

# CLASSIFICATION OF VERB SUFFIXES AND SUFFIXAL PHRASES\*

Dong-Jae Lee

Korean linguists define the dichotomy of processive and descriptive verbs on the basis of the plain statement ending alone. I propose that the difference in the plain question endings between processive and descriptive verbs be added as a criterion. This addition provides us with symmetrical paradigmatic formulae on the basis of which the verbs *iss* may be dichotomized into *iss<sub>1</sub>* and *iss<sub>2</sub>*, and the latter and other elements (suffixes and suffixal phrases) consisting of it may further be defined as a distinctive category.

Verb classification is quite common in any language. I propose that not only verbs but also verb suffixes and verb suffixal phrases be classified on the same criteria, simply because we can capture the same generalization with respect to subcategorization behavior across the board. I propose four categories: processive, descriptive, transparent, and hybrid.

The classificational system that I propose here makes the selection of different alternants of aspect suffixes much more learnable. The seemingly divergent, indefinable, and innumerable number of conjugations of a verb can now be delineated by extremely simple rules, which set the parameter that is needed in learning them.

\*I am grateful to John Haig, Samuel Martin, Gerald Mathias and Ho-min Sohn for their helpful comments. Any errors are solely mine. Both underlying and phonetic forms are represented in the Yale Romanization system. Symbols and abbreviations used are:

ASP: aspect	ASS: assertive
CAUS: causative	DESC: descriptive
EXC: exclamatory	FUT: future
HON: honorific	HUM: humble
IND: indicative	INT: interrogative
MOD: modifier	OBJ: object
POLI:polite	PROC: processive
QUES:question	RETR: retrospective
SITU:situational	TOP: topic
V <sub>1</sub> ...V <sub>1</sub> : repetition of the same verb	SUBJ: subject
STATE: statement	
∅ : non-occurrence	

## 1. Introduction

Verbs may be classified into different categories on the basis of various criteria, such as syntax, semantics, function, etc. The dichotomy for example of transitive and intransitive verbs is based on the subcategorization frame—whether a verb takes an object or not. In this paper I propose to classify verb suffixes and verb suffixal phrases<sup>1</sup> as well as verbs from the perspective of morphotactics, in particular, from the perspective of what endings<sup>2</sup> and modifier suffixes they cooccur with. Although there has been some discussion of the classification of Korean verbs (cf. Martin 1954, 1963, 1969) from this perspective, little exploration has been attempted on the classification of suffixes or suffixal phrases. I propose here four different categories of verb suffixes and verb suffixal phrases. I believe such a classification provides an explanation for the learnability of the seemingly indefinable and complicated selectional system of endings and modifier suffixes.<sup>3</sup> As I discuss and refer to Martin's works frequently, I use essentially his (1963) terms. In Section II, I review past work by Martin and point out that his criteria for the classification need to be augmented and his quasi-processive category which includes *iss-* 'stay, exist, have' calls for further clarification. *iss-* plays a major role in the morphotactics of verbs, suffixes, and suffixal phrases. I propose in Section III that *iss-*, which Martin correctly separates into three on the basis of criteria other than those adopted in this paper, be reduced into two classes *issi*<sub>1</sub>- 'stay' and *iss*<sub>2</sub>- 'exist, have'. I claim that the former is a processive verb and the latter a hybrid of processive and descriptive verbs. Section IV

<sup>1</sup>The term "suffixal phrases" refers to syntactic phrases that begin with a suffix: e.g., *-ko siph-* 'want to', MOD *tus ha-* 'it seems'. Both the suffixes and suffixal phrases that we are concerned with are those that are followed by other suffixes.

<sup>2</sup>The term "ending" is used to refer to a suffix sequence which consists of aspect + mood (see Section II).

<sup>3</sup>Martin (1963:354) points out that more than 400 different paradigmatic endings are found in Korean (See Section IV). In many sentences, they are used more than once. For example, in:

ka n il-i iss ul kes kath- ta  
 go ASP event exist ASP looks STATE  
 It looks as if (he) has been (there).

paradigmatic endings (italicized) are used three times.

is devoted to the investigation of morphotactic behavior of suffixes and suffixal phrases, and I propose that both be classified into four categories. We find that the verb *iss<sub>2</sub>*- (and its negative counterpart *eps*-) and suffixes *-ess* and *-keyss* behave exactly the same way in morphotactics. This provides a piece of synchronic evidence for the claim that the past tense suffix *-ess* is historically derived from *e* + *iss<sub>2</sub>* (cf. K-M Lee 1961: 146)<sup>4</sup>. In Section V, I argue that the proposed classification offers an explanation for the learnability of the seemingly infinitely complex selectional system of aspect<sup>5</sup> suffixes in endings, modifier suffixes, and other aspect suffixes. Section VI summarizes my conclusions.

## 2. Review of Martin's Work

From the perspective essentially of morphotactics, Martin (1954: 17) sets up two classes of verbs, processive and descriptive, and defines them as follows<sup>6</sup>:

- a) Processive verbs lack the category of plain indicative assertive *-ta* (replacing it by the processive assertive *-nun/-n. ta*)...
- b) Descriptive verbs lack the following paradigmatic forms: subjunctive forms (suggestion, command), processive forms (processive modifier, processive assertive, processive adjunctive).

He points out that the elements which he calls quasi-processives do not have the same paradigms as either processive or descriptive verbs, and states:

<sup>4</sup>There is other synchronic evidence for this historical claim. This topic merits careful research, which I will address elsewhere.

<sup>5</sup>The term 'aspect' needs a clear definition. However, I will not try to do this in this paper. I will use the term 'aspect' very broadly, as illustrated by the following examples:

- i) con -i      hakkyo-ey ka- *n*    -ta 'John is going to school.'  
John SUBJ school to go ASP STATE
- ii) hakkyo-ey ka- *nun*      con      'John who is going to school'  
school to go ASP/MOD John
- iii) con -i      ka- *l*    -ke    -ta 'John is probably going.'  
John SUBJ go ASP prob. STATE

I consider modifier suffixes such as *nun* in (ii) a kind of aspect marker. In this paper, I distinguish them only when necessary.

<sup>6</sup>Martin (1954:17) points out that some verbs are ambivalent and "underly complete paradigms as both processive and descriptive verbs".

Quasi-Processives (*iss-* 'exist, stay', *eps-* 'not exist' and the past element *-ess-* etc. and the future element *-keyss-* (which are both derived from *iss-*)) have all the processive forms except the processive assertive. (In other words, for a plain-style statement it is *itta* not *\*innunta*, *epta* not *\*emunuta*; and it is *-etta*, *-keytta*.)<sup>7</sup> All but *iss-* seem to lack subjunctive forms, and these are not common with *iss-*.

Although few in number, quasi-processive elements call for special scrutiny because the verb *iss-* (and its negative counterpart *eps-*) plays a major role in the subcategorization system we are concerned with in this paper—it participates in the system as a verb itself, as a possible component of the past suffix *-ess* and the future suffix *-keyss*, and as the last constituent of many suffixal phrases.

Before we proceed to discuss Martin's classification, I would like to point out that Martin's term "the indicative assertive *ta*" is an abbreviation for "the indicative aspect  $\emptyset$  + assertive mood *-ta*", which comprise the descriptive statement ending. Also the term "the processive aspect *-nun/-n.ta*" is an abbreviation for "the processive aspect *-nun/-n* + the assertive mood *-ta*", of which the processive statement ending is composed. Their interrogative counterparts are the descriptive question ending and the processive question ending respectively.

