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1. Introduction

In this paper, I will investigate characteristics of a number of multi-verb construction of Korean which comprise a string of two or more adjacent verbs in a single clause, and whose syntacticosemantic and pragmatic behaviors crosscut other paratactic and hypotactic constructions. In the multi-verb constructions in question, the adjacent verbs are connected by a particle /a/ which is attached to the preceding verb, in the pattern of 'V1-a V2'. Thus they will be referred to as /a/-CONS Ts in the following discussion, until a more detailed subclassification is in order. The followings are some typical examples:

(1) a. Tom-i cip-u ro ttw i-a ka -ass -ta.¹
   -NOM house-to run go -PAST-DEC
   'Tom ran to the house.'

   -NOM ball-ACC have go -PAST-DEC
   'Tom took the ball away.'

c. Tom-i Mary-lul t tayli-a cuki -ass -ta.
   -NOM -ACC strike kill -PAST-DEC
   'Tom struck Mary dead.'

The /a/-CONST in (1) has traditionally been described as a verbal compounding rather than as a kind of syntactic construction (cf. Choi 1971: 281-85, Abasolo 1978, Yang 1978). However its lexical status as a verbal compounding has not been well established. No previous studies I know of have raised a serious question why the verbal structure should be considered as a lexical compound, but not as a syntactic phrase.

One of the main reasons why it has been described as a verbal compounding is because the strings of adjacent verbs, taken together, seem to denote a single event or action, instead of making separate assertions, as implied by the English translations in (1). For example, sentence (1b) comprises two verbs, /kaci/ 'have' and /ka/ 'go', but the natural reading of the sentence does not make a direct reference to such actions as 'having' and 'going'; it is better construed as a single assertion of 'taking away'. This is, however, too vague characterization of the construction to build any significant theoretical claims on.

On the other hand, another type of a verbal construction of the pattern 'V1-ko V2' (hereafter '/ko/-CONST') was also taken to be a lexical compound (cf. Yang 1978). However the morphosyntactic behaviors of the /ko/-CONST show
that it is clearly a syntactic phrase involving a verbal coordination. Thus, I will compare and contrast the two types of constructions as well as other related multi-verbal constructions, and will claim that there are reasons to view such verbal structures as syntactic constructions rather than only as lexical compounds.

The purpose of this paper is to propose a classification of constructions based on their 'construction-specific' properties, and provide a syntactic analysis of them within a restrictive grammar which does not allow references to strictly morphological content in a syntactic rule. Section 2 is devoted to the description of the /a/-CONST and /ko/-CONST. Their internal structure are examined and claimed to be a VP-coordination, in section 3. A further subclassification of the /a/-CONST will be motivated in sections 4 and 5. Especially, the special semantics and pragmatics of verbs of 'coming and going' in one of the subclass will be discussed in detail in section 4. The question whether the constructions are to be viewed as lexical compounds or syntactic phrases is taken in section 6. Claiming that they are indeed syntactic phrases, I argue against the syncretic treatment of such particles as /a/ and /ko/, and motivate their morphosyntactic feature specifications. Finally in section 7, I provide morphosyntactic rules and operations for a fragment of Korean including the multi-verb constructions.

The main thrust of this paper is substantive rather than notational in character. For concreteness of the discussion, however, I assume a GPSG framework as in Gazdar et. al. (1985), and an inflectional morphology framework as in Zwicky (1985, 1988, 1989a). On the other hand, the complex behavior of the multi-verb constructions makes it difficult to immediately determine the bar-levels of the verbal expressions involved. Therefore, for the ease of exposition, 'VX' will be used as a cover symbol over V-type categories of whatever bar level in the following discussion, unless their bar-levels are not of an immediate concern. 'VX1' and 'VX2' will represent the first and the second V-type categories in the construction, respectively.

2. Properties of the /a/-CONST.

Among the /a/-CONSTs, let's first consider the most general type of constructions in (2). They are general in the sense that their syntax semantics and pragmatics are quite straightforward to describe, compared to other similar constructions. Some subclasses of /a/-CONSTs, which will be discussed in the next section, are parasitic on this basic type, but with a more heavily loaded semantics and pragmatics, and with one of the VXs in the construction being restricted to a small subset of verb categories.

(2) a. Tom-i (chimtay-wie) mup-a (khulkul) ca-n-ta.
   -NOM bed -on lie soundly sleep-PRES-DEC
   'Tom is sleeping (soundly), lying (on the bed).'

b. Tom-i ku ppang-ul kup-a mek-ass-ta.
   -NOM the bread-ACC bake eat-PAST-DEC
   'Tom baked and ate the bread.'
c. Tom-i  John-ul  (khal-lo)  ooji-a  (tansume)  okki-ass-ta
    -NOM  -ACC  knife-with  stab  in-one-breath  kill-PAST-DEC

'Tom stabbed John (with a knife) and killed him (in one breath).'</p>

At first glance, the verbal constructions in (2) may seem to be simply examples of the VP coordination. As in the case of VP coordination, the two VXs share the same grammatical relation to the subject NP. If there is an object NP, as in (2a) and (2b), the verbs are interpreted as sharing the same object NPs. The construction combines exactly the same type of V-categories, i.e. IVs in (2a), and TVs in (2b) and (2c).

When we consider a wider range of examples, however, the /a/-oNST turns out to be distinct from the typical VP coordination, i.e. the /ko/-oNST. First, the following examples show that the verbs in /a/-oNSTs cannot have separate argument NPs, unlike /ko/-oNSTs.

(3) a. Tom-i  ppang-to  mek-(ass)-ko  mul-to  masi-ass-ta.
    -NOM  bread-too  eat-PAST-and  water-too  drink-PAST-DEC

'Tom ate bread and drank water, too.'


    -TOP  bread-ACC  eat-PAST-AND  -TOP  water-ACC  drink-PAST-DEC

'Tom ate bread and Mary drank water.'


It is obligatory for /a/-oNSTs to share the same subject and object NPs, whereas /ko/-oNSTs may not necessarily share the same subject and object NPs. In addition to such a difference in the grammatical relations to the argument NPs, the two constructions differ in their inflectional markings such as tense, aspect and subject honorification.

As already implied in examples (3a) and (4a), each VX in /ko/-oNSTs can be independently marked in tense. In cases where the VXs share the same tense, the tense of the first VX may not be realized, without resulting in any significant semantic difference. Only the pragmatic implication changes such that when each verb is marked in tense, the assertions made by each VX are more independently interpreted than when only the second verb is marked in tense. The VXs, however, need not share the same tense, as illustrated in (5).

