

**The syntactic analysis of Korean serial verb constructions compared to Turkic languages**  
*E. Rudnitskaya (Institute of Oriental Studies, Moscow), S.-K. Hwang (Yonsei University, Seoul)*

We concentrate on “aspectual” serial verb constructions ( $V_1 + V_2$ ) in which  $V_2$  is an auxiliary or a semi-auxiliary verb with an aspectual meaning (completive, continuative, inchoative, conative), and  $V_1$  has the form of an *-a/-e* converb, and do not consider “sequential/clause-chaining” cases in which  $V_1$  and  $V_2$  are sequential events. E.g. *cenglihay[ha-e] noh-* ‘tidy up’ (*noh-* ‘put’ has a completive meaning), *nul-e ka-* ‘continue to increase’ (*ka-* ‘go’ has a continuative meaning), etc. [Yeon, Brown 2011: 235-258]. For these constructions, Korean authors agree that they are mono-clausal [Cho 1996; S.-S. Choi 2003]. Both  $V_1$  and  $V_2$  are verb forms, so either there are two VP-s in ( $V_1$ -*a/e* +  $V_2$ ) clauses, or  $V_2$  is a functional Asp head (as [S.-S. Cho 2003] proposes). Can ( $V_1$ -*a/e* +  $V_2$ ) be a complex verb? That is theoretically possible, taking into account that  $V_1$  and  $V_2$  in the “auxiliary” ( $V_1$ -*a/e* +  $V_2$ ) complex cannot be split (divided by any morphological material), and neither can be extracted. See the tests by S.-Y. Cho and S.-S. Choi; we find [Y.-J. Choi 2005]’s examples with extraction in most cases ungrammatical with respect to our data.

We apply to Korean “auxiliary” ( $V_1$ -*a/e* +  $V_2$ ) constructions the long negation test and the morphological causativization test proposed for Turkic languages by [Graschenkov 2015]. The morphological passivization test does not work in Korean because morphological passivization is restricted, so that clauses with an inanimate object as a rule do not get passivized. [Yeon 2015: 126-129].

These tests show that in most of completive constructions (with  $V_2$ -s *nay-* ‘show’, *noh-* ‘put’ *twu-* ‘put aside’), continuative/ inchoative (with  $V_2$ -s *o-* ‘come’ and *ka-* ‘go’), and benefactive (with *cwu-* ‘give’) constructions,  $V_2$  demonstrates a functional head (i.e. Asp) properties, similar to the auxiliary verb *ha-* (e.g. in complex predicate formation). The *-ci*[CVB.NEG] *anh-*[NEG] long negation can be only attached to  $V_2$  but not to  $V_1$ , and the morphological causative marker *-il/-kil/-hi...* can be attached only to  $V_1$ . In this case, the clause structure is similar to [S.-S. Choi’s 2003], and ( $V_1 + V_2$ ):

(1) [TP [NegP [AspP=V2P [vP [V1P V1]] V2]]].

There are a couple of  $V_2$ -s: *veli-* ‘throw’ (completive/ semelfactive); *tay-* ‘touch’ (iterative/ intensifier), and especially *po-* ‘see’ (conative) that allow long negation attach to either  $V_1$  or  $V_2$ , e.g.

- |     |    |  |                          |                              |
|-----|----|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| (2) | a. | Ton-ul   | <b>kaph</b> ( $V_1$ )-a  | <b>veli</b> ( $V_2$ )-ess-ta |
|     |    | money-ACC  | give_back-CVB            | throw-PST-DECL               |
|     |    | “(I) gave money back (to him)” [that I had lent] |                          |                              |
|     | b. | √... <b>kaph</b> ( $V_1$ )-ci                    | <b>anh</b> -a            | veli( $V_2$ )-ess-ta         |
|     |    | give_back-CVB.NEG                                | NEG-CVB                  | thow-PST-DECL                |
|     | c. | √... <b>kaph</b> ( $V_1$ )-a                     | <b>veli</b> ( $V_2$ )-ci | <b>anh</b> -ass-ta           |
|     |    | give_back-CVB                                    | throw-CVB.NEG            | NEG-PST-DECL                 |
|     |    | “(I) did not give money back (to him)”           |                          |                              |

(2b-c) show that certain “aspectual”  $V_2$ -s may be only partially grammaticalized as auxiliaries, and those remain a V ( $V_2$ ) projecting a  $V_2$ P. In (2b),  $V_1$  and  $V_2$  are divided by *-ci anh-a* ‘CVB.NEG NEG-CVB’. The clause structure of (2a-c) having two VP-s is (3) [TP [NegP [V2P [vP [V1P V1]] V2]].  $V_1$ P is a lexical projection that is dominated by vP;  $V_2$ P is a semi-functional projection not dominated by vP. (2a-b) are derived from (3) via a sequence of movement operations. [Graschenkov 2015] shows that in Mishar Tatar, “aspectual” ( $V_1+V_2$ ) constructions allow NEG on either  $V_1$ , or  $V_2$ , or on both.

We also study interpretation differences between (2b)-like and (2c)-like cases – those are mostly found with the conative  $V_2$  *po-* ‘see’, and can be viewed as arguments for a bi-clausal analysis. (cf. [Y.-J. Choi’ 2005] examples showing split patterns that are all based on examples with *po-*).

**References:**

Cho S.-Y. Auxiliary verb constructions in Korean // *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences*. 1996. 23 (2).  
 Choi S.-S. Serial verbs and the empty category // *Proceedings of the workshop on Multi-Verb constructions Trondheim Summer School 2003* / ed. by D. Beermann and L. Hellan. Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim, 2003.  
 Choi, Y.-J. Extended parallel morphology for V-e V verbal compounds // *Japanese/Korean linguistics 13* / ed. by M.E. Hudson, S.-A. Jun, P. Sells, Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications, 2005.

- Graschenkov P. *Turkish converbs and serialization: syntax, semantics, grammaticalization* (in Russian). Moscow: Yazyki slavjanskoj kul'tury, 2015.
- Yeon, J. Passives // *The handbook of Korean linguistics* / ed. by L. Brown and J. Yeon. London: Blackwell, 2015. 116-136.
- Yeon J., Brown L. *Korean. A comprehensive grammar*. London-New York: Routledge, 2011.