V-e V Constructions Redux*

YoungSik Choi

(Soonchunhyang University)

Choi, YoungSik. (2014). *V-e V* Constructions Redux. *The Linguistic Association of Korea Journal,* 22(1), 31-49. I address two types of verbal concatenation constructions in Korean in the form of *V-e V*, which has been a topic of much controversy in the literature with regard to its structure. I argue that what I call type I is ambiguous in structure in that it is construed as either monoclausal or biclausal, whereas type II is always construed as monoclausal. I thus crucially diverge from the common view in the literature, according to which both types are uniformly biclausal or monoclausal (Lee 1976, Yang 1976, Choe 1988, Kim 1993, Lee 1993, Choi 2001). It will be shown that a variety of tests including scope of negation and manner adverbials, along with the distribution of negative polarity items in Korean lend support to the present thesis that the two types are different in their clausal structure.

Key Words: serial, auxiliary, negation, event, monoclausal

1. Introduction

A serial verb construction, also known as verb serialization, refers to a sequence of verbs which behaves as a single predicate, with no overt grammatical marker that indicates coordination, subordination or other syntactic dependency, as illustrated below in (1) with English examples.

(1) a. I **go visit** Harry every Thursday.
    b. If we **go ask** Harry, will he be able to tell us?
      (Pesetsky 1977: 84)

The constructions are common in Creole languages, many African, Asian, and New Guinean languages, among others (see Christaller 1875, Westerman 1930, Ansre 1966, Sebba 1987, Baker 1989, Campbell 1989, Joseph and Zwicky 1990, Baker 1991, Lefebvre 1991, Manfredi 1991, Lee 1993, Collins 1997, and Payne 2011, among others). Serial verbs come in a variety of forms across languages. They may come next to each other as in English above in (1), or separate from each other by an NP as in Twi below in (2), as schematically represented below in (3).

(2) a. Kofi **de** pono no **baae** (Twi)
Kofi take-PAST table the come-PAST
'Kofi brought the table.'
 b. Kofi **gyee** Amma **dii**
Kofi receive-PAST Amma eat-PAST
'Kofi believed Amma.'
(Sebba 1987: 1)

(3) a. V V (English)
 b. V NP V (Twi)

Verbal serialization has recently been a topic of much debate across languages, and has demonstrated that its structure is very often more than meets the eyes on the surface (see Stewart 2001, among others). When it comes to Korean, the following examples in (4-5) where two verbs are concatenated to form *V-e V* via the morpheme *e*, which I call a linking morpheme, has received a lot of discussion in various forms (see Lee 1976, Yang 1976, Choi 1988, Lee 1993, Kim 1993, Choi 2001, among others).

(4) John-i koki-lul ikhy-**e** mekessta.
John-NOM meat-ACC cook-E ate
'John cooked the meat and ate it.'
(5) John-i koki-lul mek-**e** poassta.
John-NOM meat-ACC eat-E tried
'John tried to eat meat.'

A close look at the sentences in (4-5) reveals a certain difference in the semantics of the two verbs, although they look the same on the surface with the same form of *V-e V*. Both verbs in (4) maintain their own meaning whereas in (5) the second verb loses its own meaning but serves to express fine shades of meaning of the first verb. [1] So, *poassta* 'saw' is not construed literally as *saw* but *tried*. Throughout, I will call the sentence as in (4) type I, and the one as in (5) type II, respectively. Type II is also known as auxiliary verb construction in the literature (Lee 1992, Sohn 1994, among others). Throughout, I will use *poassta* 'saw' as the representative second verb for type II unless otherwise deemed necessary.

2. Structure for Type I and Type II

It has been quite a controversy whether the sentences as in (4-5) are monoclausal in structure, with the controversy mostly evolving around the syntactic status of the morpheme *e* in *V-e V* (see Lee 1976, Yang 1976, Choe 1988, Lee 1993, Kim 1993, Choi 2001, among others). It has been argued by some researchers that the morpheme is INFL (Choi 1988), or COMP (Lee 1976, Yang 1976). These authors converge to the extent that the sentences in (4-5) are biclausal across the board, abstracting away from the difference in the precise nature of the linking morpheme. In the meantime, Lee (1993), following Kang (1988), suggests that the linking morpheme *e* in both (4) and (5), albeit with no lexical content, is required. since every Korean verb is a bound morpheme that requires the presence of at least one verb-final suffix to stand alone. Lee argues that both types in (4-5) are monoclausal. Lee's proposal is mostly based on the distribution of the honorific morpheme (HM, henceforth). Assuming that Korean allows only one honorific morpheme *si* per clause, Lee suggests that it can appear only once per each sentence in type I and type II, arguing both types are monoclausal. However, the following sentence in (6), which is type II, has more than one honorific morpheme (HM, henceforth) *si* in it, immediately