    -TOP  bread-ACC  eat-PAST-AND  -TOP  water-ACC  drink-FUT-DEC

b. 'Tom ate bread and Mary will drink water.'

c. 'Tom will eat bread and Mary will drink water.'

With the past tense morpheme /-ass/ in the first verb, Sentence (5a) is
interpreted as in (5b); with no tense morpheme, the two verbs are interpreted to share the same tense, as in (5c). On the other hand, in /a/-CONSTs, only the second verb is marked in tense, while the first verb must be unmarked in tense.

The two constructions exhibit exactly the same difference in the 'subject honorification'. The two verbs in /ko/-CONSTs can be independently marked whereas, in /a/-CONSTs, only the second verb is marked in the subject honorification, as shown in the following examples.

\[ \text{capsu-si-xa} \]

(6) aperim-i ppang-to 'capsu-si-ko mul-to masi-si-ass-ta.
  father-NOM bread-too eat-NOM-and water-too drink-NOM-PAST-DEC
  'The father ate bread and drank water.'

(7) a. aperim-i chintay-wie nup-a cumu-si-n-ta.
  father-NOM bed-on lie sleep-NOM-PRS-DEC
  'The father is sleeping, lying on the bed.'

b. *aperim-i chintay-wie nup-si-a cumu-si-n-ta.

All the above examples suggest that the Vxs in /ko/-CONSTs are more independent to each other, morphosyntactically, than those in /a/-CONSTs. These morphosyntactic behaviors of the two constructions are crucially related to their semantics and pragmatics such that /ko/-CONSTs involve separate assertions of the actions denoted by each VX, whereas /a/-CONSTs contain just one assertion. In other words, the meaning of a sentence either in /a/-CONST, or in /ko/-CONST, always entails that 'NPsubj VX1' and 'NPsubj VX2'. However, in addition to such a general semantic contribution, Vxs in /a/-CONSTs combine to collectively denote a single chain of action or event. This fact is very tricky to formally represent, but it can be indirectly illustrated by the distinctive negation potentials of the constructions. In the following examples, /a/-CONSTs allow only one negation over the whole construction, while the verbs in /ko/-CONSTs can be independently negated.\(^2\)

(8) Negation of the /ko/-CONSTs

  -NOM rice-ACC not-eat-and water-ACC drink-PAST-DEC
  'Tom didn't eat rice but drank water.'

  -NOM rice-ACC eat-and water-ACC not-drink-PAST-DEC
  'Tom ate rice but didn't drink water.'

c. Töm-un pap-to an-mek-ko mul-to an-masi-ass-ta.
  -NOM rice-too eat-and water-too not-drink-PAST-DEC
  'Tom didn't eat rice nor drink water.'
(9) Negation of the /a/-CONS Ts

   -NOM bed -on lie sleep-not-PRS-DEC
   'It is the case that Tom is sleeping, lying on the bed.'

b. Tom-un chimtay-wie nup-ci aniha-a ca-n-ta.
   -NOM bed -on lie-not sleep-PRS-DEC
   'Tom is sleeping, not lying on the bed.'

3. Internal structure of the constructions

   In the above discussion, we have observed a number of morphosyntactic distinctions between /a/-CONST and /ko/-CONST. However, such distinctions may not necessarily indicate the different internal structures of the constructions. Given the semantic and pragmatic distinction between them, both constructions may still be assigned to essentially the same internal structure. For the multi-verb constructions, we may, in principle, have the following combinatorial potentials.

   (10) (a) VP
       ______________
      /                \\  
     /                 \\  
    /                   \\  
   /                     \\  
V1 X2 V2 X1 Vn

   (b) VP
       ______________
      /                \\  
     /                 \\  
    /                   \\  
   /                     \\  
     V*                \\  
      \\
       V1 V2

   (c) VP
       ______________
      /                \\  
     /                 \\  
    /                   \\  
   /                     \\  
      \\
       V1 V2

   (d) VP
       ______________
      /                \\  
     /                 \\  
    /                   \\  
   /                     \\  
      \\
       V1 V2

   (Xn' in these structures indicates the arguments or modifiers of Vn.)

   As illustrated in the above section, VXs can be independently modified by adverbials in both constructions, with modifiers of the VX2 (i.e. the second V-type category) intervening between the two VXs. This fact follows directly from the structures (10a) and (10c). (10a) is ruled out, however, on the basis of two basic assumptions that conditions on the ordering of sister constituents treat V⁰ categories (i.e. word-rank Vs) identically, and that the head categories invariably occur phrase-finally.

   The same fact that the VXs in the construction can be interrupted by modifiers suggests that they are not cases of lexical compounding, as represented by 'V⁰ in (10b). The controversy over the lexical vs. phrasal status of the constructions in question will be further elaborated in section 5.

   On the other hand, we cannot find any syntactic (and/or semantic) evidence that the /a/-CONSTs involve a hypotactic relation between the VXs: no VX can be appropriately analyzed to subcategorize for the other VX. In addition, given the verb-final nature of Korean phrases, it is quite natural
that VPs always follow nonverbal sister phrases, explaining why there is no intervening material between the complement VP and the head V in typical hypotactic constructions such as periphrastic causatives. On this assumption, the intervening material between two VPs rules out (10d), too.

The paratactic structure in (10c) is, then, the only plausible candidate for both /a/-CONSTs and /ko/-CONSTs. Even though there is a requirement for the same object NP in the /a/-CONST, this fact may not necessarily follow from the structural difference between the two types of constructions. The requirement for the same object NP may be simply the consequence of the semantic or pragmatic requirement for the 'single assertion'. If we are to provide a purely syntactic account of such facts about the argument structures, we may assign distinctive structures directly to the two types of constructions, as in the following GPSG type representations.

(11) a. /a/-CONST

```
| VP/NP[a] |
-|-|-|
| VP/NP[a] | VP |
```

b. /ko/-CONST

```
| VP |
| VP |
```

Given such structures, the VPs in /a/-CONSTs will always have the same object NP. On the other hand, the foot feature 'SLASH [NP [a]]' can be freely instantiated in the structure (10b) so that the VPs in /ko/-CONSTs may have the same object NP, but not necessarily.