Martin, as seen above, classifies verbs and quasi-processive elements on the basis of several criteria. I limit my review of his work to the morphotactic behavior of different verb bases and quasi-processive elements. Martin's proposal of a processive and descriptive verb dichotomy is based only on the plain statement ending. This criterion for the dichotomy has since been followed by Korean linguists (e.g., Y-S Kim 1985: 52) without argument. However, I propose that another criterion be added for the classification. The motivation for such a criterion is the plain question ending, which, as we have mentioned already, is composed of aspect and mood. For both classes of verbs, the aspect suffix is represented by the indicative  $\emptyset$ ; while their interrogative mood suffix is different—*ni* for the processive and *-(u)ni* for the descriptive. The following examples illustrate this point:

- (1)
- |          |     |             |            |                 |
|----------|-----|-------------|------------|-----------------|
| ssal-ul  | mek | <i>-nun</i> | <i>-ta</i> | '(I) eat rice.' |
| rice OBJ | eat | PROC.ASP    | ASS.MOOD   |                 |

<sup>7</sup>*itta*, *innunta*, *epta*, *emnunta*, *etta* and *keytta* are all phonetic surface forms of *issta*, *issnunta*, *epsnunta*, *essta*, and *keyssta*, which are their morphophonemic representations.

ssal-ul	sa	-n	-ta	'(I) buy rice.'
rice OBJ	buy	PROC.ASP	ASS.MOOD	
mwul-i	kiph	-∅	-ta	'The water is deep.'
water SUBJ	deep	DESC.ASP	ASS.MOOD	
mwul-i	ssa	-∅	-ta	'Water is cheap.'
water SUBJ	cheap	DESC.ASP	ASS.MOOD	
ssal-ul	mek	-∅	-ni	'Do (you) eat rice?'
rice OBJ	eat	PROC.ASP	INT.MOOD	
ssal-ul	sa	-∅	-ni	'Do (you) buy rice?'
rice OBJ	buy	PROC.ASP	INT.MOOD	
mwul-i	kiph	-∅	-uni <sup>8</sup>	'Is water deep?'
water SUBJ	deep	DESC.ASP	INT.MOOD	
mwul-i	ssa	-∅	-ni	'Is water cheap?'
water SUBJ	cheap	DESC.ASP	INT.MOOD	

These data clearly show that another distinction between processive and descriptive verbs lies in the interrogative mood suffix: *-ni* for the processive and *-(u)ni* for the descriptive. On the basis of this empirical evidence, I propose that the plain question ending be added to the criteria for classification of verbs (and verb suffixes and verb suffixal phrases to be discussed in Section IV). This proposal is well motivated for the following reasons:

- 1) In Martin's system, the difference in the question endings between processive and descriptive verbs would be an accident that cannot be accounted for; and
- 2) We do not have to define processive and descriptive verbs in terms of

<sup>8</sup>In many people's speech, particularly in young people's, *-ni* replaces *-uni* as in:

(a) mwul-i	kiph	-∅	-uni?	'Is water deep?'
water SUBJ	deep	DESC. ASP	INT.MOOD	
(b) mwul-i	kiph	-∅	-ni?	'Is water deep?'
water SUBJ	deep	DESC. ASP	INT.MOOD	

This may be due to analogy. However, what is clear is that such alternation is not found with the processive question ending:

(a) ssal-ul	mek	-∅	-ni?	'Do (you) eat rice?'
rice OBJ	eat	PROC. ASP	INT.MOOD	
(b) ssal-ul	mek	-∅	*uni?	'Do (you) eat rice?'
rice OBJ	eat	PROC. ASP	INT.MOOD	

negation<sup>9</sup>, as Martin does. We can define processive verbs as those which have the processive ending *-nun/n.ta* in statements and *-ni* in questions. Descriptive verbs can be defined in the same manner as those which have the descriptive ending *-ta* in statements and *-(u)ni* in question.

Martin (1963: 315-316) points out the quasi-processiveness of *iss-* as: "...the processive modifier forms *iss.nun* and *eps.nun* which are more common than the simple descriptive—addition mine, DJL modifier forms *iss.un* and *eps.un....*" He names the elements "quasi-verbs intransitive (*qvi*)". He also comments that "The base *iss-* is particularly tricky; see...for evidence that it should be treated as three homonyms 'stays', 'is', and 'has'". He later expands his description of the trickiness of the base *iss/eps-* (1969: 203):

*Iss.ey yo* and *eps.ey yo* are peculiar in that they sometimes behave like processive verbs (especially *iss.ey yo*) and sometimes behave like descriptive verbs (especially *eps.ey yo*). With respect to the processive modifiers, they both usually behave like processive verbs:

chayk i *iss.ey yo* 'has a book' → *iss.nun chayk*  
 chayk i *eps.ey yo* 'lacks a book' → *eps.nun chayk*

The trickiness or peculiarity of the *iss*'s and their related forms is compounded largely due to Martin's underspecification in his classification. As mentioned above, Martin (1963: 485-486) himself presents evidence with respect to the behaviors of *iss-* other than those we are investigating here and proposes that *iss-* should be treated as three homonyms 'stay', 'is', and 'has'. However, he does not specify which homonym behaves in which of the particular ways that he mentions. For example, in his latest reference above to the behavior of *iss-* and *eps-*, he simply says that "*Iss.ey yo* and *eps.ey yo* are peculiar." *iss.ey yo* and *eps.ey yo* have three different meanings:

- (2)
- a. *yosay cip-eyse com iss.ey yo.* '(I) am staying at home  
 these days.'
- \**yosay cip-eyse com eps.ey yo.* '(I) am not staying at home  
 these days.'

<sup>9</sup>See the first quotation on page 331. Descriptive verbs, which are also called stative verbs, indeed lack suggestion and command sentences. However, this is expected of descriptive verbs, which are [+stative] and cannot involve volition or controllability. Martin (personal communication) suggests that the distinction between processive and descriptive verbs can be expressed in positive terms as "processive verbs have suggestion and command sentences".

- b. UH-ka Hawaii-ey *iss.ey yo.*      ‘UH is (exists) in Hawaii.’  
    UH-ka Hawaii-ey *eps.ey yo.*      ‘UH is (exists) not in Hawaii.’
- c. con-i ton-i *iss.ey yo.*            ‘John has money.’  
    con-i ton-i *eps.ey yo.*            ‘John does not have money.’

In the next section, I will attempt to delineate the behaviors of the three *iss*'s so that their trickiness or peculiarity may be reduced.

### 3. My Proposal: Two *iss*'s

I will tentatively name the three *iss*'s--*iss<sub>a</sub>*- ‘stay’, *iss<sub>b</sub>*- ‘exist’, and *iss<sub>c</sub>*- ‘have’. What are the frames for the comparison? Martin (1963: 485-486) does not separate them in terms of plain endings and modifier suffixes, which are the conjugations we want to account for in the classification of verbs, suffixes, and suffixal phrases. We will take them as the testing frames. As was pointed out in Section II, Korean has the following plain statement and question endings:

#### (3) Plain Level Endings

		Endings	
		Aspect	Mood
processive statement	mek-	nun	ta
	sa-	n	ta
processive question	mek-	∅	ni
	sa-	∅	ni
descriptive statement	kiph-	∅	ta
	ssa-	∅	ta
descriptive question	kiph-	∅	uni
	ssa-	∅	ni

The modifier suffixes are:

#### (4) Modifier suffixes

	Processive	Descriptive
Present <sup>10</sup>	nun	(u)n

<sup>10</sup>I believe that Korean has an aspect system rather than tense. However, this distinction is not central to this paper and we use the more traditional terms.



- b. UH-ka Hawaii-ey  $iss_b-\emptyset$ /\**nun*-ta. 'UH exists in Hawaii.'  
 c. con-un ton-i  $iss_c-\emptyset$ /\**nun*-ta. 'John has money.'
- (6) Questions
- a. na-nun cip-ey  $iss_a$ -\**uni/ni*? 'Do I stay at home?'  
 b. UH-ka Hawaii-ey  $iss_b$ -\**uni/ni*? 'Is UH in Hawaii?'  
 c. con-un ton-i  $iss_c$ -\**uni/ni*? 'Does John have money?'

Note that in statements,  $iss_a$ - 'stay' takes the processive aspect *-nun* while  $iss_b$ - 'exist' and  $iss_c$ - 'have' cannot cooccur with *-nun* but take the descriptive aspect  $\emptyset$ . In questions, on the other hand, all three *iss*'s behave in the same way.

Now we will examine the three *iss*'s with respect to modifier suffixes:

(7) Present Modifier

- a. cip-ey  $iss_a$ -*nun* na 'I who stay at home.'  
 b. Hawaii-ey  $iss_b$ -*nun* UH 'UH which exists in Hawaii.'  
 c. ton-i  $iss_c$ -*nun* con 'John who has money.'

(8) Past Modifier

- a. cip-ey  $iss_a$ -*un*<sup>14</sup> na 'I who stayed at home.'  
 b. Hawaii-ey  $iss_b$ -?*un* UH 'UH which existed in Hawaii.'  
 c. ton-i  $iss_c$ -??*un* con 'John who had money.'

(9) Future Modifier

- a. cip-ey  $iss_a$ -*ul* na 'I who will stay at home.'  
 b. Hawaii-ey  $iss_b$ -?*ul* UH 'UH which will exist in Hawaii.'  
 c. ton-i  $iss_c$ -??*ul* con 'John who will have money.'