---

[1] The verb representing the fine shade of meaning of the other verb is limited in number, typically including verbs such as *pelita* 'throw away' *nayta*, 'bring out' *ota* 'come' *kata* 'go' *tayt*a 'supply' *nohta* 'put' *cwuta* 'give' *pota* 'see' (see Kim 1984 for related discussion).

falsifying Lee's claim: 2)

   (6) Kyoswu-nim-i   swul-ul   tu-si-**e**
       professor-HM-NOM   alcohol-ACC   drink-HM-E
       po-si-essta.
       try-HM-PAST
       'The professor tried to drink alcohol.'

Below, I will use various tests to show whether type I and type II are monoclausal or not in their structure, starting from negation and manner adverbials, whose scope is typically confined to the immediate clause where it occurs.

2.1. Scope of Negation

   It is a wellknown fact that the scope of negation is confined to the immediate clause where it occurs.

   (7) a. John does not know that the earth is round.
       b. John knows that the earth is not square.

The sentence in (7a) thus does not mean 'John does not know that the earth is not round.' Nor does the one in (7b) mean 'John does not know that the earth is not square.' Now, let us consider sentences with negation representing type I and type II as below in (8) and (9) to check their precise clausal status.

   (8) John-i   koki-lul   an   ikhy-**e**   mekessta. (type I)
       John-NOM meat-ACC NOT cook-E   ate
       'John did not cook the meat and eat it.'
       (NOT> cook and eat)
       'John did not cook the meat and ate it.'
       (NOT > cook)

---

2) As an anonymous reviewer correctly points out, it is quite a controversy whether the phenomenon of honorification is part of grammar or pragmatics.

(9) John-i   koki-lul   an mek-**e**   poassta. (type II)
    John-NOM meat-ACC   NOT eat-E   tried
    'John did not try to eat the meat.'
    (NOT > try to eat)

As indicated in the glosses above in (8-9), type I, quite in contrast to type II, is ambiguous with respect to the scope of negation. Negation can take scope over either the entire verbs in *V-e V*, which I call wide scope, or over the first verb, which I call narrow scope. In the mean time, negation can only take wide scope in type II. For those skeptical about the wide scope reading of the negation over the entire verbs in (8), the following sentence in (10) serves to confirm that negation in (8) can indeed take wide scope.

(10) John-i   koki-lul   an ikhy-**e** mek-ko nal kesulo
     John-NOM meat-ACC NOT cook-E   ate-KO raw
     nayngcangko-ey   pokwanhayssta.
     refrigerator-in   kept
     'John did not cook the meat and kept it raw in the refrigerator.'

The fact that negation in (8) can either take narrow or wide scope in (8), whereas it can take only wide scope in (9) leads one to believe that both types are not exactly the same in structure.

2.2. Scope of Manner Adverbials

Next, let us turn to a manner adverbial, another expression wellknown for its scope being confined to the immediate clause where it occurs. For this, consider the following in (11) and (12):

(11) John-i   koki-lul   ceppalli ikhy-**e** mekessta.(type I)
     John-NOM meat-ACC quickly cook-E ate
     'John quickly cooked and ate the meat.'
     (quickly >cook and eat)
     'John quickly cooked the meat and ate it.'

     (quickly >cook)

(12) John-i   koki-lul   ceppalli ikhy-**e** poassta.(type II)
     John-NOM meat-ACC quickly cook-E tried
     'John quickly tried to cook the meat.'
     (quickly > try to cook)

As indicated in the glosses, type I in (11), in contrast to type II in (12), is ambiguous with respect to the scope of the manner adverbial *ceppalli* 'quickly.' The manner adverbial can take either wide scope over the entire verbs or narrow scope over the first verb in *V-e V* in type I above in (11), whereas it can only take wide scope in type II in (12). The scope fact in type I and type II regarding the negation and the manner adverbial with respect to *V-e V* in (8-9) and (11-12) thus strongly suggests that the two types have different structures. Specifically, the fact that the negation and the manner adverbial can either take wide or narrow scope in type I with respect to *V-e V* suggests that *V-e V* forms either a single predicate in the same clause, or a separate one, each belonging to a separate clause. When the two verbs in *V-e V* form a single predicate within the same clause, the negation and the manner adverbial can thus take scope over the entire verbs, whereas when they form separate predicates, each belonging to a separate clause, the scope of the manner adverbial and the negation is necessarily confined to the first verb. I thus suggest the following structures in (13) for type I (with irrelevant details such as *pro* suppressed).