This purely syntactic account is, however, only apparently successful. That is because we have to posit both structures for the /a/-CONST, anyway, since the requirement for the same object NP is not relevant when the construction involves only IVs: i.e. (10a) for cases involving IV-type categories, (10b) for cases involving IV-type categories. What's more, the requirement of the 'single assertion' has to be independently motivated, since sharing the same object NP does not necessarily guarantee such a semantic effect. Therefore, it is much more natural to assume that both /a/-CONST and /ko/-CONST have the same syntactic configuration, i.e. VP-coordination, and that the requirement of the same argument NP is the consequence of the semantic requirement of the 'single assertion'. After all, actions involving separate 'patients' would be harder to construe to be a single assertion than actions involving a single 'patient'. As a so-called pro-drop language, Korean avoids two occurrences of the same object in the same clause. Then, the lack of independent overt object NPs in /a/-CONST seems to be accounted for as the result of an interaction between the single assertion requirement and the pro-drop nature of Korean. In fact, we may informally define the 'single assertion' as a constellation of properties which at least include the following:

i) actions involved in a single assertion cannot be independently negated.

ii) actions involved in a single assertion cannot have separate 'patients'

iii) actions involved in a single assertion must have the same tense.

From the above observations, we can conclude that the /ko/-CONST is
simply a VP coordination, period, while the /a/-\textit{CONST} a marked VP-Coordination associated with special semantics, which is not obtained by the syntactic rules and the general semantic composition alone.

4. /a-ka/-\textit{CONST}, parasitic on /a/-\textit{CONST}

Since we have observed the general characteristics of /a/-\textit{CONST}s, let's move on to a special subtype of the construction, exemplified below:

(12) a. 
\begin{verbatim}
apenim-i cip-u\textsubscript{lo} tt\textsubscript{wi} a ka-(si)-ass-ta
-NOM house-to jump go-NON-PAST-DEC
\end{verbatim}

'Father ran to the house.'

b. 
\begin{verbatim}
etten salam-i Mary-lul cap-a o-(si)-ass-ta
certain man-NOM -ACC hold come-NON-PAST-DEC
\end{verbatim}

'Somebody arrested and brought Mary.'

The above sentences look like instances of the /a/-\textit{CONST} discussed in the previous sections, except that no modifiers can intervene between the two VXs, and that the VX2 belongs to a small subset of verbs, i.e. the so-called verbs of 'coming and going', such as /ka/ 'go', /o/ 'come', and /tami/ 'come and go'. Thus this subtype of the /a/-\textit{CONST} will be referred to as the /a-ka/-\textit{CONST}, after the verb /ka/ 'go'.

First of all, two VXs are combined by the particle /-a/. Second, like /a/-\textit{CONST}s, only VX2 is marked in tense, while VX1 lacks any inflectional marking (i.e. tense, aspect, subject honorification). Third, the sentences contain a single assertion, rather than separate assertions. The English translations in (12) do not effectively express the concept of 'single assertion'. However the concept of single assertion is indirectly suggested by the fact that the VXs cannot be independently negated, as was with /a/-\textit{CONST}:

(13) a. 
\begin{verbatim}
* Tom-i cip-u\textsubscript{lo} tt\textsubscript{wi} ci aniha-a ka-ass-ta
-NOM house-to jump not go-PAST-DEC
\end{verbatim}

'Tom went to the house, not running.'

b. 
\begin{verbatim}
* etten salam-i Mary-lul cap-ci aniha-a o-ass-ta
certain man-NOM -ACC hold not come-PAST-DEC
\end{verbatim}

'Somebody came, not having arrested Mary.'

The whole construction can be collectively negated as follows:

(14) a. 
\begin{verbatim}
Tom-i cip-u\textsubscript{lo} tt\textsubscript{wi} a ka-ci aniha-ass-ta
-NOM house-to jump go not-PAST-DEC
\end{verbatim}

'Tom didn't run to the house.'

b. 
\begin{verbatim}
amuto Mary-lul cap-a o-ci aniha-ass-ta
anybody -ACC hold come not -PAST-DEC
\end{verbatim}

'Nobody arrested and brought Mary.'
If one wants to make separate assertions involving 'coming/going' and 'not doing some action' at the same time, he has to use the /ko/-CONST, in which the particle /a/ of the VXs in (13) must be replaced by /ko/:

On the other hand, the semantics and pragmatics of this /a-ka/-CONST are significantly different from those of the simple /a/-CONST. In the discussion of /a/-CONST and /ko/-CONST, we have noted that both VXs are coordinated, semantically and syntactically, thus being predicated of the same subject. But in a sentence with the /a-ka/-CONST, the subject NP does not stand in the same relation to the two VXs, semantically: 'NP-subj VX1' is always entailed, but 'NP-subj VX2'—i.e. the subject NP's coming or going—is not. As will be discussed shortly, however, because of the complicated pragmatics of 'coming/going', such a semantic fact about the construction has long been overlooked, and the delicate distinction between the /a-ka/-CONST and the /ko/-CONST has not been clearly captured.

The best way to convey this fact is by means of examples. Consider the following sentences:

(15) a. apei-im-i cip-uloo ttwi-a ka-(si)-ass-ta  
   -NOM house-to jump go-HON-PAST-DEC
   'Father ran to the house.'

b. etten salam-i Mary-lul ca-pa_ o-(si)-ass-ta  
   certain man-NOM arrest come-HON-PAST-DEC
   'Somebody forcibly brought Mary.'

Traditionally, it has been claimed, implicitly or explicitly (cf. Choi 1971, Yang 1978), that sentences like the above entail the subject NP's coming/going. Thus, for example, sentences (15a) and (15b) have been translated into 'Father went to the house, running' and 'Somebody came, forcibly bringing Mary', respectively. However I argue that the subject's coming/going is only pragmatically compatible with those sentences, but not semantically entailed by them.

Part of the confusion in the previous analyses seems to have derived from the lack of distinction between pragmatic compatibility and semantic entailment. Virtually all examples of the /a-ka/-CONST in the previous studies were pragmatically compatible with the subject NP's coming/going, as already seen in (15). If the subject NP's coming/going is merely part of the pragmatic implicature, however, either it would be cancellable in a proper context, or the /a-ka/-CONST would be compatible even with a situation in which the subject NP's coming/going is not involved. Now consider the following set of sentences which would make the point clear:

    -NOM the dog-ACC pull go-PAST-DEC
    'John went away with the dog, by pulling it' (from Yang (1978))
    'John pulled the dog (away from the speaker).' (My translation)
   -NOM the card-ACC self-toward pull go-PAST-DEC
   'John pulled the card toward him.'

   -NOM the card-ACC self-toward pull come-PAST-DEC
   'John pulled the card toward him.'