Note that although  $iss_b$ - 'exist' and  $iss_c$ - 'have' do not behave exactly alike with respect to the past and future modifiers, these two *iss*'s are dubious at

b. con-i	cip-eyse	$iss-\emptyset$ -ta	'John is at home.'
John SUBJ	home at	is STATE	

We have no way of telling whether the *iss*- here is  $iss_a$ - or  $iss_b$ -. Significant though it would be to clarify which one this *iss*- is, it is not crucial for our proposal here because we can distinguish  $iss_a$ - 'stay' from  $iss_b$ - 'exist' and  $iss_c$ - 'have' if only on the basis that  $iss_a$ - 'stay' conjugates with either *-nun/n* or  $\emptyset$ . On the other hand,  $iss_b$ - 'exist' and  $iss_c$ - 'have' can have only  $\emptyset$ . Thus the distinction. However, I would like to believe that *iss*- here is  $iss_2$ - 'exist' rather than  $iss_1$ - 'stay'. For arguments, see Lee (in preparation).

<sup>14</sup>A more common form for this modifier construction may be *cip-ey iss-te-n na*. This may be ascribed to an analogical process patterned after the modifier construction involving  $iss_b$ - and  $iss_c$ - which are more frequent in usage.

best in their acceptability and differ from *iss<sub>a</sub>-* 'stay', which is completely acceptable. We can conclude, therefore, that there exists again a disparity of behavior between *iss<sub>a</sub>-* 'stay', and both *iss<sub>b</sub>-* 'exist' and *iss<sub>c</sub>-* 'have'. Although all three behave alike in the present, they behave differently in the past and future.

Their behavior is represented in Table 1 below:

Table 1

<i>iss<sub>a</sub>-</i> 'stay'			Contrasted with			<i>iss<sub>b</sub>-</i> 'exist'			and			<i>iss<sub>c</sub>-</i> 'have'.		
	<i>iss<sub>a</sub>-</i>	'stay'		<i>iss<sub>b</sub>-</i>	'exist'		<i>iss<sub>c</sub>-</i>	'have'						
na-nun	iss	nun ta	UH-ka	iss	*nun ta	ton-i	iss	*nun ta						
		*∅			∅			∅						
		ni			ni			ni						
		*uni			*uni			*uni						
pres.	iss	nun na		iss	nun UH		iss	nun con						
past		(u)n			?(u)n			??(u)n						
fut.		(u)l			?(u)l			??(u)l						

On the basis of the differences<sup>15</sup> shown above, I conclude that *iss<sub>a</sub>-* and *iss<sub>b/c</sub>-* are different verbs and name them *iss<sub>1</sub>-* and *iss<sub>2</sub>-*, respectively.

What are the negatives of these three *iss*'s? Martin(1963: 486) shows that the negative of *iss<sub>a</sub>-* 'stay' is made by either the short negative *an-* or the long negative *-ci anh-*, which derive regular negative constructions. On the other hand *iss<sub>b</sub>-* 'exist' may have either regular negative constructions or the suppletive *eps-*, and *iss<sub>c</sub>-* 'have' has only the suppletive *esp-*. It is clear then that *eps-* does not belong to the same class with *iss<sub>1</sub>-*. Our discussion thereafter concerning *iss<sub>2</sub>-* is equally applicable to *eps-*.

Now, I will compare *iss<sub>1</sub>-* 'stay' with processive and descriptive verbs. Some example are:

(10) Statements

- a. na-nun cip-ey *iss-nun*/\*∅-ta. 'I (will) stay at home.'
- b. kimchi-lul mek-*nun*/\*∅-ta. '(I) eat kimchi.'
- c. san-i noph-*\*nun*/∅-ta 'The mountain is high.'

<sup>15</sup>The difference in the acceptability of past and future modifier constructions between *iss<sub>b</sub>-* and *iss<sub>c</sub>-* is not important for our study. This difference will be ignored and marked by one question mark in this study.

(11) Questions

- a. na-nun cip-ey iss-*ni*/*\*uni*? 'Do I stay at home?'
- b. kimchi-lul mek-*ni*/*\*uni*? 'Do (you) eat kimchi?'
- c. san-i noph-*\*ni/uni*? 'Is the mountain high?'

These examples show that *iss*<sub>1</sub>- 'stay' behaves exactly like the processive verb *mek*- 'eat' and not like the descriptive verb *noph*- 'high'. Let's examine some examples to see how these three verbs behave in conjunction with modifier endings:

(12) Present Modifier

- a. cip-ey iss-*nun* na 'I who stay at home'
- b. kimchi-lul mek-*nun* na 'I who eat Kimchi'
- c. noph-*un* san 'the mountain which is high'

(13) Past Modifier

- a. cip-ey iss-*un* na 'I who stayed at hoem'
- b. kimchi-lul mek-*un* na 'I who ate Kimchi'
- c. noph-*\*un* san 'the mountain which was high'

(14) Future Modifier

- a. cip-ey iss-*ul* na 'I who will stay at home'
- b. kimchi-lul mek-*ul* na 'I who will eat Kimchi'
- c. noph-*?ul* san 'the mountain which will be high'

We find again that *iss*<sub>1</sub>- 'stay' behaves exactly like a processive verb and not like a descriptive verb.

These behaviors are represented in Table 2 below:

Table 2

<i>iss</i> <sub>1</sub> - Contrasted with Proc. & Desc. Verbs		
<i>mek</i> - 'eat'	<i>iss</i> <sub>1</sub> - 'stay'	<i>noph</i> - 'high'
mek nun ta	iss nun ta	noph *nun ta
*∅	*∅	∅
ni	ni	*ni
*uni	*uni	uni
pres. mek nun na	iss nun na	noph un san
past (u)n	(u)n	*(u)n
fut. (u)l	(u)l	? (u)l

Table 2 clearly shows that in all its conjugations, *iss*<sub>1</sub>- 'stay' behaves exactly like the processive verb *mek*- 'eat' and not like the descriptive verb *noph*- 'high'.

We will proceed to compare *iss*<sub>2</sub>- 'exist, have' with processive and decriptive verbs:

(15) Statements

- |  |                         |
|--|-------------------------|
| a. na-nun ton-i iss- <i>*nun/∅</i> -ta.    | 'I have money.'         |
| a'.UH-ka Hawaii-ey iss- <i>*nun/∅</i> -ta. | 'UH is in Hawaii.'      |
| b. kimchi-lul mek- <i>nun/*∅</i> -ta.      | '(I) eat kimchi.'       |
| c. san-i noph- <i>*nun/∅</i> -ta           | 'The mountain is high.' |

(16) Questions

- |   |                         |
|---|-------------------------|
| a. na-nun ton-i iss- <i>ni/*uni?</i>    | 'Do I have money?'      |
| a'.UH-ka Hawaii-ey iss- <i>ni/*uni?</i> | 'Is UH in Hawaii?'      |
| b. kimchi-lul mek- <i>ni/*uni?</i>      | 'Do (you) eat kimchi?'  |
| c. san-i noph- <i>*ni/uni?</i>          | 'Is the mountain high?' |

These examples show that *iss*<sub>2</sub>- 'exist, have' behaves like the descriptive verb in a statement and like a processive verb in a question. The following examples show how these three verbs behave in conjunction with modifier endings:

(17) Present Modifier

- |                                  |                             |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| a. ton-i iss- <i>nun</i> na      | 'I who have money'          |
| a'.Hawaii-ey iss- <i>nun</i> UH  | 'UH which is in Hawaii'     |
| b. kimchi-lul mek- <i>nun</i> na | 'I who eat Kimchi'          |
| c. noph- <i>un</i> san           | 'the mountain that is high' |

(18) Past Modifier

- |                                 |                              |
|---------------------------------|------------------------------|
| a. ton-i iss- <i>?un</i> na     | 'I who had money'            |
| a'.Hawaii-ey iss- <i>?un</i> UH | 'UH which was in Hawaii'     |
| b. kimchi-lul mek- <i>un</i> na | 'I who ate Kimchi'           |
| c. noph- <i>*un</i> san         | 'the mountain that was high' |

(19) Future Modifier

- |                                 |                                  |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| a. ton-i iss- <i>?ul</i> na     | 'I who will have money'          |
| a'.Hawaii-ey iss- <i>?ul</i> UH | 'UH which will be in Hawaii'     |
| b. kimchi-lul mek- <i>ul</i> na | 'I who will eat Kimchi'          |
| c. noph- <i>?ul</i> san         | 'the mountain that will be high' |

We find that *iss*<sub>2</sub>- 'exist, have' behaves like a processive verb in the present modifier construction but like a descriptive verb in the past and

future modifier constructions.

