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 $iss_1$ and $iss_2$, 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
- POL: processive
- QUES: question
- RETR: retrospective
- SITU: situational
- TOP: topic
- $V_1$ to $V_i$: repetition of the same verb
- SUBJ: subject
- $\varnothing$: non-occurrence
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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 as well as verbs from the perspective of morphotactics, in particular, from the perspective of what endings 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. 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 iss₁- ‘stay’ and iss₂- ‘exist, have’. I claim that the former is a processive verb and the latter a hybrid of processive and descriptive verbs. Section IV

1The term “suffixal phrases” refers to syntactic phrases that begin with a suffix: e.g., -ko si ph- ‘want to’, MOD tüs ha- ‘it seems’. Both the suffixes and suffixal phrases that we are concerned with are those that are followed by other suffixes.

2The term “ending” is used to refer to a suffix sequence which consists of aspect + mood (see Section II).

3Martin (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 \textit{issz-} (and its negative counterpart \textit{eps-}) and suffixes \textit{-ess} and \textit{-keyss} behave exactly the same way in morphotactics. This provides a piece of synchronic evidence for the claim that the past tense suffix \textit{-ess} is historically derived from \textit{e + issz} (cf. K-M Lee 1961: 146). In Section V, I argue that the proposed classification offers an explanation for the learnability of the seemingly infinitely complex selectional system of aspect 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:

a) Processive verbs lack the category of plain indicative assertive \textit{-ta} (replacing it by the processive assertive \textit{-nur'/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:

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

5The 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 \textit{nun} in (ii) a kind of aspect marker. In this paper, I distinguish them only when necessary.

6Martin (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.) 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 Ø + 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 Ø; while their interrogative mood suffix is different—ni for the processive and -(u)ni for the descriptive. The following examples illustrate this point:

(1)

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{ssal-ul} & \text{mek} & -\text{nun} & -\text{ta} \\
\text{rice OBJ} & \text{eat PROC.ASP ASS.MOOD}
\end{array}
\]

\footnote{itta, innunta, epta, emunuta, etta and keytta are all phonetic surface forms of isssta, issnunta, epsnunta, esssta, and keyssta, which are their morphophonemic representations.}
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

In many people's speech, particularly in young people's, -ni replaces -uni as in:

(a) mwul-i kiph -Ø -uni? 'Is water deep?'
    water SUBJ deep DESC. ASP INT.MOOD
(b) mwul-i kiph -Ø -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 -Ø -ni? 'Do (you) eat rice?'
    rice OBJ eat PROC. ASP.INT.MOOD
(b) ssal-ul mek -Ø *uni? 'Do (you) eat rice?'
    rice OBJ eat PROC. ASP.INT.MOOD
negation⁹, 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-eys com iss.ey yo. ‘(I) am staying at home these days.’
* yosay cip-eys com eps.ey yo. ‘(I) am not staying at home these days.’

⁹See 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_a—‘stay’, iss_b—‘exist’, and iss_c—‘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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plain Level Endings</th>
<th>Endings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>processive statement</td>
<td>mek- nun ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sa- n ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>processive question</td>
<td>mek- Ø ni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sa- Ø ni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>descriptive statement</td>
<td>kiph- Ø ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ssa- Ø ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>descriptive question</td>
<td>kiph- Ø uni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ssa- Ø ni</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The modifier suffixes are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modifier suffixes</th>
<th>Processive</th>
<th>Descriptive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present^10</td>
<td>nun</td>
<td>(u)n</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^10I 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.
Past (u)n
Future (u)l
I will show that issₐ- 'stay', issₛ- 'exist', and issₖ- 'have' should be classified into two classes, iss₁- and iss₂-. I will further demonstrate that iss₁- is a bona fide processive verb and iss₂- is indeed different from other processive and descriptive verbs. I propose that we call iss₂- a hybrid verb.

First let's compare issₐ- 'stay' with issₜ- 'exist' and iss₆- 'have' with respect to what endings and modifier suffixes they take:

(5) Statements
a. na-nun cip-ey issₐ-nun/*∅₁³-ta. 'I (will) stay at home.'

₁²-(u)₁ is not readily used as the descriptive future modifier suffix with a full noun, as we find in:

i) *ssa-I chayk
    *mayw-ul kimchi
    'a book which will be cheap'
    'kimchi which will be hot'

It is, however, possible to find a context in which -(u)₁ is marginally acceptable in modifying a full noun:

ii) kochwu-lul manhi nehese mayw-?ul kimchi
    'kimchi which will be hot because we put in a lot of pepper.'