Sentence (16) and its translation are from Yang (1978:229), and his account of the sentence explicitly involves the subject NP's going. In fact, he claims that in sentence (16), JOHN's going is 'the primary action', and pulling a dog is 'the secondary action'. However, in my examples in (17) which have exactly the same construction as (16), the subject NP's coming/goings is not part of the meaning at all. On the contrary, it should be noted that sentences (17a & b) have exactly the same translation except the change of the deictic center, which I do not know how to translate into English. The deictic center of (17a) is on the speaker, while that of (17b) is on the subject of the sentence, JOHN. Sentences like (17), then, clearly show that the subject's coming/goings is only pragmatically implied but not entailed by the /a-ka/-CONST.

I will not discuss in detail the pragmatics of the verbs of coming/goings in this paper. It is not because the pragmatics of such verbs is not worth investigating, but because I believe that whatever pragmatics such verbs have, they will be transparently transferred to the /a-ka/-CONST. For further discussion of the pragmatics of such verbs, refer to K.D. Lee (1978) and references cited there.

As for the interpretation of the /a-ka/-CONST, it would suffice to say that verbs of coming/goings indicate a movement toward or away from the deictic center, respectively. Thus, the whole construction will be interpreted, in general, to express a movement denoted by the VX1, toward or away from the deictic center. In case of transitive VX1, the whole construction will therefore entail the locational change of the object NP, which may or may not imply the locational change of the subject. To be more explicit, the interpretation of the whole sentence can be schematized as follows: (the parenthetical remarks are relevant only in case of transitive VX1.)

(18) 'VX1-a VX2' $\longrightarrow$ [move (the object NP) toward/away-from the deictic center by VX1-ing (it1)]

On the other hand, verbs of coming/goings imply not only spatial but also temporal movements. Therefore, when the VX1 in the /a-ka/-CONST has nothing to do with a spatial movement, the whole construction is interpreted to express an action denoted by the VX1, in progress toward or away from the temporal deictic center, as shown in (19):

(19) a. nai-i palk-a o-ass-ta
    day-NOM bright-a come-PAST-DEC
    'It became brighter and brighter.'
b. motu-ka nulk-a ka-n-ta
   all-NOM old go-PRS-DEC
   'Everybody goes on getting old.'

   -NOM rice-ACC almost eat go-PRS-DEC
   'John is eating rice, but did not eat it up yet.'

Once we understand the semantics and pragmatics of the /a-ka/-CONST, it becomes clear that the construction does not contain separate assertions but one assertion: the VX2, i.e. a member of verbs of coming and going, does not have its own verbal semantics, but only its deictic force is superimposed onto the meaning of the VX1, as described above.

Notice here that the semantic relation between the VX1 and VX2 is not the kind of relation found in VP-coordinations (e.g. the /a/-CONST or the /ko/-CONST). In the /a-ka/-CONST, the VX2, i.e. the verb of coming/goiing, appears to be a 'semantic function' which can take any non-deictic VP as its 'argument' and give out a deictic VP. In other words, the relation between VX1 and VX2 is hypotactic rather than paratactic. The lack of intervening modifier before VX2 also suggests the hypotactic relation between them. As already mentioned in section 2, given the verb-final nature of Korean phrases, it is quite natural that VPs always follow nonverbal phrases, explaining why there is no intervening material between the complement VP and the head V in typical hypotactic constructions. As will be discussed in the next section, the branching of a head verb and its complement VP is also supported by the fact that the complement VP can serve as an antecedent of a VP-anaphoric expression /kulekhe ha/ (i.e. Do SO in English).

The above description of /a-ka/-CONST can provide an insightful solution to the traditional puzzle about the distinctions between /ko/-CONST and /a-ka/-CONST. The puzzle concerns a systematic difference in cooccurrence restrictions on VX1 between the two types of constructions, when the VX2 is a verb of coming/goiing: certain verbs occur only in one type of construction, but not in the other, as in the following examples from Choi (1971:283) and Yang (1978:230): (The grammatical judgments are not mine but theirs, with which I do not agree.)

(20) a. ki-a ka-n-ta
    crawl go-PRS-DEC
    'Crawl away'

b. * ki-ko ka-n-ta

(21) a. ket-a ka-ass-ta
    walk go-PAST-DEC
    'walked away.'

b. * ket-ko ka-ass-ta

(22) a. * kicha-lul tha-a ka-n-ta
    train-ACC ride go-PRS-DEC
    'go by train'

b. kicha-lul tha-ko ka-n-ta
    train-ACC ride go-PRS-DEC
(23) a. *ciphangi-lul ciph-a ka-n-ta
    walking-stick-ACC use go-PRS-DEC
b. ciphangi-lul ciph-ko ka-n-ta
    walking-stick-ACC use go-PRS-DEC
'go, using a walking stick'

Choi (1971), who made the first attempt to investigate and classify the multi-verb constructions in Korean, observed the above cooccurrence restrictions, but could not give a satisfactory account. Later, Yang (1978:230) attributed such cooccurrence restrictions to the transitivity of the VX1. In the examples given above, /ki/ 'crawl', and /ket/ 'walk' are intransitive, while /tha/ 'ride' and /ciph/ 'use' are transitive. The apparent restriction is that intransitive VX1 is not compatible with the /ko/-CONST with a verb of coming going as its VX2, while transitive VX1 is not compatible with the /a-ka/-CONST. However, Yang (1978) himself provides a counterexample to his own generalization, since a transitive VX1 occurs in /a-ka/-CONST, as in (16) above. On the other hand, our discussion of the construction does not make any reference to the transitivity of the VX1.

Before we try to give another account of the cooccurrence restrictions exhibited above, it should be noted that their understanding of the /a-ka/-CONST was different from mine, in that they take the construction to express 'the manner (or method) of going/coming', with the VX1 denoting the method taken. Obviously, such a characterization of the constructions cannot be supported, as shown in the above discussion, nor be taken as an account of the cooccurrence restrictions.

In fact, (20b) and (21b) are not ungrammatical. In a proper context, they will be interpreted as 'crawled and (then) went' and 'walked and (then) went', respectively, as expected from our characterization of the /ko/-CONST as a simple VP coordination involving separate assertions. The sequentiality in the actions involved will directly follow from such a very general pragmatic principle as Gricean Maxims of Manner.