These behaviors are represented in Table 3 below:

Table 3

<i>iss</i> <sub>2</sub> - 'exist, have' Contrasted with <i>Proc.</i> & <i>Desc.</i> Verbs		
<i>mek</i> - 'eat'	<i>iss</i> <sub>2</sub> - 'exist, have' (ton/UH-ka)	<i>noph</i> - 'high'
<i>mek nun ta</i> *∅ ni *uni	<i>iss *nun ta</i> ∅ ni *uni	<i>noph *nun ta</i> ∅ *ni uni
pres. <i>mek nun na</i>	<i>iss nun ton/UH</i>	<i>noph *nun san</i> un
past (u)n	?(u)n	* (u)n
fut. (u)l	?(u)l	?(u)l

This table summarizes the behavior of *iss*<sub>2</sub>- 'exist, have' in contrast with that of processive and descriptive verbs: *iss*<sub>2</sub>- behaves ambivalently with respect to both plain endings and modifier constructions. There appears to be a difference between *iss*<sub>2</sub>- and a description verb in the past: the former is marginally acceptable with *-(u)n* but the latter is totally unacceptable with the same suffix. This is a putative difference which is explainable by the fact that *-(u)n* is not available to a description verb because it is already used for the present structure. On the basis of the ambivalent behavior of *iss*<sub>2</sub>- 'exist, have' I will call it a hybrid verb.

What we further observe is that *iss*<sub>2</sub>- 'exist, have', with respect to the plain-level endings, selects the simpler form of the possible alternants: i.e., in the statement ending, *iss*<sub>2</sub>- 'exist, have' chooses the simpler descriptive form *∅-ta* rather than the processive *nun/n-ta*, and in the question ending the simpler processive *∅-ni* rather than the descriptive *(u)ni*.<sup>16</sup>

I hope I have shown convincingly that the three *iss*'s should be classified into *iss*<sub>1</sub>- 'stay' and *iss*<sub>2</sub>- 'exist, have' with respect to endings and modifier suffixes, and also that the former is a bona fide processive verb and the latter a hybrid of processive and descriptive verbs.

<sup>16</sup>Why does *iss*<sub>2</sub>- 'exist, have' choose the simpler forms? My wild guess is that its ambivalence in the selection of endings is already complicated enough, and that the selection of the simpler of the two alternants in statements and questions seems to be a sort of compensatory phenomenon. Martin (personal communication) thinks that it may represent the oldest forms of all verbs.

The discussions in this section may be summarized as follows:

Table 4  
Classification of Verbs

	Modifiers	Endings		
		Statement	Question	
		-ta	-ni	
Processive including	mek-/ka- iss <sub>1</sub> -	nun/(u) n/(u)l	nun/n	∅
Descriptive <sup>17</sup>	noph-/ssa-	(u)n/∅ /?(u)l	∅	(u)
Hybrid	iss <sub>2</sub> -(eps-)	nun/?(u)n/?(u)l	∅	∅

Now I will move on to examine how *iss<sub>2</sub>*- 'exist, have' compares with the past *-ess* (and the future *-keyss*). On the basis of the results, I will attempt to classify suffixes and suffixal phrases into four categories.

#### 4. Four Classes of Suffixes and Suffixal Phrases

It is common that verbs are classified with respect to their subcategorizational behavior. I propose in this paper that, in Korean, not only verbs but also verb suffixes and verb suffixal phrases are to be classified into different categories on the basis of the same criteria, namely their subcategorizational frame, more specifically morphotactic behavior. This will capture the significant generalization of subcategorization behavior across the board. I am not alone in making this proposal. As I quoted in Section II, Martin (1954: 17 (some 35 years ago)) already noted:

Quasi-Processives (*iss*- 'exist, stay', *eps*- 'not exist' and the past element *-ess*- etc., and the future element *-keyss*- (which are both derived from *iss*-)) have all the processive forms except the processive assertive...

He (1963: 315) proposes, "Such verbs and *bound elements* [Italics mine-DJL] can be called quasi-processive in their behavior and we can label them

<sup>17</sup>The copula *i*- is included in the descriptive class, even though it is different from other descriptive verbs in some conjugations. For example, it may have a suppletive negative *ani*- and it does not stand in construction with the future modifier suffix *-(u)l*. However, it behaves like any other descriptive verb in the selection of the aspect suffix in endings and modifier suffixes.

quasi-verbs intransitive (qvi).”

We will first see how *iss<sub>2</sub>-* compares with the past *-ess* and the future *-keyss*. Considering that the reader is by now familiar with the table form, I will not present example sentences but tabulate their behaviors in a table:

Table 5 below shows that with respect to plain-level endings, the past *-ess* and the future *-keyss* behave exactly like *iss<sub>2</sub>-*, which as we found in Section III, conjugates ambivalently--like a descriptive verb in a statement and like a processive verb in a question.

It appears that there is a difference in the behaviors of *iss<sub>2</sub>-*, *-ess*, and *-keyss* with respect to the modifier ending *nun*.

Table 5  
Past/Future Tense *-ess/keyss* Contrasted with *iss<sub>2</sub>-*.

	<i>-ess/keyss</i>	<i>iss<sub>2</sub>-</i>
	-pap-ul mek ess/keyss	ton/UH-ka iss
	*nun ta	*nun ta
	Ø	Ø
	ni	ni
	*uni	*uni
pres.	Ø	iss nun ton/UH
past	(u)n (for <i>ess.nun</i> )	?(u)n
fut.	(u)l (for <i>keyss.nun</i> )	?(u)l

- (20) ton i iss *nun* na                    ‘I who have money’  
 cip-ey ka-ess \**nun* na                ‘I who went home’  
 cip-ey ka-keyss \**nun* na              ‘I who will go home’

However, this is a superficial difference. The language has the suppletive past and future processive modifier *-(u)n* and *-(u)l* as presented in Section III. They replace the unwanted sequence in (20) above:

- (21) ton i iss *nun* na                    ‘I who have money’  
 cip-ey ka-(u)n na                        ‘I who went home’  
 cip-ey ka-(u)l na                         ‘I who will go home’

It is clear that *-ess/keyes* and *iss<sub>2</sub>-* behave exactly the same way in that

the former can be assumed to occur with *-nun*.<sup>18</sup>

Now I propose the following classification (Table 6 below) of verb suffixes. Martin (1963: 354) states that "the total number of paradigmatic endings for modern Korean is well over 400". We will select a few and attempt to classify them according to the criteria established in Section III, namely their morphotactic behavior with respect to plain-level endings and modifier suffixes.

Table 6  
Classification of Verb Suffixes

		Modifier	Endings	
			State	Quest
			-ta	-ni
Processive	-i <sup>19</sup> (causative) noph-/po- i-	nun/(u)n/ (u)l	n/nun	∅
Descriptive	-te(retrospective) noph-/po- te-	(u)n/ ∅ / ∅ <sup>20</sup>	∅-la	-(u)n.ka
Transparent	-(u)si (honorific) po-si- noph-usi-	nun/(u)n/ (u)l (u)n/ ∅ / ?(u)l	n/nun ∅	∅ (u)
Hybrid	-ess, -keyss (past, future) ka-ess/-keyss noph-ess/-keyss	∅/(u)n/ (u)l ∅/∅ / ?(u)l	∅ ∅	∅ ∅

<sup>18</sup>The sequences *ess nun* and *keyss nun* are found in:

encey o -*ass-nun* ci alayo 'Do you know when (he) came?'

when come PAST ASP if know

encey o -*keyss-nun* ci alayo 'Do you know when (he) will come?'

when come FUT ASP if know

They are used along with the suppletive modifier suffixes without any appreciative meaning difference:

encey o -*n* ci alayo 'Do you know when (he) came?'

when come ASP if know

encey o -*l* ci alayo 'Do you know when (he) will come?'

when come ASP if know

<sup>19</sup>The causative/passive *-i* is different from other suffixes, which Martin calls paradigmatic endings. It is a derivational suffix while paradigmatic endings could be considered inflectional suffixes. I include it in this classification.