In such usage, a detailed context has to be provided and several readings are needed before the meaning can be deciphered. This is different from what we find in processive modifier structure.

However, -(u)₁ occurs with defective nouns, which are constituents of suffixal phrases:

iii) chayk-i ssa-I kes kath-ta
    kimchi-ka mayw-ul kes kath-ta
    'It looks as if the book is/will be cheap.'
    'It looks as if the kimchi is/will be hot.'

The -(u)₁ in iii) may have to be considered an aspect suffix different from modifier suffixes. See Note 31 for the acceptability of -(u)₁ and even -(u)n in suffixal phrases.

₁²With respect to other behaviors, issₜ-, 'exist' and iss₆- 'have' may not behave in exactly the same way. All three might show different behaviors when, for example, their honorific counterpart kyeysi- and the negative counterpart eps- are taken into consideration (See below). This issue is not directly related to the topic I discuss in this paper, and I will discuss it elsewhere.

₁³The unacceptability judgement of Na-nun cip-ey iss-∅₁-ta, in the meaning of 'I (will) stay at home,' may not be obvious. na-nun cip-ey iss-ta is a good sentence and appears to be a counterexample to my intuition. This claim can further be supported by the fact that this sentence can take both -ey and -eyse, both of which mean 'at' 'in' or 'on':

(i) a. con-i cip-ey iss-∅₁-ta
    John SUBJ home at is STATE
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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\_14 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-eys\_e 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\_c- 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\_c- ‘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\_b- ‘exist’ rather than iss\_a- ‘stay’. For arguments, see Lee (in preparation).

\_14 A more common form for this modifier construction may be cip-ey iss-\(\emptyset\)-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 \textit{iss\textsubscript{a}} - 'stay', which is completely acceptable. We can conclude, therefore, that there exists again a disparity of behavior between \textit{iss\textsubscript{a}} - 'stay', and both \textit{iss\textsubscript{b}} - 'exist' and \textit{iss\textsubscript{c}} - '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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>\textit{iss\textsubscript{a}} - 'stay'</th>
<th>Contrasted with</th>
<th>\textit{iss\textsubscript{b}} - 'exist'</th>
<th>and \textit{iss\textsubscript{c}} - 'have'.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>na-nun iss nun ta</td>
<td>UH-ka iss *nun ta</td>
<td>ton-i iss *nun ta</td>
<td>*\textempty{}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ni</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*uni</td>
<td>*uni</td>
<td>*uni</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pres. iss nun na</td>
<td>iss nun UH</td>
<td>iss nun con</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>past (u)n</td>
<td>??(u)n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fut. (u)l</td>
<td>??(u)l</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the basis of the differences shown above, I conclude that \textit{iss\textsubscript{a}} - and \textit{iss\textsubscript{b}} - are different verbs and name them \textit{iss\textsubscript{1}} - and \textit{iss\textsubscript{2}} - , respectively.

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

Now, I will compare \textit{iss\textsubscript{1}} - 'stay' with processive and descriptive verbs. Some example are:

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

\textsuperscript{15}The difference in the acceptability of past and future modifier constructions between \textit{iss\textsubscript{b}} - and \textit{iss\textsubscript{c}} - 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 iss₁- '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 home'
   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 iss₁- 'stay' behaves exactly like a processive verb and not like a descriptive verb.

These behaviors are represented in Table 2 below:

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>iss₁- 'stay'</th>
<th>Contrast with Proc. &amp; Desc. Verbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mek- 'eat'</td>
<td>iss₁- 'stay'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mek nun ta</td>
<td>iss nun ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Ø</td>
<td>*Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ni</td>
<td>ni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*uni</td>
<td>*uni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pres. mek nun na</td>
<td>iss nun na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>past (u)n</td>
<td>(u)n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fut. (u)l</td>
<td>(u)l</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 clearly shows that in all its conjugations, iss₁- 'stay' behaves exactly like the processive verb mek- 'eat' and not like the descriptive verb noph- 'high'.

