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1. Introduction

As the term implies, bound nouns in Korean should have a helping word (or phrase) in a sentence. Consider a typical bound noun *kes* in Korean.

(1) a. Tom-un nappun salam-i-n kes kath-ta.
    Tom-TOP bad person-COP-ADN BN seem-DECL
    ‘Tom seems to be a bad person.’

b. phalan kes
    blue BN
    ‘A blue thing/one’

c. *kes kath-ta.
   BN seem-DECL

d. *kes
   BN

As shown in (1c/d), when there is nothing which aids the bound noun *kes* (e.g., the complement Tom-un nappun salam-i-n in (1a) and the adjunct *phalan* in (1b)), the sequences are ungrammatical. *Swu* also exhibits the same behavior in that it requires an aiding word (or phrase).

(2) a. Bill-un cha-lul wuncenha-l swu iss-ta.
    Bill-TOP car-ACC drive-ADN BN exist-DECL
    ‘Bill is capable of driving a car.’ (RM)
    ‘It is possible that Bill will drive a car.’ (EM)

b. *swu iss-ta.
   BN exist-DECL

In (2a), we find the complement of the bound noun *swu* (e.g., Bill-un cha-lul wuncenha-l), and the sentence is fine. However, in (2b) there is no complement of the bound noun *swu*, and the sentence is ungrammatical.

The bound noun *swu* has two major modal meanings—the ability meaning (i.e., Root Modal, RM henceforth) and the possibility meaning (i.e., Epistemic Modal, EM henceforth) (Ha 2007). Consider the following examples.

(3) Mary-ka maykcwu-lul masi-l swu iss-ta.
    Mary-NOM beer-ACC drink-ADN BN exist-DECL
    a. ‘Mary is capable of drinking beer.’ (RM)
b. ‘It is possible that Mary will drink beer (given what is known).’ (EM)  
(Ha 2007:312)

(3) is ambiguous between RM and EM. However, we find a different pattern when a sentence contains an NPI (Ha 2007).

(4) amwuto maykwcwulul masi-ci anh-ul swu iss-ta.
   anyone beer-ACC drink-ci Neg-ADN BN exist-DECL
   a. *(Intended:) ‘No one is capable of drinking beer.’ (*RM)
   b. ‘It is possible that no one will drink beer.’ (EM)  
      (Ha 2007:313)

In (4), the NPI amwuto ‘anyone’ is in the subject position, and the sentence cannot have the root modal meaning. Interestingly enough, when a sentence has a direct object NPI, the ambiguity reappears (Ha 2007).1

(5) Mary-ka amwukesto masi-ci anh-ul swu  iss-ta.
   Mary-NOM anything  drink-ci  NEG-Adn BN   exist-DECL
   a. ‘Mary is capable of not drinking anything.’ (RM)
   b. ‘It is possible that Mary will drink nothing.’ (EM)  
      (Ha 2007:320)

To account for this peculiar behavior, the bound noun swu has been discussed in the literature fairly intensively (Ha 2007, Chung 2007; 2017, Kim 2014; 2016c; 2018, Tchoe 2015, Lee 2017; 2018, Choe 2020, inter alia).2 Recently Park (2022) criticizes the previous approaches and puts forth an argument. However, Park (2022) has some problems that are not faced with the previous studies.

In this article, I will defend Kim (2014) and criticize Park (2022) on empirical and theoretical grounds. The roadmap is as follows: I will explain Kim (2014) in the second section. In section 3, I will show that Park’s (2022) criticism does not pose a challenge for Kim (2014). In section 4, I will discuss Park (2022) and the problems. After that, I will add more advantages of Kim (2014)

---

1 There seems to be a variation with regard to the asymmetry between (4) and (5). For a different judgment, see Choe (2020).
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compared to Park (2022). The last section will conclude this paper.

2. Kim (2014)

Kim (2014) argues that the structures of RM and EM syntactically differ. Kim (2014) focuses on the adnominal phrase that the bound noun swu takes and argues that there are two types of adnominal phrases with the bound noun swu. Consider the following RM structure given in Kim (2014).