As for (22a) and (23a), they can never mean the subject's going by doing some action on the object NP. On the contrary, given our description of the /a-ka/-CONST, they can only mean moving a train (away from the deictic center) by riding it and moving a walking stick (away from the deictic center) by using it, respectively: what is moved, then, is a train or a walking stick. It is unlikely that anyone would want to express such meanings, and certainly they are not the intended meanings such as going by train and going, using a walking stick. Therefore all the problems plaguing previous studies turn out to be a matter of pragmatics which is not specific to the construction in question. Given our analysis, there is no syntactic restriction on the VX1 in the /a-ka/-CONST.

5. AUX-construction

There is another class of multi-verb constructions which have been traditionally analyzed as taking as their VX2 the so-called auxiliary verbs. In spite of their morphosyntactic similarities to the /a-ka/-CONST, Choi
(1971) distinguishes them from the /a-ka/-CONST, viewing the former as syntactic phrases and the latter as lexical compounds. In the following discussion, this construction illustrated in (24-26) will be referred to as AUX-CONST, and the subclass of verbs occurring in VX2 as AUX.

It should be noted, however, that I will not make any theoretical commitment to the traditional label AUX, except that it is a syntactically motivated subcategory of verbs. After all, the category of AUX may be language-specific, motivated only by reference to a certain set of syntactic operations (e.g. Subj-Aux-Inversion in English). However, the set of syntactic operations used to establish the category of AUX in one language may not be available in other languages. Therefore, what I call AUX in Korean does not directly correspond to the category of AUX motivated in many European languages.

(24) a. Tom-i ka-a peli-ass-ta
   -NOM go abandon-PAST-DEC
   'Tom went (already).'

   b. Tom-i ppang-ul mek-a peli-ass-ta
   -NOM bread-ACC eat abandon-PAST-DEC
   'Tom ate the bread (already).'

(25) a. Tom-i ka-a po-ass-ta
   -NOM go see-PAST-DEC
   'Tom went (as a trial).'

   b. Tom-i ppang-ul mek-a po-ass-ta
   -NOM bread-ACC eat see-PAST-DEC
   'Tom ate the bread (as a trial)/ Tom tried and ate the bread.'

(26) a. Tom-i ka-a chu-ass-ta
   -NOM go give-PAST-DEC
   'Tom went (for somebody salient in the discourse).'

   b. Tom-i ppang-ul mek-a chu-ass-ta
   -NOM bread-ACC eat give-PAST-DEC
   'Tom ate the bread (for somebody salient in the discourse).'

Based on our previous discussion about the /a/-CONST, /ko/-CONST, and /a-ka/-CONST, we will describe the characteristics of the AUX-CONST only briefly. Basically, their morphosyntactic characteristics are exactly the same as the /a-ka/-CONST, except for their negation potentials:

i) The particle /-a/ is used to combine two VXs with no morphosyntactic cooccurrence restrictions on VX1,
ii) no modifiers intervene between the two VXs,
iii) only VX2 is marked for tense, but both VXs are interpreted to share
the same tense,
iv) the relation between VXs is hypotactic rather than paratactic, so that the head V (i.e. AUX) subcategorizes for a complement VP.

Unlike the /a-/CONST or /a-ka/-CONST, however, the VP-complement can be independently negated, as in (27). I will give only one example of negation, but the same pattern applies to all the other examples of AUX-CONST.

(27) ku ppmang-ul mek-ci mal-a chu-o
the bread-ACC eat not give-IMP

'Please, don't eat the bread.'

The branching of the head V and its complement VP is supported by the lack of intervening modifiers between two VXs. The branching is also supported by the following examples, in which the complement VP serves as an antecedent of a VP-anaphoric expression /kulekhe ha/ (i.e. DO SO in English).

(28) a. John-un [vp sukce-lul kkutnay ]-a peli-ass-ta
-IM homework-ACC finish abandon-PAST-DEC

'John has already finished the homework.'

b. na-do [vp kulekhe ha ]-a peli-ass-ta
I-too so do abandon-PAST-DEC

'I have already done so, too.'

The VP-anaphor /kulekhe ha/ in (28b) receives the same interpretation as that of the complement VP of AUX-CONST in (28a). This VP-anaphoric pattern is found not only in AUX-CONST, but also in another hypotactic construction, i.e. /a-ka/-CONST, as illustrated in (29).

(29) a. John-un [vp konghwatang-ul ciciha ]-a o-ass-ta
-IM republican-ACC support come-PAST-DEC

'John has supported the republican party so far.'

b. Mary-to [vp kulekhe ha ]-a o-ass-ta
-IM so do come-PAST-DEC

'John has done so, so far.'

This VP-anaphoric possibility not only indicates the internal constituency of the hypotactic constructions, but also helps resolve the controversy over the morphosyntactic status of the constructions, as will be discussed in the next section.

Another short comment on the subcategory of AUX is in order. As in the /a-ka/-CONST, the head Vs in the AUX-CONST (i.e. /peli/ 'abandon', /po/ 'see', /cu/ 'give', etc) can be independently used as simple transitive verbs. If the AUX-CONST involves a simple VP coordination as in the /ko/-CONST or /a/-CONST, we expect the object NPs in (24b), (25b), and (26b) to be shared by both VXs. However, as implied by the corresponding translations, that is not the case.
The semantic type of the head V (i.e. AUX) in AUX-CONST is the same as that of English AUX, in that it takes the preceding VP as its arguments: its semantic contribution is, in a sense, similar to that of VP adverbials, as represented into a quasi-predicate logic as below:

\[(30)\]  
\[\text{a. } \text{VP-a peli} \Rightarrow [\text{peli'}(\text{VP'})] \quad \text{'already VP'}\]  
\[\text{abandon}\]  
\[\text{b. } \text{VP-a po} \Rightarrow [\text{po'}(\text{VP'})] \quad \text{'VP, as a trial'}\]  
\[\text{see}\]  
\[\text{c. } \text{VP-a cu} \Rightarrow [\text{cu'}(\text{VP'})] \quad \text{'VP for someone salient}\]  
\[\text{give}\]  
\[\text{in the discourse'}\]

As noted in the previous section, the deictic force of the verbs of coming/goings is transparently carried over to the /a-ka/-CONST. However the semantics/pragmatics of AUXs in AUX-CONST is not related to that of their independently used homonyms. There might be some diachronic account of each pair of homonyms. Synchronically, however, it seems impossible to establish a systematic pattern of correlation between such homonym pairs. In addition to the difference in their meaning, AUXs form a subclass of verbs which subcategorize for a VP, whereas their independently used homonyms are simple transitive verbs. Thus, I will assume that they are indeed different lexemes.