<sup>20</sup>This construction does not occur due to a semantic clash.

The processive suffix *-i* (causative) calls for the endings and modifier suffixes of a processive verb, regardless of the type of verb to which it is suffixed--the verb can be any of the three types of verbs discussed in Section III. Examine the following examples:

(22) Processive Suffix *-i* (causative/passive) after:

- |                        |  |                    |
|------------------------|--|--------------------|
| a. a processive verb:  | mek-i- <i>n</i> -ta                            | mek-i- <i>nun</i>  |
|                        | mek-i- $\emptyset$ - <i>ni</i> ? <sup>21</sup> |                    |
| b. a descriptive verb: | noph-i- <i>n</i> -ta                           | noph-i- <i>nun</i> |
| c. a hybrid verb:      | eps-ay <sup>22</sup> - <i>n</i> -ta            | eps-ay- <i>nun</i> |

It is clear that the causative suffix, *-i* has its own subcategorizational frame that calls for the processive ending and Processive modifier suffix.

The retrospective aspect *-te* is quite restricted in its behavior (cf. C-H Cho 1982), and it is difficult to ascertain if it indeed behaves like a descriptive suffix with respect to plain endings. The following sentences are ill-formed:

(23)

- |                      |                              |
|----------------------|------------------------------|
| *mek-te- <i>ta</i>   | ‘(I) found him eating.’      |
| eat RETR STATE       |                              |
| *mek-te- <i>ni</i> ? |                              |
| eat RETR QUES        | ‘Did (you) find him eating?’ |

On the other hand, it occurs with *-la* and *-(u)n-ka*, which are statement and question endings respectively, as indicated in Table 6. In *ka-te-la*, if we assume that *-la* is a variant of *-ta*<sup>23</sup>, we see that it occurs without *-nun/n*; i.e., without an aspect suffix. This is characteristic of descriptive verbs. The *-(u)n* in *ka-te-(u)n-ka* occurs with descriptive verbs, as in (24a), in contrast with the processive verbs in (24b):

<sup>21</sup>It is not clear here whether the causative/passive suffix *-i* (or the *-e ya ha-* ‘must’ discussed later) calls for the processive question ending *-ni* or the descriptive question ending *-(u)ni*, because the distinction reveals itself only after a consonant. Therefore we will not present question examples when a suffix ends in a vowel.

<sup>22</sup>*-ay* should probably be analyzed as *-i ha-*.

<sup>23</sup>This assumption is well supported by the *-ta* and *-la* alternation in indirect quotation. Compare:

- |                       |                               |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------|
| con -i -ta            | ‘It is John.’                 |
| John is STATE         |                               |
| con -i -la ko hanta   | ‘It is said that it is John.’ |
| John is STATE is said |                               |

- (24) a. *coh-un-ka* 'Is it good?'  
       *ssa-n-ka* 'Is it cheap?'  
       b. *ka-nun-ka* 'Are you going?'  
       *mek-nun-ka* 'Are you eating?'

We can then safely conclude that *-te* belongs to the descriptive class.<sup>24</sup>

As a descriptive suffix, it subcategorizes for a descriptive ending and modifier suffix regardless of what precedes it:

(25) Descriptive Suffix *-te* after:

- a. a processive verb: *mek-te-∅-la* *mek-te-n*  
 b. a descriptive verb: *noph-te-∅-la* *noph-te-n*  
 c. a hybrid verb: *iss-te-∅-la* *iss-te-n*

The honorific suffix *-(u)si* is transparent, in that its presence is not felt in

<sup>24</sup>Some might still argue that *-te* calls for the processive aspect as follows:

- a. *mek nun kwun* '(Someone) is eating!'  
    eat ASP EXC.MOOD  
 b. *pissa ∅ kwun* '(Something) is expensive!'  
    see ASP EXC. MOOD  
 c. *ka te n kwun* '(Somebody) was going!'  
    go RETR ASP EXC.MOOD

However, I would like to view *ka te n kwun* as a more colloquial form of *ka te kwun* generated probably by analogy patterned after the forms such as *mek nun ta* or *po n ta*. The following examples clearly show that *-te* behaves like a descriptive suffix:

- i. a. *noph i nun tey yo* '(He) is raising it and uh...'  
       high CAUS ASP SITY POLI  
    b. *ssa n tey yo* 'It is cheap and uh...'  
       cheap ASP SITU POLI  
    c. *ssa te n tey yo* 'It was cheap and un...'  
       cheap RETR ASP SITU POLI  
 ii. a. *noph i nun cipwung* 'roof (he) is raising'  
       high CAUS MOD roof  
    b. *ssa n kaysolin* 'gasoline which is cheap'  
       cheap MOD gasoline  
    c. *ssa te n kaysolin* 'gasoline which was cheap'  
       cheap RETR MOD gasoline

The *-te* in (c)'s behave exactly like a descriptive verb in (b)'s rather than like a processive verb in (a)'s.

the selection of aspect suffixes in endings and modifier suffixes. The sub-categorization frame of the preceding verb extends over the honorific suffix, as in:

(26) Transparent Suffix<sup>25</sup> *-(u)si* after:

- |                        |                           |                                 |
|------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|
| a. a processive verb:  | mek-usi- <i>n</i> -ta     | mek-usi- <i>nun</i>             |
| b. a descriptive verb: | noph-usi- $\emptyset$ -ta | noph-usi- <i>n</i>              |
| c. a hybrid verb:      | eps-usi- $\emptyset$ -ta  | eps-usi- <i>n</i> <sup>26</sup> |

The hybrid suffixes, the past *-ess* and future *-keyss*, behave like *iss-*. Note again that they call for a descriptive ending in statements and a processive ending in questions, no matter what type of verbs they are suffixed to. *-ess* and *-keyss* do not occur with modifier suffixes because, as discussed above they have suppletive forms, *-(u)n* for *ess* + *nun* and *-(u)l* for *keyss* + *nun*.

<sup>25</sup>This type could be called a null type, following Lieber(1980: 88).

<sup>26</sup>We find an anomaly when the honorific suffix is added to a hybrid verb modifier construction:

ton -i iss- <i>nun</i>	<i>but</i>	ton -i iss- usi - <i>n/?nun</i>
money SUBJ have MOD		money SUBJ have HON MOD
'... who has money'		'... who (HON) has money'
ton -i eps- <i>nun</i>	<i>but</i>	ton -i eps- usi- <i>n/?nun</i>
money SUBJ not have MOD		money SUBJ not have HON MOD
'... who does not have money'		'... who (HON) does not have money'

The same anomaly occurs when *iss-* is replaced by its honorific counterpart *kyeysi-*:

atul -i iss- <i>nun</i>	<i>but</i>	atul -i kyeysi- <i>n/nun</i>
son SUBJ have MOD		son SUBJ have (HON) MOD
'...who has a son'		'...who has (HON) a son'
atul -i eps- <i>nun</i>	<i>but</i>	atul -i an kyeusi- <i>n/nun</i>
son SUBJ not have MOD		son SUBJ not have (HON) MOD
'...who does not have a son'		'...who (HON) does not have a son'

In the case of *kyeysi-*, both *-nun* and *-n* are acceptable. Two possibilities are plausible: one is that *-n* is a contracted form of *-nun*, as can be found in the alternation of the topic marker *nun/n*. The other possible explanation is that the *-n* is the descriptive modifier *-(u)n*. I have no evidence to choose one assumption over the other. A third possibility suggested by Martin (personal communication) is that *-n* might be an abbreviation of *-nun*, as in:

con -i molu- *n(un)* chey hanta. 'John pretends not to know it.'  
John SUBJ not know ASP pretend

(27) Hybrid Suffix *-ess/keyss* after:

- a. a proc. verb:      *mék-ess/keyss-Ø-ta*  
                               *mék-ess/keyss-ni?* *not* *mék-ess/keyss-uni?*
- b. a desc. verb:      *noph-ass<sup>27</sup>/keyss-Ø-ta*  
                               *noph-ass/keyss-ni?* *not* *noph-ass/keyss-uni?*
- c. a hybrid verb:      *iss-ess/keyss-Ø-ta*  
                               *iss-ess/keyss-ni?* *not* *iss-ess/keyss-uni?*

Our examples have shown that verb suffixes may or may not call for their own suffixes. Verb suffixes may occur in sequence. Martin (1963: 359) presents the following sequence positions and an example of the maximum possibility of conjugation:

(28) Status	Tense	Tense	Tense	Style	Aspect	Mood
usi	ess	ess	keyss	sup <sup>28</sup>	ni	ta
HON	PAST	PAST	FUT	HUM	IND	STATE

The meaning he gives for this conjugation is "...something like 'someone honored will have done (or probably did) something at an earlier time (and I am treating my listener with deference by using the formal style of speech)'". We can add a verb and the causative suffix before the status:

- (29) *noph-i-si-ess-ess-keyss-up-ni-ta*  
       1    2 3 4    5    6

Numbers are not given to the last three suffixes because their variants are the verb endings, which we have taken as the testing frame for the classification of verbs, verb suffixes, and verb suffixal phrases. The endings (as well as modifier suffixes) called for differ depending on which suffixes one chooses in a sentence. For example, if (6) is the last suffix, it will call for its own endings regardless of what precedes. If (3) is the last suffix, what precedes will decide which ending is to be chosen. Space limitations force me to leave to future work an examination of the different suffixes and their categorization in these four different classes of suffixes.