(6) The initial RM structure of (2a)

Abe (1992) and Saito (2004) argue that adnominal T may not have an external argument. Kim (2014) follows this assumption and argues that the bound noun with RM lacks vP which is assume to structurally introduce an external argument. Instead, the external argument Bill directly merges in [Spec, T_{adm}P]. Since we do not find any vP, which assigns a theta-role in normal cases, no theta-role is given to the external argument. To satisfy the need of a theta-role, the external argument moves from [Spec, T_{adm}P] to [Spec, nP] in which it receives a theta-role (i.e., the small n related to the bound noun swu assigns a theta-role).

---

3 Kim (2014) assumes that the want of a theta-role can trigger movement following Hornstein (1999).
In addition, Kim (2014) assumes that the theta-role is transferred from the verb *wuncenha* ‘drive’ to the small *n* of the bound noun *swu* (i.e., the argument transfer in Grimshaw and Mester (1988)). The external argument further moves to [Spec, TP] in the matrix clause to satisfy EPP, as shown below.

(7) The partial RM structure of (2a)

This structure explains why RM in (4) is not available. Sohn (1996) claims that NPIs in Korean have an uninterpretable [+Neg] feature and it should be deleted in [Spec, NegP]. However, since NegP is below $T_{advP}$, an NPI external argument cannot be in [Spec, NegP], which leads to the ungrammaticality of RM in (4).
(8) The unavailable RM reading in (4)

\[
\begin{align*}
nP & \quad n' \\
\triangle & \quad amwuto \quad NP & \quad n \\
| & \quad N' & \quad \emptyset \\
T_{\text{adr}P} & \quad N \\
| & \quad T_{\text{adr}'} & \quad swu \\
\triangle & \quad amwuto \quad NegP & \quad T_{\text{adr}} \\
| & \quad Neg' & \quad -l \\
VP & \quad Neg \\
| & \quad maykwulul & \quad masi-ci & \quad anh
\end{align*}
\]

However, RM in (5) is possible since the direct object NPI merges beneath NegP, and thus the NPI can move to [Spec, NegP] to delete the uninterpretable feature.
Now, let us move onto the structure of EM. Unlike RM, Kim (2014) assumes that EM has a full vP structure. Since the structure has vP, the external argument merges in [Spec, vP] and is assigned a necessary theta-role as usual.
(10) The initial EM structure in (2a)

Later in the derivation, this whole DP is taken by the verb `iss` in the matrix clause and moves to [Spec, TP] in the matrix clause to satisfy EPP.

(11) The partial EM structure in (2a)

With this structure, we find that an NPI can be licensed whether it is a subject (e.g., (4b)) or an object ((e.g., (5b)), since vP is below NegP.
(12) The NPI Licensing of EM in (4b) and (5b)

```
(3)
   DP
     \__________
        \        \        \        \__________
         \       \       \       \        \        \__________
          \      \      \      \      \      \      \        \        \__________
           \    \    \    \    \    \    \    \    \    \    \    \    \    \    \    \    \    \    \    t
```

(iii) John-i cacenke-lul tha-l **swu** eps-ta.

John-NOM bicycle-ACC ride-ADN BN not.exist-DECL

‘John is not capable of riding a bicycle.’ (RM)

(iii) John-i cacenke-lul tha-l **li** eps-ta.

John-NOM bicycle-ACC ride-ADN BN not.exist-DECL

‘It is not possible for John to ride a bicycle.’ (EM)


Park (2022) criticizes Kim (2014) mainly based on the following data.4

4 In (13), li is used instead of swu. Also, the sentence has the suppletive negation eps (the negative version of iss) in the main clause, and the sentence only has an EM meaning. Consider the following sentences.

(i) John-i cacenke-lul tha-l **swu** eps-ta.