    (13) a.[$_{IP}$NP-NOM NP-ACC [$_V$ V-e V]] monoclausal (type I)
        b.[$_{IP}$NP-NOM [$_{CP}$ NP-ACC V-e] V] biclausal

As one can see in (13), type I is either monoclausal as in (13a) or biclausal as in (13b), a conclusion as drawn from the scope fact of the manner adverbial and the negation with respect to *V-e V*. I also suggest that the embedded clause in (13b) is an adjunct CP since it is characteristic of Korean subordinate clauses that they are generally nonfinite without tense and sentence ending morphemes (see Sohn 1994: 53ff). Now, from the two structures above in (13), the narrow and wide scope of the negation and the manner adverbial with respect to *V-e V* in (8-9) and (11-12) follow in a straightforward manner, as schematically

represented below in (14a) and (14b), respectively, with MA standing for the manner adverbial.[3]

(14) a. [IP NP-NOM NP-ACC   { NOT/ MA} [V V-e V]]
          ({NOT/ MA} > V-e V)
      b. [IP NP-NOM [CP NP-ACC { NOT/ MA} V-e] V]
          ({NOT/ MA > V)

Meanwhile, the scope fact in type II in (8-9) and (11-12), according to which the negation and the manner adverbial can take only wide scope with respect to *V-e V* suggests that the concatenation necessarily forms a single predicate within the same clause. Based on this scope fact, I now suggest the following structure for type II for the sentences above in (8-9) and (11-12) (with irrelevant details such as *pro* suppressed):

(15) [IP NP-NOM NP-ACC [V V-e V]] monoclausal (type II)

With the structure in (15) for type II, the wide scope reading of the negation and the manner adverbial with respect to *V-e V* follows quite straightforwardly, as schematically represented below in (16).

(16) [IP NP-NOM   NP-ACC { NOT/ MA} [V V-e V]]
      ({ NOT/ MA} > V-e V)

2.3. Morpheme *e* in *V‒e V* in Type I and Type II

As we saw thus far, type I and type II have overlapping property of monoclausality in that type I is either monoclausal or biclausal, whereas type II is always monoclausal. When type I is analyzed as monoclausal, the *V-e V* forms a single predicate just like type II. Now a question immediately arises: What is the nature of the linking morpheme *e* in type I and type II?   As briefly

---

3) I assume both the negation and the manner adverbial is adjoined to VP, although not explicitly represented in the structure. Choi (2013), among others, presents various arguments for *an* 'not' as a VP adverbial.

mentioned in section 2, there have been various proposals made regarding the precise nature of the morpheme *e*. Some suggest that it is INFL (Lee 1976 and Yang 1976, among others) and others suggest that it is COMP (see Choe 1988). Still others suggest that it has no syntactic status (see Kang 1988, Lee 1993). That being said, one cannot define the nature of the morpheme in an across the board fashion for both types, especially given the present proposal for their structures. At this point, a natural guess is the morpheme *e* may wear more than a single hat. Let us first address the case where both types have a monoclausal structure in (13a) and (15), respectively. To the extent that both types admit monoclausal structures, it follows that the morpheme *e* is not something like INFL or COMP, hence falsifying the proposal for INFL or COMP. Does the morpheme then have no syntactic status as Kang (1988) and Lee (1993) suggest? A careful investigation into the morpheme *e* in the sequence of *V-e V*, however, reveals a clear difference in the two types. In type II, it is a syntactic marker of aspect. As one can see below in (17) with type II, the morpheme *e,* coupled with the second verb, can represent various types of aspect: perfective, continuous and attemptive in (17a), (17b) and (17c), respectively (Sohn 1999: 327).

(17) a. John-i   chayk-ul   elyese-pwute ilk-**e**   wassta.
        John-NOM book-ACC   young-since   read-E came
       'John has read books since young.'
    b. Palam-i   congil pwul-**e**   taynta.
       wind-NOM   day   blow-E   continue
       'The wind is blowing all day long.'
    c. John-i   ku chayk-ul   ilk-**e**   poassta.
       John-NOM   that book-ACC read-E tried
       'John tried to read a book.'