6. Idioms or syntactic constructions?

Up to this point, I have compared and contrasted four different multi-verb constructions, with an implicit assumption that they are indeed syntactic phrases. On the other hand, most previous analyses have treated them as verbal compounds, that is, as if they are lexical units (i.e. word rank categories). However, there is reason to believe that they are not word rank categories.

First, independent modification of VXs, and intervening modifiers between VXs indicate that the two paratactic constructions (i.e. /ko/-CONST and /a/-CONST) are indeed VPs. Second, as for the hypotactic constructions (i.e. /a-ka/-CONST and AUX-CONST), no adverbial modifiers intervene between the complement VP and the head V. But their behavior with respect to a VP-anaphoric expression indicates that they are not lexical units. That is because lexical items are anaphoric islands.

In a now classic paper, Postal (1969) proposed the following constraint on coreference between anaphors and parts of lexical items:

\[(31)\]  
\[\text{Lexical items are anaphoric islands with respect to outbound anaphora involving the pro verb phrase do so. (= Postal's Constraint E)}\]

This constraint is illustrated below in (32), using Postal's annotation of judgment:

\[(32)\]  
\[\text{*Max wanted to} \text{strangle the monster, but Peter wanted to do so with poison. (strangle = 'kill by choking')}\]
(33) a. People who support McCarthy sometimes deny they do so.
   b. *McCarthyites sometimes deny they do so.

These examples are evidence that pro VP anaphor cannot be coreferential with material which is part of the meaning of monomorphic items (e.g. (32)) or complex lexical items (e.g. (33b)). Thus, assuming that lexical items (regardless of their internal complexity) are anaphoric islands, one must conclude that the multi-verb constructions in Korean are not lexical units, but syntactic phrases.

Still another piece of evidence that the multi-verb constructions are not lexical units comes from the distribution of the plural marker in Korean. It is well known that the plural marker /tul/ in Korean can float from the subject NP to any syntactic units in a sentence, like 'floated quantifiers' in English. This floated plural marker can occur even between the VX1 and VX2 of the multi-verb constructions, as in (34):

(34) a. kutul-un pap-ul mek-ko-tul ka-ass-ta
    they -IM rice-ACC eat- PL go-PAST-DEC
    'They ate rice and went.'

   b. kutul-un koki-lul cap-a-tul mek-ass-ta
    they -IM fish-ACC bake PL eat-PAST-DEC
    'They baked and ate fish.'

   c. kutul-un koki-lul cap-a-tul o-ass-ta
    they -IM fish-ACC catch PL come-PAST-DEC
    'They caught fish and brought it.'

   d. kutul-un koki-lul cap-a-tul peli-ass-ta
    they -IM fish-ACC catch PL abandon-PAST-DEC
    'They have already caught the fish.'

If the distribution of the floated plural marker is to be accounted for within syntax, and if we further assume that syntax is blind to the internal structures of lexical units, one must conclude that the multi-verb constructions are indeed syntactic phrases.

Therefore, the traditional label 'compounding' needs to be taken with a grain of salt. In fact, most previous studies of such constructions did not posit a theoretical distinction between the lexical component and the syntactic component of grammar. What they implicitly claim by classifying some multi-verb constructions as lexical compounding is simply that the properties associated with the construction is 'idiomatic'. Yes, they are idiomatic in the sense that not all the properties of such constructions directly follow from their syntactic structures and general semantic/pragmatic principles: some properties must be treated as being associated with templates over representations, rather than with individual representations. However such negative characterization of the idiomaticity alone does not help determine whether a complex expression is an idiom or a syntactic construction.
Obviously, previous analyses did not bother to draw a clear line between idioms and syntactic constructions, as suggested in the following paragraph from Yang (197:227): on one end of the scale falls the case in which unit verbs are so closely fused that they form an organic whole, and on the other end falls the case in which unit verbs are each identifiable as unit verbs of a type of verbal conjunction.

This lack of division between syntax and lexicon is not a trend unique to studies of Korean. As noted by Fillmore, Kay & O'Connor (1988; hereafter FKO) and Zwicky (1989b) among others, most of the current frameworks for language description do not make room for the proper description of constructions. Even FKO do not make any significant distinction between idioms and syntactic constructions. Thus their descriptions of a construction may make a direct reference to lexical, semantic, and pragmatic information, not to mention syntactic information. Even in the description of syntactic information, it is not confined to a local tree consisting of mother and her daughters, but may span wider range of sentential tree. According to them, lexical items, being mentionable in syntactic constructions, may be viewed, in many cases at least, as constructions themselves.

But Zwicky (1989d) convincingly argues that there are (at least) theoretical reasons for distinguishing lexicon from syntax. He agrees with FKO that constructions may be idiomatic in a sense that a large construction may specify a 'construction specific' semantic/pragmatics. However he argues that the idiomaticity may derive from the lexicon or from the syntax: i.e. lexical idiosyncrasies must be distinguished from syntactic idiosyncrasies.

What is needed for the division of syntax and lexicon is, then, some restrictive guiding principles that determine the kinds of information relevant to syntactic description. One of such principles is the 'Principle of Morphology-Free Syntax' in Zwicky's program of modular grammar such that 'syntactic rules are blind to strictly morphological information' (see Zwicky (1989 a,b,c,d) for further discussion). Unless we want to abandon virtually all the component-separation assumptions in most modern syntactic theories, syntactic rules (or descriptions of syntactic constructions) must not make reference to 'item-specific' content such as internal structures or derivational history of a lexical unit.

Now, the question I have raised at the beginning of this section (i.e. a lexical unit or a syntactic phrase?) is shifted to another question, 'idioms or syntactic constructions?' And the answer to this question crucially depends on whether all the description of the multi-verb constructions can be made by only syntactically relevant information under the principle of morphology-free syntax.

6.1. Formal characterization of each construction

Let's consider how the multi-verb constructions discussed so far figure in such a restrictive view of grammar. A proper description of a complex expression must involve information about constituency and linear ordering, various properties of the constituents (e.g (sub)category membership, ranks (or Bar levels)), grammatical functions, and construction-specific semantics/pragmatics. Based on the discussions in the previous sections, we
can now summarize the kinds of information required for the description of the multi-verb constructions, as follows.

**CONSTITUENCY, LINEAR ORDERING**: /ko/-CONST and /a/-CONST have a paratactic construction, whereas the others (i.e. /a-ka/-CONST, AUX-CONST) have a hypotactic construction with VX2 as its head. The two paratactic constructions combines VPs, whereas the hypotactic constructions involves a complement VP preceding a head V.