John-NOM bicycle-ACC ride-ADN BN not.exist-DECL

‘John is not capable of riding a bicycle.’ (RM)


John-NOM bicycle-ACC ride-ADN BN not.exist-DECL

‘It is not possible for John to ride a bicycle.’ (EM)

(i) has **swu** and eps, we only find a RM reading, and EM is not available. The unavailable EM reading is possible if the bound noun **swu** is changed into the bound noun **li** as shown in (ii). Thus, basically **li eps** has the same structure as **swu eps** (Ha 2007, Chung 2007, Kim 2014, inter alia). Park (2022) judges (13) with the bound noun **swu** (instead of **li**) is also grammatical, but to my ear, **swu eps** sound very ungrammatical, which is in line with the judgment given in Ha (2007), Chung (2007) and Lee (2018).
Park (2022) argues that Kim (2014) cannot explain (13) since DP, which contains the bound noun li, does not have a slot for the past tense morpheme -ess. However, as already defended in Kim (2020b), it is doubtful to assume that -ess in (13) is truly a past tense morpheme (even though it is a very productive past tense marker in Korean). Consider the following examples from Kim (2020b:525).

(14) a. ne nayil cwuk-ess-ta. 
   'You will die tomorrow.'

b. nay mal-ul ttal-asstamyen, Chelswu-ka
   my word-ACC follow-if Chelswu-NOM
   iki-ess-ul swu iss-Ø-ta.
   win-??-ADN BN exist-PRES-DECL
   'If he followed my advice, it is possible that Chelswu might have won.'

Note that in (14), -ess does not appear to be related to the meaning of PAST: in (14a) -ess is more related to future; in (14b), the meaning is closer to a counterfactual/hypothetical meaning—the event of ‘him following my advice’ in fact never happened. Likewise, in (13), the event of (lit.) ‘anyone drinking beer’ did not happen, either. Given that we do not find the past tense meaning with -ess in these examples, it is not logical to assume that -ess in (13) has a past tense meaning simply because we find -ess.5

5 An anonymous reviewer comments that even though -ess in (14) is not a past tense morpheme, -ess in (13) may be past. However, (13) does not seem to convey a past meaning. First, a past meaning is related to the status of factuality (Yule 1998). In (13), the event of (lit.) ‘anyone drinking beer’ does not happen at all and thus [-factual]. Second, it is very strange that only -ess (the alleged past tense marker) can occur in the target position, but not a present tense morpheme.

(i) a. na-nun ecey cemsim-ul mek-ess-ta.
   I-TOP yesterday lunch-ACC eat-PAST-DECL
   'I had lunch yesterday.'

b. na-nun cilum cemsim-ul mek-nun-ta.
   I-TOP now lunch-ACC eat-PRES-DECL
   'I have lunch now.'
Furthermore, the target structure is already tensed since it has adnominal T (Kim 2020b:525-527). Adnominal T has its own tense meaning (Ahn 2001:160, Choe 2020:43, among others). Consider the following examples from Kim (2020b:526).

   John-NOM meal-ACC eat-ADN BN seem-PRES-DECL
   ‘It seems that John had a meal.’

   John-NOM meal-ACC eat-ADN BN seem-PRES-DECL
   ‘It seems that John has a meal.’

   John-NOM meal-ACC eat-ADN BN seem-PRES-DECL
   ‘It seems that John will have a meal.’

The adnominal -un in (15a) has a past tense meaning, -nun in (15b) is about present, and -(u)l expresses future. If -ess in (13) is in fact past, then (13) has one past (-ess) and one future (the adnominal T -(u)l) in one clausal boundary, which is very hard to explain.

4. Park (2002) and its Problems

In this section, I will briefly explain the proposal given in Park (2022) and discuss its problems. Park (2022) assumes that the bound noun *swu* and the main verb *iss* merge in Mod as one unit. Following Cinque (1999), Park (2022) argues that RM Mod is below T and EM Mod is above T in the bound noun *swu* construction.