Meanwhile, the linking morpheme *e* in type I does not represent any particular syntactic function including aspect. An interesting prediction then arises. If the morpheme *e* in type I with a monoclausal structure does not serve to mark any grammatical function, one may expect to find some cases where it simply drops, quite in contrast to type II, where it serves to mark the grammatical function of

aspect. This is confirmed in (18-19).[4][5][6]

(18) a. John-i   ttyu-**e**   nolassta.   (type I)
          John-NOM   run-E   played
          'John ran and played.'
      b. John-i   ttyu-nolassta.
          John-NOM   run-played
          'John ran and played.'
(19) a. John-i   ttyu-**e**   poassta.   (type II)
          John-NOM   run-E   tried
          'John tried to run.'
      b. *John-i   ttyu-poassta.
          John-NOM   run-tried
          'John tried to run.'

---

4) There are numerous instances of *e* drop in *V-e V* in type I. Some of them are listed below.

  (i) *kam-tolta*, 'wind-turn,' *mac-seta*, 'meet-stand' *olk-mayta*, 'bind-tie,'' *na-tulta*,
      'exit-enter.' (see Sohn 1994: 425 for more examples)

5) Although not directly relevant for the present discussion, one may in passing wonder whether type I with a monoclausal structure is a serial verb construction, given that it is monoclausal and the morpheme *e* does not serve to mark any grammatical function including coordination or subordination. Serial verb constructions are known to show the following properties across languages (Sebba 1987, Baker 1989, Collins 1997, Joseph and Zwicky 1990, Payne 2011, among others).

  (i) a. Serial verb construction is mono-clausal, with two or more verbs occurring without any conjunction or subordination or any markers of syntactic dependency.
      b. There is a single tense or aspect specification for serial verb construction.
      c. Serial verb construction shares the same subject and sometimes the same object.
      d. Serial verb construction is a concatenation of sub-events, together representing a single event.

  It seems type I with a monoclausal structure qualifies as a serial verb construction. *V-e V* in (8), for example, shares the same subject and object. It has only one specification of tense for both verbs, and each verb represents a sub-event, together forming a whole event.

6) It should be noted that serial verb constructions are closely related to auxiliary verb constructions cross-linguistically. As observed by Anderson (2006: 11), one of the most common sources of auxiliary verb constructions is serial verb construction. It is thus of no surprise that the two share the same structure.

Next, let us turn to the morpheme *e* in type I with a biclausal structure above in (13b), repeated below as (20b).

(20) a.[IP NP-NOM NP-ACC [V V-eV]] monoclausal (type I)
   b.[IP NP-NOM [CP NP-ACC V-e] V] biclausal

What is the status of the linking morpheme *e* in (20b)? Recall that in our proposal the biclausal structure in (20) contains an adjunct clause, which is CP. Given this structure, I suggest that the morpheme *e* is a syntactic marker of subordinate conjunction.[7]

As we saw thus far, the linking morpheme *e* is ambiguous. It is a marker of

---

7) In a way, type I with the structure in (20b) is like (i), where the linking morpheme *e* is a conjunction.

(i) John-i   [CP montwungi-lul   tul-**e**]   Tom-ul   ttaylyessta.
   John-NOM   bat-ACC   take-E Tom-ACC hit
   'John took the bat and hit Tom.'

The sentence in (i) is clearly biclausal, given that the following sentence with a negative polarity item is ungrammatical:

(ii) *John-i   [CP amwukesto   tul-**e**]   Tom-ul   an   ttaylyessta.
    John-NOM   anything-ACC   take-E Tom-ACC   NOT   hit
    *'John took anything and did not hit Tom.'

As will be discussed in detail in section 4 negative polarity item should satisfy clause mate condition with negation. Also, note that (iii) with the object NP *mongtwungi* 'bat' preposed, is ungrammatical, strongly suggesting the movement violates the adjunct island condition (Huang 1982).