We will proceed to compare iss₂- 'exist, have' with processive and descriptive verbs:

(15) Statements
   a. na-nun ton-i iss-*nun/Ø-ta.    ‘I have money.’
   a’.UH-ka Hawaii-ey iss-*nun/Ø-ta.  ‘UH is in Hawaii.’
   b. kimchi-lul mek-nun/*Ø-ta.       ‘(I) eat kimchi.’
   c. san-i noph-*nun/Ø-ta             ‘The mountain is high.’

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

These examples show that iss₂- '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-nun na                    ‘I who have money’
   a’.Hawaii-ey iss-nun UH                ‘UH which is in Hawaii’
   b. kimchi-lul mek-nun na               ‘I who eat Kimchi’
   c. noph-uni san                       ‘the mountain that is high’

(18) Past Modifier
   a. ton-i iss-?un na                    ‘I who had money’
   a’.Hawaii-ey iss-?un UH                ‘UH which was in Hawaii’
   b. kimchi-lul mek-?un na               ‘I who ate Kimchi’
   c. noph-*un san                       ‘the mountain that was high’

(19) Future Modifier
   a. ton-i iss-?ul na                    ‘I who will have money’
   a’.Hawaii-ey iss-?ul UH                ‘UH which will be in Hawaii’
   b. kimchi-lul mek-?ul na               ‘I who will eat Kimchi’
   c. noph-?ul san                        ‘the mountain that will be high’

We find that iss₂- '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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>issz-‘exist, have’</th>
<th>Contrasted with Proc. &amp; Desc. Verbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mek-‘eat’</td>
<td>issz-‘exist, have’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>issz-‘exist, have’</td>
<td>noph-‘high’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ton/UH-ka)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mek nun ta</td>
<td>iss *nun ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Ø</td>
<td>noph *nun ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ni</td>
<td>*ni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uni</td>
<td>uni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pres. mek nun na</td>
<td>iss nun ton/UH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>past (u)n</td>
<td>*(u)n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fut. (u)n</td>
<td>*(u)n</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table summarizes the behavior of issz-‘exist, have’ in contrast with that of processive and descriptive verbs: issz- behaves ambivalently with respect to both plain endings and modifier constructions. There appears to be a difference between issz- 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 issz-‘exist, have’ I will call it a hybrid verb.

What we further observe is that issz-‘exist, have’, with respect to the plain-level endings, selects the simpler form of the possible alternants: i.e., in the statement ending, issz-‘exist, have’ chooses the simpler descriptive form Ø-ta rather than the processive nun/n-ta, and in the question ending the simpler processive Ø-ni rather than the descriptive (u)ni.16.

I hope I have shown convincingly that the three iss’s should be classified into iss1-‘stay’ and issz-‘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.

16Why does issz-‘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       | mek-/ka- | nun/(u)  | nun/n    | Ø        |
| including iss    |          |          |
| Descriptive      | noph-/ssa- | (u)n/Ø  | /?(u)l   | Ø        |
| Hybrid           | iss²-(eps-) | nun/?(u)n/?(u)l | Ø        | Ø        |

Now I will move on to examine how iss²- ‘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

17The 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 iss₂⁻ 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 iss₂⁻, 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 iss₂⁻, -ess, and -keyss with respect to the modifier ending *nun·

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5</th>
<th>Past/Future Tense -ess/ keyss Contrasted with iss₂⁻.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-ess/keyss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iss₂⁻</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-pap-ul mek ess/keyss *nun ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ton/UH-ka iss *nun ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*uni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pres.</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>past</td>
<td>(u)n (for ess.nun) ?(u)n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fut.</td>
<td>(u)l (for keyss.nun) ?(u)l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iss nun ton/UH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(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 iss₂⁻ behave exactly the same way in that
the former can be assumed to occur with -nun.\textsuperscript{18}

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modifier</th>
<th>Endings</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Quest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Processive</td>
<td></td>
<td>-tá</td>
<td>-ni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-i\textsuperscript{19} (causative)</td>
<td>noph-/po- i-</td>
<td>nun/(u)n/ (u)l</td>
<td>n/nun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>-te(retrospective)</td>
<td>noph-/po- te-</td>
<td>(u)n/ Ø / Ø\textsuperscript{20}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparent</td>
<td>-(u)si (honorific)</td>
<td>po-si-</td>
<td>noph-usi-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid</td>
<td>-ess, -keyss (past, future)</td>
<td>ka-ess/-keyss</td>
<td>noph-ess/-keyss</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{18}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

\textsuperscript{19}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.