**RESTRICTIONS ON THE VXs**: the paratactic constructions impose no special constraint on the conjunct VPs, whereas the hypotactic constructions require the head verb to belong a specific subclass of verbs: the head V of /a-ka/-CONST must be a verb of coming/going, and the head V of AUX-CONST an AUX.

**SEMANTICS/PRAGMATICS**: /ko/-CONST is simply a conjunction, syntactically and semantically, as well. /a/-CONST is specified for single assertion in addition to the semantics for conjunction. The hypotactic constructions requires no stipulated semantic principles: the head V serves as a semantic function taking the complement VP as its argument.

### 6.2. Apparent syncategorematicity of the particles

All the above properties of the multi-verb constructions can be described in the syntactic component without making reference to item-specific content. However, there is still one remaining problem which defies an easy solution: i.e. the treatment of particles like /-ko/ and /-a/ which attach to the end of VXs and serve as the obligatory marks of the syntactic constructions. A syntactic analysis of the multi-verb constructions cannot be complete without making it explicit how a syntactic component makes reference to these particles.

One of the most obvious analytical options is to treat them syncategorematically, thus allowing syntactic rules to directly refer to the specific morpheme /ko/ or /a/ as such, without assigning them to any lexical or grammatical categories. This practice has actually been made in most analyses of constructions in Korean, and in many other languages, as well. For example, as noted by Pullum (1982), Chomsky (1957) formulates syntactic rules which directly introduce be, by, do, en, have, ing, not, n't, to, etc. syncategorematically. Another recent example is KROG's position that 'lexical items, being mentionable in syntactic constructions, may be viewed...as constructions themselves'.

However, such a syncategorematic treatment of lexical items is undesirable, since it makes syntactic constructions just as item-specific as any idiom, rejecting a theoretical distinction between lexicon and syntax. Certainly, a restrictive framework including the Principle of Morphology-Free Syntax will not allow such an analytical option. For much the same reason, they cannot be treated as derivational affixes, either.

Then, what other analytical options are available? Before we go on, it should be noted that the traditional label 'particle' is a descriptive label, rather than a theoretical construct. For convenience, however, I will keep using the term particle as a descriptive label, without attributing any theoretical status to it.
Among other analytical options, we may treat them (i) as inflectional suffixes, (ii) as postpositions, (ii) as phrasal affixes, or (iii) as bound words. Inflectional affixes serve as marks of syntactic constructions in the same way adpositions do. What one language does with inflections, another does with adpositions. Even within a single language, adpositions can occur in alternation with inflections. Both inflectional affixes and particle lexemes are treated as the realization of grammatical features.

Phrasal affixes (e.g. the English possessive 's) are very much like inflectional affixes. Thus, they are also treated as the realization of grammatical features which are distributed in the syntax via feature passing conventions. However, unlike inflectional affixes, phrasal affixes are realized, in most cases, on the leftmost or rightmost member of a constituent.

Bound words behave just like independent words syntactically but, phonologically, they are dependent on adjacent words. (see Zwicky 1989 (a,b,c), for a more detailed discussion)

In principle, all four options mentioned above are workable, as long as one can motivate their categorial/grammatical features which syntax can make reference to. In the following discussion, I will pursue, without argument, an option of treating the particles as inflectional affixes (i.e. realizations of grammatical features distributed by syntactic rules). This inflectional analysis can, I believe, be modified to be compatible to other analytical options if there is evidence to the contrary.

Assuming their morphological status as inflectional affixes, we have to determine what grammatical features they realize. This is not an easy task. On one hand, /ko/ and /a/ seem to serve as a mark of conjunction in the two paratactic constructions (i.e. /ko/-CONST and /a/-CONST). On the other hand, particle /a/ can also serve as a mark of VP-complement in the two paratactic constructions (i.e. /a-ko/-CONST and AUX-CONST). In addition, it is not clear whether the particles make any consistent meaning contribution in their occurrences in different constructions. The obvious question is, then, what the grammatical category of the particle /a/ is: is it a conjunction or a VP-complementizer, or simply a "shape property" which can be referred to by several syntactic rules.

Before we answer this question, it should be noted that it is not unique to Korean morphosyntax for a particle (or a grammatical category) to serve as marks of several syntactic functions. For example, the English PRP (present participle) is used both in progressives VPs (e.g., They were playing the piano) and in postnominal VP modifiers (e.g., Anyone having a hat on will be arrested); similarly, the English PSP (past participle) is used both in passive VPs (e.g., They were praised by everyone) and in perfect VPs (e.g., They have praised everyone). (for more similar examples, see Zwicky (1989a)).

Thus, strange as it may look initially, there is nothing special for Korean particle /a/ to serve as a mark of different constructions. In addition, as Zwicky (1989a,c) notes, such a particle (or 'particlexeme' in his term) might have a characteristic semantics of its own, but this is only a default and can be overridden by the semantics associated with the construction. Accordingly, it is not always possible to find a 'meaning' for
such a particle in all its occurrences. After all, particles or inflectional affixes are not like ordinary lexemes in that they are specialized as a grammatical mark (or 'as a counter in the game of syntax', as Zwicky (1989c) puts it).

Bearing such complex properties of particles in mind, I will assume that their default function is to be used 'as a counter in the game of syntax', with no inherent lexical semantics. I further propose that the grammatical category of these particles is VFORM. The subcategories of VFORM may also realize some other grammatical categories (e.g. case, number, tense, aspect, polarity, etc), or they may be simply part of certain 'shape properties' to serve as a mark of particular constructions.

This apparently innocent claim implicitly embodies an important metatheoretical assumption to the effect that there is a universal morphosyntactic feature set and that such features as [SERIAL] and [CONJ] are just some items from the universal set that the grammar of a particular language makes available for certain purposes. Such features as [SERIAL] and [CONJ] are indeed good candidates for the members of a universal feature set, since all languages, as far as we know, make use of coordinate constructions, and the so-called serial verb constructions are found in a very wide range of languages, as witnessed by this mini-conference on serial verbs. The /a/-CONST and /a-ka/-CONST are very similar to typical serial verb constructions in many respects (e.g. the requirement of same external arguments and the semantics of single assertion).

It happens to be the case that these features are cashed out by inflectional affixes in Korean, but they can, in principle, be associated with an intonation contour, or even with a zero in other languages, (just as a yes-no question is marked by an intonation contour in one language but by a particle or inflection in other languages).