The proposal that I have made in Section III to reduce Martin's three *iss*'s into two, *iss*<sub>1</sub>- 'stay' and *iss*<sub>2</sub>- 'exist, have', and the subsequent

<sup>27</sup>-*ass* is an alternant of *-ess* determined by vowel harmony.

<sup>28</sup>The humble style suffix is always followed by the aspect suffix *-ni* or *-ti*, and no other conjugation is allowed, and it is not discussed in this paper.

classification of *iss*<sub>1</sub>- 'stay' as a bona fide processive and *iss*<sub>2</sub>- 'exist, have' as a hybrid, shed some light on the problems that Martin faces in his analysis. My proposals offer explanations for the "peculiar" and "tricky" behavior of what Martin calls quasi-processives and which I propose to rename as hybrids, and show that their "peculiarity" and "trickiness" are not so much due to their intrinsic and indefinable complexity as to Martin's underspecification of them. I will attempt to demonstrate how my analysis accounts for their behavior. Martin (1954: 17) points out that these elements do not have the same paradigms as either processive or descriptive verbs and states, as we quoted in Section II:

Quasi-Processives (*iss*- 'exist, stay', *eps*- 'not exist' and the past element *-ess*- etc. and the future element *-keyss*- (which are both derived from *iss*-)) have all the processive forms except the processive assertive. (In other words, for a plain-style statement it is *itta* not *\*innunta*, *epta* not *\*emnunta*; and it is *-etta*, *-keytta*.)<sup>29</sup> All but *iss*- seem to lack subjunctive forms, and these are not common with *iss*-.

We will first discuss *epsta* (for *\*issnunta*, see immediately below). According to Martin's own analysis (see my discussion in Section III), *eps*- is necessarily the negative counterpart of *iss*<sub>b</sub>- 'exist' or *iss*<sub>c</sub>- 'have', which I separated from *iss*<sub>1</sub>- 'stay' and posited as *iss*<sub>2</sub>- 'exist, have'. The latter, which I classify as a hybrid, behaves ambivalently—like processive verbs in plain questions and descriptive verbs in plain statements. If this claim is correct, the explanation offers itself as a natural consequence of the classification. As I presented in (3), which is repeated below:

### (3) Plain Level Endings

		Endings	
		Aspect	Mood
processive statement	<i>mek</i> -	<i>nun</i>	<i>ta</i>
	<i>sa</i> -	<i>n</i>	<i>ta</i>
processive question	<i>mek</i>	∅	<i>ni</i>
	<i>sa</i>	∅	<i>ni</i>
descriptive statement	<i>kiph</i>	∅	<i>ta</i>
	<i>ssa</i>	∅	<i>ta</i>
descriptive question	<i>kiph</i>	∅	<i>uni</i>
	<i>ssa</i>	∅	<i>ni</i>

<sup>29</sup>See Note 7 for the morphophonemic representation of the forms for which Martin uses here a phonetic transcription.

the plain-style descriptive statement lacks the aspect suffix *nun/n*, which is found only in the processive counterpart. This explains why the plain-style statement of *eps-* is *epsta* rather than *\*epsnunta*. The remaining *essta* and *keyssta* are explainable in the same manner: *-ess* and *-keyss* are suffixes which I classify as hybrids.

Now I return to his statement that "...for a plain-style statement it is *itta* not *\*innunta*..." This is simply an oversight. As we discussed in Section III, *issnunta* is a well formed conjugation (see (5a)). This statement contradicts his immediately following comment, which reads, "All but *iss-* seem to lack subjunctive forms, and these are not common with *iss-*." This "peculiarity" is due to underspecification of the three *iss*'s: *iss*<sub>1</sub>- 'stay' as a bone fide processive verb does have subjunctive forms, by which Martin refers to command and proposal endings. In Korean, only processive verbs may have these conjugations. If some *iss*'s indeed have subjunctive forms, they are expected to have the plain processive statement *issnunta* as well, and his statement should read: "All but *iss*<sub>1</sub>- 'stay' lack subjunctive forms." The latter part of the "peculiarity", "..., and these [=subjunctive forms— addition 'mine-' DJL] are not common with *iss-*" is quite natural because subjunctive forms are available only to *iss*<sub>1</sub>- and not to others, which includes *iss*<sub>2</sub>- which in turn consists of *iss*<sub>b</sub>- 'exist' and *iss*<sub>c</sub>- 'have'. These two *iss*'s have a much higher frequency of occurrence.

In reference to modifier forms Martin (1963:315) states: "the processive modifier forms *iss.nun* and *eps.nun*...are more common than the simple modifier forms *iss.un* and *eps.un*..." The explanation for this also follows naturally from my analysis. The *iss-* includes the processive verb *iss*<sub>1</sub>- and the hybrid verb *iss*<sub>2</sub>-. As we have observed in Section III, in modifier constructions, a hybrid conjugates ambivalently: it behaves like a processive verb in the present and like a descriptive verb in the past and future. If our observation is correct, *iss-* either as a processive verb or a hybrid is expected to have the present modifier construction *iss.nun*. On the other hand, *eps-* which is the negative of *iss*<sub>2</sub>- is always a hybrid verb. It is expected of a hybrid to have *eps.nun* in the present modifier construction. In fact, these are only well-formed modifier constructions in the present. *iss.un* is well formed only as the past modifier construction of the regular processive verb *iss*<sub>1</sub>- 'stay' and therefore its occurrence is bound to be few in number. *eps-*, again the negative of the hybrid *iss*<sub>2</sub>-, behaves like a descriptive verb in the past. As Table 4 shows, the past modifier construction built of a hybrid and a modifier suffix is very dubious in acceptability. If it is found at all, it is possibly a form created by analogy in some

people's speech.<sup>30</sup>

The "peculiarity" that Martin (1969: 203) points out in his latest reference to *iss-* and *eps-* is presented in polite-level speech, as we quoted in Section II and repeat below:

*Iss.ey yo* and *eps.ey yo* are peculiar in that they sometimes behave like processive verbs (especially *iss.ey yo*) and sometimes behave like descriptive verbs (especially *eps.ey yo*).

The differences that we discussed in Section III, in the morphotactic behavior among different classes of verbs, are not quite obvious in other levels of speech, because they do not reveal themselves except in the plain-level speech and some other constructions essentially built from the plain-level speech, such as the indirect quotative construction. This "peculiarity" however, is the same as those in his earlier work, and may be explained in the same way.

Now we turn to the classification of verb suffixal phrases. Verb suffixal phrases are phrases which begin with a suffix and are suffixed by another ending or a modifier suffix (See Note 1) just like verbs or verb suffixes. To present the conclusion first again, I classify them into four types, just like verb suffixes. They are represented in Table 7 below:

The morphotactic behaviors of these verb suffixal phrases are exactly the same as those suffixes of the same class, and it suffices to present one example.

The processive suffixal phrase *-e ya ha-* 'must' calls for the endings and modifier suffixes of a processive verb or a processive suffix, regardless of the type of verb, or suffix to which it is added—the verb or the suffix can be any of the types discussed above. Examine the following examples:

(30) Processive Suffix *-e ya ha-* after:

i) Verbs

- |                 |                                      |                         |
|-----------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| a. processive:  | <i>mek-e ya ha-n-ta</i>              | <i>mek-e ya ha-nun</i>  |
|                 | <i>mek-e ya ha-ni?</i> <sup>21</sup> |                         |
| b. descriptive: | <i>noph-a ya ha-n-ta</i>             | <i>noph-a ya ha-nun</i> |
| c. hybrid:      | <i>eps-e ya ha-n-ta</i>              | <i>eps-e ya ha-nun</i>  |

ii) Suffixes

<sup>30</sup>I was born and brought up in Seoul, and *issun* does not occur except in the past tense meaning of *iss-* 'stay', and *epsun* does not occur at all in my speech.