\textsuperscript{20}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-n-ta, mek-i-nun
- b. a descriptive verb: noph-i-n-ta, noph-i-nun
- c. a hybrid verb: eps-ay22-n-ta, eps-ay-nun

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-ta ‘(I) found him eating.’
   *mek-te-ni? ‘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 -ta23, 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):

21It 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.

22-ay should probably be analyzed as -i ha-.

23This 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
We can then safely conclude that -te belongs to the descriptive class.\(^{24}\)

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

\(^{24}\)Some might still argue that -te calls for the processive aspect as follows:

a. mek nun kwun
   eat ASP EXC.MOOD
   '(Someone) is eating!'

b. pissa ∅ kwun
   see ASP EXC. MOOD
   '(Something) is expensive!'

c. ka te n kwun
   go RETR ASP EXC.MOOD
   '(Somebody) was going!'

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

i. a. noph i nun tey yo
   high CAUS ASP SITY POLI
   '(He) is raising it and uh...'

b. ssa n tey yo
   cheap . ASP SITU POLI
   'It is cheap and uh...'

c. ssa te n tey yo
   cheap RETR ASP SITU POLI
   'It was cheap and un...'

ii. a. noph i nun cipwung
    high CAUS MOD roof
    'roof (he) is raising'

b. ssa n kayosolin
   cheap MOD gasoline
   'gasoline which is cheap'

c. ssa te n kayosolin
   cheap RETR MOD gasoline
   'gasoline which was cheap'

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\(^{25}\) -\((u)si\) after:
   a. a processive verb:  mek-usi-\(n\)-ta  mek-usi-\(n\)un
   b. a descriptive verb:  noph-usi-\(\emptyset\)-ta  noph-usi-\(n\)
   c. a hybrid verb:  eps-usi-\(\emptyset\)-ta  eps-usi-\(n\)\(^{26}\)

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 \(keyss + nun\).

\(^{25}\)This type could be called a null type, following Lieber(1980: 88).

\(^{26}\)We find an anomaly when the honorific suffix is added to a hybrid verb modifier
construction:

\begin{verbatim}
 ton  -i iss-nun     but     ton  -i iss- usi -?nun
 money SUBJ have MOD money SUBJ have HON MOD
 '... who has money' '... who (HON) has money'
 ton  -i eps- nun    but     ton  -i eps- usi-?nun
 money SUBJ not have MOD money SUBJ not have HON MOD
 '... who does not have money' '... who (HON) does not have money'
\end{verbatim}

The same anomaly occurs when \(iss\) is replaced by its honorific counterpart \(kyeysi\):

\begin{verbatim}
atul  -i iss-nun     but     atul  -i kyeysi- n/nun
 son SUBJ have MOD    son SUBJ have (HON) MOD
 '...who has a son' '...who has (HON) a son'
atul  -i eps- nun    but     atul  -i an kyeusi- n/nun
 son SUBJ not have MOD son SUBJ not have (HON) MOD
 '...who does not have a son' '...who (HON) does not have a son'
\end{verbatim}

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:

\begin{verbatim}
con  -i molu- n(un) chey hanta. 'John pretends not to know it.'
John SUBJ not know ASP pretend
\end{verbatim}
(27) Hybrid Suffix -ess/keyss after:
   a. a proc. verb:  mek-ess/keyss-Ø-ta
                    mek-ess/keyss-ni? not mek-ess/keyss-uni?
   b. a desc. verb:  noph-ass\textsuperscript{27}/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:

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccc}
\text{Status} & \text{Tense} & \text{Tense} & \text{Tense} & \text{Style} & \text{Aspect} & \text{Mood} \\
usi & ess & ess & keyss & sup^28 & ni & ta \\
\text{HON} & \text{PAST} & \text{PAST} & \text{FUT} & \text{HUM} & \text{IND} & \text{STATE}
\end{array}
\]

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\textsubscript{1}- 'stay' and iss\textsubscript{2}- 'exist, have', and the subsequent

\textsuperscript{27}ass is an alternant of -ess determined by vowel harmony.

