ida* Constructions), *gokeohak* 45, gukeohakhoi.
- Haspelmath, Martin. et al. (eds) 2005, *The World Atlas of Language Structures*, Oxford University Press.
- Mel’čuk, Igor A., Clas, André & Polguère, Alain. 1995, *Introduction à la lexicologie explicative et combinatoire*, Louvain-la-Neuve: Duculot.
- Pustet, Regina. 2003, *Copulas: Universals in the Categorization of the Lexicon*, Oxford University Press.