In (i), we find past tense -ess and present tense -nun. Note that they occupy the same position (between the verb *mek* and the declarative marker -ta), and we can exchange them syntactically. However, the alleged past tense morpheme in (iia) below cannot be changed to the present tense -nun as shown in (iib). If -ess in (13) were a past tense morpheme, we cannot explain the contrast between (iia) and (iib).

    John-NOM lunch-ACC eat-???-ACC BN not.exist-DECL
    ‘It is not possible for John to have lunch.’

    John-NOM lunch-ACC eat-PRES-ACC BN not.exist-DECL
The available EM reading in (4b) is accounted for by this structure.

(17) EM in (4b) (Park 2022)

In (17), the NPI amwuto ‘anyone’ moves to [Spec, NegP] to check off its uninterpretable feature. This leads to the grammaticality of EM in (4b). Also, consider the RM structure in (18).
(18) RM in (4a) (Park 2022)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{TP} \\
\text{amwuto} \\
\text{ModP} \\
\text{amwuto} \\
\text{NegP} \\
\text{amwuto} \\
\text{vP} \\
\text{amwuto} \\
\end{array}
\]

Since the NPI *amwuto* ‘anyone’ can be in [Spec, NegP], there seems to be no problem with the uninterpretable feature, which should be deleted to avoid derivational crash. However, Park (2022) argues that when the NPI *amwuto* is in [Spec, NegP], it acquires a negative meaning (since it is in [Spec, NegP] and licensed by the Neg head), and the NPI becomes ‘nobody’ instead of ‘anyone’. She further assumes that the Root Mod head demands that the entity in the specifier position should not be ‘nobody’, since the ability meaning requires the presence of an entity (i.e., we cannot say anything about the ability of a non-existing entity). Thus, we find the unavailable RM in (4a).

However, Park (2022) is not free from flaws. The first problem comes from the position of the adnominal -(u)l. Consider (2a) repeated here as (19).

(19) Bill-un cha-lul wuncenha-l swu iss-ta.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Bill-TOP} \\
\text{car-ACC} \\
\text{drive-ADN} \\
\text{BN} \\
\text{exist-DECL} \\
\end{array}
\]

\begin{itemize}
  \item a. ‘Bill is capable of driving a car.’ (RM)
  \item b. ‘It is possible that Bill will drive a car.’ (EM)
\end{itemize}

In the proposed structure by Park (2022) (e.g., (16)), there is no position reserved for the adnominal T. Note that T in (16) is not for adnominal T but full-fledged T, which can host -ess (the alleged past tense morpheme in the bound noun *swu* structure). Given the following sentence, the adnominal T should be right after
the full-fledged T.

(20) Chelswu-ka  iki-ess-ul  swu iss-∅-ta.
    Chelswu-NOM  win-???-ADN  BN  exist-PRES-DECL
a.  ‘#Chelswu was able to win.’ (RM)
b.  ‘It is possible that Chelswu won.’ (EM)  (Lee 2017:807)

However, both adnominal T and full-fledged T are about tense. The difference between them is that adnominal T occurs with a noun-related projection (e.g., a relative clause, a bound noun, etc.) and full-fledged T occurs with a clause-related projection. Consider the following examples.

(21) a.  nay-ka  sa-n  khephi
    I-NOM  buy-ADN  coffee
‘The coffee that I bought’
b.  nay-ka  sa-nun  khephi
    I-NOM  buy-ADN  coffee
‘The coffee that I buy’
c.  nay-ka  sa-l  khephi
    I-NOM  buy-ADN  coffee
‘The coffee that I will buy’

(22) a.  *nay-ka  sa-ess  khephi
    I-NOM  buy-PAST  coffee
b.  *nay-ka  sa-ess-n/nun/l  khephi
    I-NOM  buy-PAST-ADN  coffee

Note that the past tense morpheme -ess cannot modify the head noun khephi ‘coffee’ in a relative clause (e.g., (22a)). It cannot be directly followed by adnominals in a relative clause, either (e.g., (22b)). Then if -ess were a past tense morpheme and in the head position of T, the position of the adnominal T should be between T and MOP_EPS (e.g., (20)). The position should also be related to tense and begs an explanation.