7. Syntax of the Multi-verb constructions

Now that the feature specifications of the particles are motivated, I will provide morphosyntactic rules and operations whereby a particular FORM value is distributed and realized, using the formalism in Gazdar et. al. (1985) and in Zwicky (1985).

To account for a Korean fragment including the multi-verb constructions, the following FS rules need to be posited. For ease of exposition, I will not provide rules for the case marking of NPs and the double subject construction. [VFORM, SERIAL] will be shortened as [SERIAL], in addition to some conventional abbreviations.

Head Features and Feature values

\[
\text{VFORM} \rightarrow \{ \text{SERIAL, BSE, FIN,} \ldots \}
\]

FS Rules

\[
\begin{align*}
S & \rightarrow \text{NP, VP} \\
\text{VP} & \rightarrow H(\text{CONJ}), H \\
\text{VP} & \rightarrow H(\text{SERIAL}), H
\end{align*}
\]
VP $\rightarrow$ VP[SERIAL], $H^4[3]$  
$V[3] \rightarrow /ka/ 'go', /o/ 'come', /tani/ 'come and go'$

VP $\rightarrow$ VP[SERIAL], $H^1[4]$  
$V[4] \rightarrow /pel/ 'abandon', /po/ 'see', /cu/ 'give', /noh/ 'put'$

FCR (Feature Cooccurrence Restriction)
FCR 1: [SERIAL] $\gg$ [BSE]

FSD (Feature Specification Default)
FSD 1: $-$[SERIAL]
FSD 2: $-$[CONT]

Having these rules in the syntax, such particles as /ko/ and /a/ are introduced as a morphosyntactic feature (i.e. VFORM) by 'government' or directly by PS rules. This feature VFORM then are eventually passed down to the head verb by a feature trickling convention (e.g. the Head Feature Convention in GPSG). The morphosyntactic representation of a verb will then be spelled out in the lexical component.

For the sake of completeness, I provide inflectional rules for the VFORMs in (35-36), using the formalism in Zwicky (1985) in which Realization Rules (RRs) and morphological operations (OPs) are distinguished.

(35) RR 32: In the context of [V:+, Bar:0], [FORM:SERIAL] is realized by operation 32.

(36) OP 32: Suffix /a/ in the second inflectional slot.

In this account, it is assumed that all inflectional categories are assigned inflectional slots whose number is determined by the number of inflections that can occur on the stem. The exact slot number that the realization of a particular inflection will occupy depends on the interaction among various inflectional categories. Part of the interaction among them can be accounted for partially via Feature Cooccurrence Restrictions in syntax. For example, the FCR 1: SERIAL $\gg$ [BSE] will account for the lack of tense/aspect when [VFORM:SERIAL] is realized. The interaction among morphosyntactic features can also be resolved by some 'slot competition' statement in the inflectional component, the full account of which goes beyond the scope of this paper. (For a discussion of slot competition, see Zwicky (1985, 1988, 1989a) and references cited there)

8. Closing statement

To summarize the main points in this paper, I have proposed a fine classification of multi-verb constructions involving such particles as /a/ and /ko/, and a syntactic analysis of them within a restrictive grammar. During the discussion of the constructions, I provided a semantic/pragmatic account of a traditional puzzle concerning the distinction between /ko/-CONST and /a/-CONST (more specifically /a-ka/-CONST). The solution to the traditional puzzle based on my argument that the subject's coming/going in /a-ka/-CONST is not a semantic entailment but a pragmatic implicature. Then I discussed another
controversy over the morphosyntactic status of the constructions, and claimed that they are indeed syntactic phrases, based on the lack of intervening modifiers on one hand, and on their VP-anaphoric potential, on the other. Finally, to complete the syntactic analysis of the constructions, I took an analytical option of treating the particles as inflections. And their morphosyntactic feature specifications (e.g. [VFORM:SERIAL]) are motivated on the basis of general behavior of particlexesemes.

The above morphosyntactic analysis is, admittedly, only sketch. After all, the success of any syntactic analysis will crucially depend on whether it can be matched with an appropriate analysis in the lexical component. However, the main thrust of this paper is to entertain a possible analysis of the multi-verb constructions within a restrictive grammar including the Principle of Morphology-Free Syntax, rather than to provide any definitive answer to the realization of grammatical features in lexical component.

There are some other related multi-verb construction which I failed to cover in this paper. Those other multi-verb constructions are also marked by particles like /ke/ and /ci/, posing questions similar to that raised in this paper. A more refined syntactic account of the multi-verb constructions in general will be made possible only if we expand our database to all the nominal and verbal postpositions serving various morphosyntactic functions.

*This paper was originally written for an independent study with Prof. Arnold M. Zwicky at OSU in Autumn Quarter, 1988. I thank Prof. Zwicky for helpful comments. I also thank Prof. David R. Dowty who first drew my attention to serial verbs. I also owe thanks to Prof. Brian D. Joseph for his encouragement. Of course, I assume sole responsibility for the content of the present paper.

1. Transcriptions of Korean words in the text are within slashes (i.e. /) and the following abbreviations are used in the gloss: NOM: Nominative, ACC: Accusative, DEC: Declarative, IMP: Imperative, PRS: Present tense, PAST: Past tense, TM: Topic Marker, PL: Plural, HON: Honorific

2. There are two means of negation, i.e. lexical negation by a prefix /an/, and periphrastic negation /-ci anija/. The two negation differ in their scope properties: in general, the periphrastic negation has the preceding VP as its scope, whereas the lexical negation has the following verb as its scope.

3. Korean allows a great degree of freedom in the ordering of sister constituents, except that the head must invariably occur at the phrase-final position. Thus it is often claimed to be a non-configurational language. I will not take any definite stance about the issue of configurationality. I believe, however, that such a notion as 'locality', represented by local constituent structures, must be captured somewhere in the grammar in order to account for some structure-dependent phenomena (e.g. the domain of anaphoric binding).
4. See Nevis (1985) and Zwicky (1985b, 1989d), for a taxonomy of 'little words'.

5. This statement that such morphosyntactic features are realized by inflectional affixes need not be understood from the viewpoint of 'morpheme-based' morphology.

6. Zwicky (1987) claims that there is an instance of the serial verb construction even in English, i.e. the so-called 'GO-verb' construction.

7. To avoid unnecessary complications, I will provide syntactic rules in the traditional PS rule format, instead of the ID rules and IP statements in Gazdar et al. (1985)
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