Table 7  
Classification of Verb Suffixes Phrases

		Modifiers	Endings	
			Statement	Question
			-ta	-ni
Processive	-e ya ha-	nun/(u)n/(u)l	nun/n	∅
including	-e iss <sub>1</sub> -			
Descriptive	-e to			
	kwaynchanh-	(u)n/ ∅ /(u)l <sup>31</sup>	∅	(u)
Transparent	-ci anh-			
Proc		nun/(u)n/(u)l	nun/n	∅
Desc		(u)n/ ∅ /(u)l	∅	(u)
Hybrid	-(u)l swu iss <sub>2</sub> -	nun/(u)n/(u)l	∅	∅

- a. processive:      noph-i-e ya ha-n-ta      *noph-i-e ya ha-nun*
- b. descriptive:      noph-te-\*e ya ha<sup>32</sup>-n-ta      *noph-te-\*a ya ha-nun*
- c. transparent:      noph-usi-e ya ha-n-ta      *noph-usi-e ya ha-nun*
- d. hybrid:      noph-ass-e-ya ha-n-ta      *noph-ass-e ya ha-nun*

It is clear that *-e ya ha-* 'must' has its own subcategorization frames that calls for the processive ending and processive modifier suffix.

Again a list of each type could be compiled but we will leave it to a later project. Only a few examples are given in the next section, in which they are discussed in conjunction with their learnability.

<sup>31</sup>Compared to the acceptability of verbs with respect to the future (and even the past) modifier suffix, the comparable suffixal phrases are readily acceptable. For example, the verb *iss<sub>2</sub>-* 'exist, have' is marginal in acceptability in the past and final constituent of a suffixal phrase, it freely occurs in modifier constructions as follows:

wuncen ha -l swu iss <i>nun</i> salam	'one who can drive'
drive ASP can MOD man	
wuncen ha -l swu iss <i>un</i> salam	'one who could drive'
drive ASP can MOD man	
wuncen ha -l swu iss <i>ul</i> salam	'one who will be able to drive'
drive ASP can MOD man	

<sup>32</sup>This construction does not occur, presumably due to the limited distribution of *-te* (See C-H Cho 1982).

I hope I have clearly shown that my proposal to classify verb suffixes and verb suffixal phrases into four categories is well motivated. In the next section, I will attempt to show how this classification would be helpful in describing the selection of aspect suffixes in endings, modifier suffixes, and other suffixes.

## 5. Application in Teaching and Learning

Some examples of verb suffixal phrases that belong to the four different classes are listed below:

### (31) Processive

- e ya ha- 'must'
- e ya tway- 'must'
- key ha- 'make/let...do/be...'
- e ha- (e.g., coh-a-ha-) changes descriptive verb  
into processive verb
- e po- 'try ...ing'
- nun/(u)n chek ha- 'pretend to'
- e ci- 'become'
- MOD<sup>33</sup> -cwul (lo) al- (molu-) 'expect (not) to'
- (u)l cwul al- (molu-) 'know (not) how to'
- ci mal- 'Don't'
- e iss<sub>1</sub>- resultative
- ko iss<sub>1</sub>- progressive

### (32) Descriptive

- e to kwaynchanh- 'may'
- ko siph- 'want to'
- nun/un-ka po- 'it appears'
- na po- 'it appears'
- MOD-tus ha- 'it appears'
- N man mos ha- 'inferior to'
- (u)l man-ha- 'worthy of'
- MOD-kes kath- 'it looks'
- (u)l kes i- 'it is sure that'

<sup>33</sup>MOD represents both modifier suffixes and the aspect suffix -(u)l. See Note 11.

## (33) Transparent

- ci anh- 'do not'
- ci mos ha- 'cannot'
- ki to ha- 'indeed'
- V<sub>1</sub>-ki nun V<sub>1</sub>- concessive
- ta siphil ha- 'almost'
- (u)l-kka mal-kka ha- 'wonder if'

## (34) Hybrid

- (u)l ssu iss-/eps- 'can/cannot'
- MOD cek-i iss-/eps- 'occasion was/is/will be...'
- nun/-(u)n il-i iss-/eps- 'event was/is...'
- e iss<sub>2</sub>- resultative
- ko iss<sub>2</sub>- progressive

There are two types of suffixes and suffixal phrases—those whose behavior (or subcategorization frame) may be predicted on the basis of their last constituent and those whose behavior cannot be so predicted. Those which may be predicted are:

1) Suffixes: *-ess* and *-keyss* are predictable on the bases of *iss*<sub>2</sub>, which is assumed to be their last component.

2) Suffixal phrases: those such as *-(u)lkes kath-* or *-(u)l cwul al-* on the bases of the behavior of the last component; *kath-* and *al-* respectively.

However, the last constituent is not always a clue to their behavior. For example, *ha-* is found in all the categories except the hybrid, *po-* in two—processive and descriptive, and the phrase *mos-ha-* again in two categories—descriptive and transparent. The verb *iss-* is found in two categories, processive and hybrid. This is expected because there are two *iss*'s—*iss*<sub>1</sub>- 'stay' and *iss*<sub>2</sub>- 'exist, have'—the former being a processive verb and the latter a hybrid. For example, the *iss-* in *-e iss-* and *-ko iss-* in the processive category behaves like *iss*<sub>1</sub>- and the one in the hybrid category like *iss*<sub>2</sub>-.

Meaning can be helpful in categorizing such suffixal phrases as *-key ha-* 'make/let...do/be' or *MOD-tus ha-* 'It seems'. This is also true of most verbs—most of the meanings which are expressed by English verbs belong to the processive category and those expressed by adjectives to the descriptive category. However, meaning may not be of any use in some cases. For example, in *sal-KO ISS-ta* 'Somebody is living' and *sal-A ISS-ta*

'Somebody is alive', the meaning difference is of no help. Both of them behave both as hybrid and processive phrases.

The unpredictability described above shows that the classification of verbs, verb suffixes, and verb suffixal phrases has to be learned. After it has been learned, the morphotactic behavior of the aspect suffixes in the statement ending and modifier suffixes can be easily defined and our classification system makes them learnable. We will take the plain statement ending as an example and see how our system works. Note the following example:

(35) Plain Statement Ending *-nun/n*<sup>34</sup>/ $\emptyset$ -*ta*.

- |                            |                     |
|----------------------------|---------------------|
| 1. mek-nun-                | 18. noph-ass-       |
| 2. noph-                   | 19. iss-ess-        |
| 3. i-                      | 20. mek-keyss-      |
| 4. iss <sup>35</sup> -nun- | 21. noph-keyss-     |
| 5. iss-                    | 22. iss-keyss-      |
| 6. eps-                    | 23. mek-e-ya-ha-n-  |
| 7. mek-i-n-                | 24. noph-a-ya-ha-n- |
| 8. noph-i-n-               | 25. mek-ko-siph-    |
| 9. eps-ay-n-               | 26. yeyppu-ko-siph- |
| 10. mek-te <sup>36</sup>   | 27. mek-ci-anh-nun- |
| 11. noph-te-               | 28. noph-ci-anh-    |
| 12. iss-te-                | 29. mek-ci-mos ha-n |
| 13. mek-usi-n-             | 30. noph-ci-mos ha- |
| 14. noph-usi-              | 31. mek-ko iss-     |
| 15. iss-usi-n-             | 32. sal-a iss-      |
| 16. iss-usi-               | .                   |
| 17. mek-ess-               | .                   |

This is only a partial list. The number can multiply as suffixes and suffixal phrases may be concatenated one after another. What generalization can we offer to students to help them learn the distribution of the aspect suffixes *-nun/n* and  $\emptyset$  in the statement ending? In the system where only verbs are classified and where the *iss*'s have not been clearly distinguished, it is hopeless and impossible to define the morphotactic behavior of *-nun/n* and  $\emptyset$ . In the classificational system proposed here, the transpar-

<sup>34</sup>The processive aspect suffix has the shape *-nun* after a consonant and *-n* after a vowel.