Some might argue that adnominal T is not an independent morpheme in Syntax but a morpheme in Morphology. Thus, we may not need an independent position for adnominal T. However, given the very high productivity of adnominal T (e.g., (15a/b/c/) and (21a/b/c)) and its important core meaning (e.g., tense), it is not plausible if we attribute adnominal T to Morphology.
Next problem is that we find a couple of grammatical/pragmatic markers that can intervene between *swu* and *iss*.

   John-NOM bicycle-ACC ride-ADN BN-NOM exist-DECL
   ‘It is possible that John will ride a bicycle.’ (EM)
   ‘John is capable of riding a bicycle.’ (RM)

   John-NOM bicycle-ACC ride-ADN BN-too exist-DECL
   ‘It is also possible that John will ride a bicycle.’ (EM)
   ‘John is also capable of riding a bicycle.’ (RM)

Note that *-ka* and *-to* are between *swu* and *iss* in (23). If *swu* and *iss* form one unit, it is hard to explain the intervention of those markers. Also consider the following examples.

   John-NOM bicycle-ACC ride-ADN BN exist-NOM-DECL
   John-NOM bicycle-ACC ride-ADN BN exist-too-DECL

As shown in (24), if those markers are right after *swu iss*, the sentences are ungrammatical. Given that those markers are suffixes, if *swu* and *iss* form one unit, we expect (24) to be grammatical, contrary to the fact.

We find another problem with ellipsis and right node raising.

(25) a. ne ike ha-l *swu iss-*e? eps-*e?
   you this do-ADN BN exist-Q not.exist-Q
   ‘Are you capable of doing this? or not?’ (RM)

b. ne ike ha-l *swu iss-*e? ha-l *swu eps-*e?
   you this do-ADN BN exist-Q do-ADN BN not.exist-Q
   ‘Are you capable of doing this? or not?’ (RM)

(26) a. wunmyeng-ul pakkwu-l *swu eps-*e? iss-*el"6
   fate-ACC change-ADN BN not.exist exist-DECL

   6 This sentence is retrieved from
   https://m.blog.naver.com/PostView.naver?isHttpsRedirect=true&blogId=kecologist&logNo=22117095 3325 on Mar 24, 2022.
(27) a. John-i cacenke-lul tha-l swu-to thaci anh-ul
John-NOM bicycle-ACC ride-ACC BN-too ride-ci NEG-ADN
swu-to iss-ta.
BN-too exist-DECL
'It is also possible that John will ride a bicycle or not.' (EM)
??'John is also capable of riding a bicycle or not.' (RM)
b. John-i cacenke-lul tha-l swu-to iss-ke thaci anh-ul
John-NOM bicycle-ACC ride-ACC BN-too exist-CONJ ride-ci NEG-ADN
swu-to iss-ta.
BN-too exist-DECL
'It is also possible that John will ride a bicycle or not.' (EM)
??'John is also capable of riding a bicycle or not.' (RM)

In (25) and (26), we find that swu is ellided, but iss/eps is stranded. In (27), we find that the verb iss is deleted, but swu survives. These ellipsis and right-node-raising examples suggest that swu and iss do not form a constituent. This also needs an explanation.

Lastly, we find examples that an adverb (phrase) is between swu and eps (the negative form of iss).

(28) i motun mwuncey-lul kunponcekulo haykyelha-l
this all problem-ACC fundamentally solve-ADN
swu-nun tocehi eps-ta-ko sayngkakha-n-ta.
BN-TOP really not.exist-DECL-COMP think-PRES-DECL
'I think (pro) is really not capable of fundamentally solving all these problems.' (RM) (Nam 2015:98)

(29) i salamtul-uy hayngtong-ul olhtako ha-l
this people-GEN behavior-ACC right do-ADN
swu-nun celtaylo epsta.
BN-TOP absolutely not.exist-DECL
'(pro) is absolutely not capable of saying that the behavior of these people is right.' (Nam 2015:98)
In these examples, adverbs directly precede and modify the verb \( eps \). These pieces of evidence suggest that \( swu \) and \( eps \) do not merge in Mod together, which is also a problem in Park (2022).