(iii) *Mongtwungi$_i$-lul John-i   [CP t$_i$ tul-**e**]   Tom-ul   ttaylyessta.
     bat-ACC   John-NOM   take-E   Tom-ACC hit
     'John took the bat and hit Tom.'
(iv) John-wa   [boosi-o   nui-**te**]   Mary-ni   aisatusi-ta.
    John-TOP   hat-ACC   take-TE   Mary-DAT g reet-PAST
    'John took off his hat and greeted Mary.'
    (Stewart 2001: 5)

Incidentally, note that the Japanese sentence in (iv) corresponding to (i) is argued as a biclausal construction, with the morpheme *te* serving as a conjunction (see Nishiyama 1995 for related discussion).

aspect for type II. When it comes to type I with a monoclausal structure, it does not serve any grammatical function, whereas with the biclausal structure it serves as a subordinate conjunction. The present proposal for the structure of type I and type II can find immediate support in the following paradigm:

(21) a. John-i   koki-lul ikhy-**e** ceppalli mekessta.(type I)
      John-NOM meat-ACC cook-E quickly ate
    'John cooked the meat and ate it quickly.'
    b. John-i   koki-lul   ikhy-**e-se**   mekessta.
      John-NOM meat-ACC cook-E-CONJ   ate
     'John cooked the meat and ate it.'
(22) a. *John-i   koki-lul mek-**e**   ceppali poassta.(type II)
      John-NOM meat-ACC eat-E quickly tried
    'John quickly tried to eat the meat.'
    b. *John-i   koki-lul   mek-**e-se**   poassta.
      John-NOM meat-ACC eat-E-CONJ   tried
    'John tried to eat the meat.'

The sentences in (21-22) show that the manner adverbial *ceppalli* 'quickly' and the clausal subordinator *se* (see Sohn 1994: 53) can intervene between *V-e V* in type I, but not in type II, a phenomenon independently discussed in Lee (1993) for a completely different reason. [8] Also, with a long pause after the first verb, negation *an* 'not' can intervene in *V-e V* in type I as below in (23).

(23) ?John-i   koki-lul   ikhy-**e** # an   mekessta.
     John-NOM meat-ACC cook-E   NOT   ate
    'John cooked the meat and did not eat it.'

As for type II, however, there is no pause after the first verb, nor can the negation interpose between the two verbs as shown in (24).

---

8) Lee (1993) discusses the phenomenon of the manner adverbial and the clausal subordinator *se* intervening between the two verbs in *V-e V*, only to highlight the difference between what I call type I and type II, falling short of pursuing its implication for different structures.

(24) a. *John-i   koki-lul   mek-**e**   #   poassta.
        John-NOM meat-ACC   eat-E   tried
        'John tried to eat the meat.'

    b. *John-i   koki-lul   mek-**e**   an   poassta.
        John-NOM meat-ACC   eat-E NOT tried
        'John tried to eat the meat.'

From the proposed structures for type I, one can account for why the manner adverbial, the clausal subordinator and the negation can intervene in *V-e V* in type I in (21-23). Recall that type I is ambiguous in structure, either monoclausal or biclausal as shown above in (13) and (20). With the biclausal structure for type I in (13b=(20)), the manner adverbial, the clausal subordinator and the negation can all intervene, since *V-e V* does not form a single predicate. The sentences in (21-23) thus are correctly predicted as grammatical. Meanwhile, when it comes to type II above in (21-22) and (24), it has only one structure in (15), which is monoclausal with *V-e V* forming a single predicate of V, repeated below as (25).

(25) [$_{IP}$ NP-NOM NP-ACC [$_V$ V-e V]] monoclausal (type II)

The manner adverbial, the clausal subordinator, and the negation thus cannot intervene in *V-e V,* leading to ungrammatical sentences in (21-22) and (24). The present proposal can also account for the contrast in grammaticality in the two types in (26-29) involving preposing in type I and type II with (4) and (5), repeated respectively below as (26a) and (27a).

(26) a. John-i   koki-lul   ikhy-**e** mekessta. (type I)
        John-NOM   meat-ACC cook-E ate
        'John cooked the meat and ate it.'
    b. ?[Koki-lul ikhy-**e**]$_i$ John-i   t$_i$ #   mekessta.
         meat-ACC cook-E   John-NOM   ate
        'John cooked the meat and ate it.'

(27) a. John-i   koki-lul   mek-**e** poassta.   (type II)
         John-NOM meat-ACC eat-E   tried
        'John tried to eat meat.'
      b. *[Koki-lul   mek-**e**]ᵢ   John-i   tᵢ   poassta.
          meat-ACC   eat-E   John-NOM   tried
         'John tried to eat the meat.'