<sup>35</sup>The *iss-* in (4) and (15) is *iss*<sub>1</sub>- 'stay' and the one in (5) and (16) is *iss*<sub>2</sub>- 'exist, have'.

<sup>36</sup>The statement mood *-ta* is replaced by *-la* after the retrospective *te-*. See the sentences in (23) and the discussion that follows.

ent elements do not affect the morphotactic behavior and we can simply state that:

- (36) *-NUN/N* AFTER A PROGRESSIVE ELEMENT (VERB, SUFFIX, AND SUFFIXAL PHRASE)  
*-Ø* ELSEWHERE.

The system makes it simple to learn other suffixes that we did not discuss in this paper but which behave in a similar way. We will present one example—the situational ending has the shape of *-nun/(u)n-tey*. What is the distribution of the aspect suffix in the following examples?

(37) Situational Ending *-nun/(u)n-tey*

- |                             |                       |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. mek-nun                  | 17. noph-ass-nun      |
| 2. noph-un                  | 18. mek-keyss-nun     |
| 3. i-n                      | 19. noph-keyss-nun    |
| 4. iss <sup>37</sup> -nun   | 20. mek-e-ya-ha-nun   |
| 6. eps-nun                  | 21. noph-a-ya-ha-nun  |
| 6. mek-i-nun                | 22. mek-ko-siph-un    |
| 7. noph-i-nun               | 23. yeyppu-ko-siph-un |
| 8. eps-ay-nun               | 24. mek-ci-anh-nun    |
| 9. mek-te-n                 | 25. noph-ci-anh-un    |
| 10. noph-te-n               | 26. mek-ci-mosha-nun  |
| 11. iss-te-n                | 27. noph-ci-mosha-un  |
| 12. mek-usi-nun             | 28. mek-ko iss-nun    |
| 13. noph-usi-n              | 29. sal-a iss-nun     |
| 14. iss-usi-nun             | .                     |
| 15. iss-usi-n <sup>26</sup> | .                     |
| 16. mek-ess-nun             |                       |

Again, in the system where only verbs are classified, it is an insurmountable task to define the morphotactic behavior of the aspect suffix *-nun* and *-(u)n* before *-tey*. In the classificational system proposed here, we can simply state that (of course, with the understanding that transparent elements do not affect the selection):

- (38) *-(U)N* AFTER A DESCRIPTIVE ELEMENT (VERB, SUFFIX, AND SUFFIXAL PHRASE)  
*-NUN* ELSEWHERE.

<sup>37</sup>Both *iss<sub>1</sub>-* 'stay' and *iss<sub>2</sub>-* 'exist, have' take *-nun* in modifier construction. See Table 4.

## VI. SUMMARY

Korean linguists define the dichotomy of processive and descriptive verbs on the basis of the plain statement ending alone. I have proposed that the difference in the plain question endings be added as a criterion. This addition accounts for the occurrence of *u* in the plain descriptive question ending which otherwise would be a systematic accident and could not be accounted for in any systematic way. Such an addition will also make it possible to define verbs in positive terms—i.e., by what they are rather than what they lack. More importantly, this addition provides us with symmetrical paradigmatic formulae on the basis of which the three *iss*'s may be distinguished into *iss*<sub>1</sub> and *iss*<sub>2</sub>-, and the latter and other elements consisting of it may further be defined as hybrids.

The verb *iss*<sub>2</sub>- (and its negative counterpart *eps*-) plays a major role in the subcategorization system we are concerned with—it participates in the system as a verb itself, as a possible component of the past suffix *-ess* and the future suffix *-keyss*, and as the last constituent of many suffixal phrases. Scrutiny of three kinds of *iss*'s that Martin distinguishes on the bases of criteria other than the selection of aspect suffix in endings and modifier suffixes (which I have used for investigating the subcategorization system), has led me to propose that the three *iss*'s be reduced to two types. One is to be classified as a bona fide processive verb and the other as a hybrid verb. In the selection of aspect suffixes in plain-level endings, a hybrid verb behaves like a processive verb in a question and like a descriptive verb in a statement. A hybrid is ambivalent also in modifier suffix selection; in the present, it behaves like a processive verb and in the future and past, like a descriptive verb. This dichotomy of *iss*'s and the subsequent classification shed light on the behavior of those elements that Martin calls quasi-processives. The “peculiarity” and “trickiness” of those elements is not so much due to their intrinsic and indefinable complexity as due to their underspecification by Martin. On the basis of these findings, I propose that Martin's quasi-processives be renamed as hybrids in the classification.

Verb classification is quite common in any language. I have proposed that not only verbs but also verb suffixes and verb suffixal phrases be classified on the same criteria, simply because we can capture the same generalization with respect to subcategorization behavior across the board.

I have proposed four categories: processive, descriptive, transparent, and hybrid. Now we can explain for example, in:

- (39) *ka* si            ci-anh    usi            ci-mosha    si            *nun*    ipcang  
       go HON        not        HON        cannot     HON    ASP        position  
       1            2            3            4            5  
       'position in which one cannot afford not to go'

how the processive verb *ka-* subcategorizes for the processive aspect suffix *-nun*, which happens to be separated by five elements—three suffixes and two suffixal phrases. In the system where only verbs are classified for their selectional behavior, it would be a mystery and the system could not offer any explanation. In my system, the subcategorization behavior follows naturally; both the three suffixes and the two suffixal phrases belong to the transparent category and their presence does not affect the selection.

The classificational system that I have proposed here makes the selection of different alternants of aspect suffixes much more learnable. As we have seen in Section V, the seemingly divergent, indefinable, and innumerable number of conjugations of a verb can now be delineated by an extremely simple rule such as '*-nun* after a processive element' or '*-(u)n* after a descriptive element' in the examples. This setting of the parameter is all that is needed in learning, for example, the complicated selectional system of aspect suffixes in the plain-level statement and the situational ending.

## REFERENCES

- Ahn, Sang-Cheol (1985) *The Interplay of Phonology and Morphology in Korean*, Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Seoul, Hanshin.
- Cho, Choon-Hak (1982) *A Study of Korean Pragmatics: Deixis and Politeness*, Doctoral dissertation, University of Hawaii.
- Choi, Hyun Bae (1959=1965) *Wuli Malpon (Our Grammar)*, Seoul, Cengum-sa.
- Han, Young-Hie (1978) 'The Korean Verb of Existence, *Iss*', *Papers in Korean Linguistics*, Chin-W. Kim ed Columbia, S. C., Hornbeam Press, 129-136.
- Kim, Jong Mi (1986) *Phonology and Syntax of Korean Morphology*, Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, Seoul, Hanshin.
- Kim, Soon-Ham Park (1967) *A Transformational Analysis of Negation in Korean*, Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan.
- Kim, Young-Seok (1985) *Aspects of Korean Morphology*, Doctoral dis-

- sertation, University of Texas, Seoul, Pan Korea Book Corporation.
- Kiparsky, Paul (1982) 'Lexical Morphology and Phonology', *Linguistics in the Morning Calm*, Linguistic Society of Korea ed. Seoul, Hanshin. 3-91.
- Lee, Dong-Jae (in preparation) Many Faces of iss-.
- Lee, Hee Sung (1962) *kwuke hak kaysel (Introduction to Korean Language Study)*. Seoul, Mincwung Sekwan.
- Lee, Ki-Moon (1976) *kayceng kwukesa kaysel (Introduction to History of Korean Language (Revised))*. Seoul, Mincwung Sekwan.
- Lieber, Rochelle (1980). *On the Organization of the Lexicon*, Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Martin, Samuel E (1954) 'Korean Morphophonemics,' Linguistic Society of America.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1963) *Korean Reference Grammar*, MS.
- \_\_\_\_\_ and Young-Sook C. Lee (1969) *Beginning Korean*. New Haven and London, Yale University Press.
- Sato, Paul T (1978) 'Adjectives and Copula in Korean'. *Papers in Korean Linguistics*, Chin-W. Kim ed. Columbia, S.C., Horbeam Press. 185-196.
- Sohn, Hyang-Sook (1987) 'Derivational Morphology and Tensification in Korean Compounds', In S. Kuno, I-H Lee, J. Whitman, S-Y Bak and Y-S Kang eds. *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics--Proceedings of the 1987 Harvard Workshop on Korean Linguistics (Harvard WOKL-1987)*, Seoul, Hanshin.

Department of East Asian Language  
 University of Hawaii at Manoa  
 Honolulu, HI 96822  
 U.S.A.