5. Kim (2014) and its Independent Motivation with Grammaticalization

In a series of studies (Kim 2014, 2016a, 2016b, 2017a, 2017b, 2017c, 2020a, 2021), bound nouns in Korean are assumed to be a grammaticalized noun. The bound noun \( swu \) in Kim (2014) shows the initial stage of the grammaticalization of bound nouns in Korean in that it has acquired the theta-role-assigning capability. At this stage of grammaticalization, the bound noun still merges in the lexiccal \( N \) position (e.g., (7)).

On the other hand, the further grammaticalized bound noun \( kes \) merges in \( N \), but it moves to small \( n \) due to its lexical (e.g., ‘thing’) meaning and another functional meaning (e.g., pro-form).

(30) The bound noun \( kes \) proposed in Kim (2016a)

The bound noun \( kes \) is more functional than the bound noun \( swu \) since one of its meanings is functional (e.g., pro-form) rather than lexical (e.g., ‘thing’). This property is mirrored in the structure with the movement operation from lexical \( N \) to functional small \( n \).

Another bound noun \( man \) shows more grammaticalized nature than the bound noun \( kes \), since we do not find any lexical meaning and it only denotes functional one. Thus, Kim (2017a) proposes the following structure.
(31) The bound noun man proposed in Kim (2017a)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{nP} \\
\mid \\
\text{n'} \\
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{NP} \\
\mid \\
\text{n} \\
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{man} \\
\end{array}
\]

The purely functional meaning of man is reflected in the structure—the bound noun man does not merge in lexical N (i.e., no lexical meaning), but it merges in the functional small n position directly implying it is only functional.

One more example of grammaticalization is a bound noun cwul. Kim (2021) argues that one of the structures with the bound noun cwul is diachronically reanalyzed as the head of C.

(32) The bound noun cwul proposed in Kim (2021)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{nP} \\
\mid \\
\text{n'} \\
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{NP} \\
\mid \\
\text{n} \\
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{N'} \\
\mid \\
\text{cwul} \\
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{T_adn} \\
\mid \\
\text{cwul} \\
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{CP} \\
\mid \\
\text{C} \\
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{T_adn} \\
\mid \\
\text{cwul} \\
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{C} \\
\end{array}
\]

Note that the bound noun cwul does not merge inside a nominal layer but it is reanalyzed as a C head.

With these representative cases, we find that bound nouns in Korean are grammaticalized based on their functional properties: the bound noun swu has acquired the ability of assigning a theta-role; the bound noun kes has acquired the movement from N to small n and more grammaticalized than the bound noun swu; the bound noun man directly merges in small n, which implies that it is more functional than the bound noun kes; the bound noun cwul is reanalyzed
as C, which is outside the nominal domain, and more grammaticalized than the bound noun man. Thus, Compared to Park (2022), Kim (2014) has more explanatory power and independent motivation in that the bound noun swu (Kim 2014) is fully entrenched in the grammaticalization model of bound nouns in Korean (also see Kim 2018, 2020b).

6. Conclusion

In a nutshell, the pointed problem of Kim (2014) by Park (2022) does not seem to be valid since the alleged past tense morpheme in the bound noun swu construction is questionable. Rather, Park (2022) suffers from several problems: the position of the adnominal -ul cannot be pinpointed; a couple of grammatical/pragmatic markers can be between swu and iss; the ellipsis/right-node-raising data pose a challenge for Park (2022); the insertion of adverbs between swu and eps (the negative form of iss) cannot be easily explained. Furthermore, Kim (2014) has independent motivation in encompassing the grammaticalization with bound nouns in Korean.
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