\textsuperscript{28}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 \( iss_1 \) 'stay' as a bona fide processive and \( iss_2 \) '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.)\(^{29}\) 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 \( iss_b \) 'exist' or \( iss_c \) 'have', which I separated from \( iss_1 \) 'stay' and posited as \( iss_2 \) '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 or the classification. As I presented in (3), which is repeated below:

(3) Plain Level Endings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Mood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>processive statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mek-</td>
<td>nun</td>
<td>ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sa-</td>
<td></td>
<td>ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>processive question</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mek</td>
<td>( \emptyset )</td>
<td>ni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sa</td>
<td>( \emptyset )</td>
<td>ni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>descriptive statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kiph</td>
<td>( \emptyset )</td>
<td>ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ssa</td>
<td>( \emptyset )</td>
<td>ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>descriptive question</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kiph</td>
<td>( \emptyset )</td>
<td>uni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ssa</td>
<td>( \emptyset )</td>
<td>ni</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{29}\)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 keysta 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: iss1- ‘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 iss1- ‘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 iss1- and not to others, which inc­ludes iss2- which in turn consists if iss0- ‘exist’ and issc- ‘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 iss1- and the hybrid verb iss2-. 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 iss2- 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 iss1- ‘stay’ and therefore its occurrence is bound to be few in number. eps-, again the negative of the hybrid iss2-, 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
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:  mek-e ya ha-n-ta    mek-e ya ha-nun
   b. descriptive: noph-a ya ha-n-ta    noph-a ya ha-nun
   c. hybrid:     eps-e ya ha-n-ta    eps-e ya ha-nun

ii) Suffixes

---

30I 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modifiers</th>
<th>Endings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processive</td>
<td>-e ya ha-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>including</td>
<td>-e iss₁-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>-e to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparent</td>
<td>-ci anh-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid</td>
<td>-(u)l swu iss₂-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- a. processive: noph-i-e ya ha-n-ta  
- b. descriptive: noph-te-*e ya ha³²-n-ta  
- c. transparent: noph-usi-e ya ha-n-ta  
- d. hybrid: noph-ass-e-ya ha-n-ta

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.

³¹Compared 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 iss₂- ‘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 nun salam | 'one who can drive' |
| drive ASP | can MOD man |
| wuncen ha | -l swu iss un salam | 'one who could drive' |
| drive ASP | can MOD man |
| wuncen ha | -l swu iss ul salam | 'one who will be able to drive' |
| drive ASP | can MOD man |
```

³²This 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\textsuperscript{33} -cwul (lo) al- (molu-) 'expect (not) to'
- -(u)l cwul al- (molu-) 'know (not) how to'
- -ci mal- 'Don’t'
- -e iss\textsubscript{1} resultative
- -ko iss\textsubscript{1} 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'

\textsuperscript{33}MOD represents both modifier suffixes and the aspect suffix -(u)l. See Note 11.
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 iss₂, which is assumed to be their last component.

2) Suffixal phrases: those such as -(u)kes 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—iss₁—‘stay’ and iss₂—‘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 iss₁- and the one in the hybrid category like iss₂.

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/Ø-ta.

1. mek-nun-
2. noph-
3. i-
4. iss-35-nun-
5. iss-
6. eps-
7. mek-i-n-
8. noph-i-n-
9. eps-ay-n-
10. mek-te-36
11. noph-te-
12. iss-te-
13. mek-usi-n-
14. noph-usi-
15. iss-usi-n-
16. iss-usi-
17. mek-ess-
18. noph-ass-
19. iss-ess-
20. mek-keyss-
21. noph-keyss-
22. iss-keyss-
23. mek-e-ya-ha-n-
24. noph-a-ya-ha-n-
25. mek-ko-siph-
26. yepppu-ko-siph-
27. mek-ci-anh-nun-
28. noph-ci-anh-
29. mek-ci-mos ha-n
30. noph-ci-mos ha-
31. mek-ko iss-
32. sal-a iss-
33. 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 Ø 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 Ø. In the classificational system proposed here, the transpar-

34 The processive aspect suffix has the shape -nun after a consonant and -n after a vowel.
35 The iss- in (4) and (15) is iss1 ‘stay’ and the one in (5) and (16) is iss2 ‘exist, have’.
36 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 PROCESSIVE ELEMENT (VERB, SUFFIX, AND SUFFIXAL PHRASE)
\(-\emptyset\) 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\(^{37}\) -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. yeypu-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\(^{26}\)
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.

\(^{37}\)Both iss\(_1\) 'stay' and iss\(_2\) '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 iss₁ and iss₂⁻, and the latter and other elements consisting of it may further be defined as hybrids.

The verb iss₂⁻ (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.
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