(26b) is acceptable, when it accompanies a long pause, whereas (27b) is just ungrammatical. Recall that type I has ambiguous structures. It can be either monoclausal or biclausal. Given that prosodically the long pause in (26b) signals a major constituent boundary, one may interpret it as indicating the two verbs in *V-e V* form a separate predicate, belonging to a separate clause (also see the discussion regarding (23)). Also recall that when type I is construed as biclausal, it has an adjunct CP embedded in the structure under the present system. Now, what is preposed is thus the embedded clause CP in (26b), hence grammatical, not violating any constraint on movement. Type II in (29), in the meantime, is necessarily monoclausal in structure with the two verbs in *V-e V* forming a single predicate. So, what is preposed in (27b) is not a constituent from the very beginning, leading to ungrammaticality.

3. Prediction

The present proposal for the ambiguity in structure for type I in contrast to type II makes an interesting prediction regarding scope of the negation, the manner adverbial, and the negative polarity item.

3.1. Scope of Negation and Manner Adverbial

We suggested that when the manner adverbial, the clausal subordinator and the negation (accompanied with a long pause in case of negation) intervene between the two verbs in *V-e V* in type I, it is necessarily biclausal. The following paradigm in (28-29) where these expressions intervene indeed confirms that:

(28) John-i   koki-lul   an   ikhy-**e-se**   mekessta.
    John-NOM meat-ACC NOT cook-E-CONJ   ate
    'John did not cook the meat and ate it.'
     (NOT > cook), (*NOT > cook and eat)

(29) John-i   koki-lul   ceppali ikhy-**e-se**   mekessta.
    John-NOM meat-ACC   quickly cook-E-CONJ ate
    'John quickly cooked the meat and ate it.'
     (quickly > cook), (*quickly > cook and eat)

(30) John-i   koki-lul   an   ikhy-**e** ceppali mekessta.
    John-NOM meat-ACC NOT cook-E quickly ate
    'John did not cook the meat and ate it.'
     (NOT > cook),   (*NOT > cook and eat)

(31) John-i   koki-lul   ceppalli ikhy-**e** # an mekessta.
    John-NOM meat-ACC quickly cook-E NOT ate
    'John quickly cooked the meat and ate it.'
     (quickly > cook), (*quickly > cook and eat)

The scope of the negation and the manner adverbial in (28-29) is respectively confined to the first verb, with the clausal subordinator *se* intervening in *V-e V*, confirming the biclausal structure as shown above in (20b) for the sentences in (28-29). Also, when the manner adverbial and the negation (accompanied by a long pause) intervene in *V-e V* in (30-31), the negation in (30), and the manner adverbial in (31) can take scope only over the first verb, further confirming the biclausal structure for (30-31).

3.2. Negative Polarity Items

Sentences with negative polarity items below in (32-33) also render support to the biclausal structure for type I, when the manner adverbial, the clausal subordinator, and the negation intervene.

(32) *John-i   amwukokito ikhy-**e-se**   an   mekessta.
    John-NOM any meat   cook-E-CONJ NOT ate
    *'John cooked any meat and did not eat it.'

(33) *John-i   amwukokito ikhy-**e** ppalli   an   mekessta.
     John-NOM meat-ACC   cook-E quickly NOT ate
     *'John cooked any meat and did not eat it quickly.'

It is a well-known fact that Korean negative polarity items should appear in the same clause with negation as shown below in (34).

(34) a. John-un   amwuto   chotayhaci an   hayssta.
        John-TOP   anyone   invite   NOT   did
        'John did not invite anyone.'
     b. *Mary-un [CP John-i   amwuto   chotayhassta-ko]
        Mary-TOP John-NOM   anyone   invited-COMP
        sayngkakhaci   an   hayssta.
        think   NOT   did
        'Mary did not think John invited anyone.'

The strict locality of the negative polarity item as illustrated with *amwuto* 'anyone' has led to the proposal of clause mate condition according to which the NPI and the negation are in the same clause (see Choe 1988, Suh 1990, Kuno 1998, Chung and Park 1998, and Choi 1999, 2000, 2011, among others). With the locality of the negative polarity item as a background, let us go back to (32-33): With the intervening clausal subordinator *se,* and the manner adverbial, the ungrammaticality of (32-33) suggests that they are biclausal in their structure as respectively represented below in (35) and (36). [9]

(35) *John-i [CP amwukokito ikhy-**e-se**]   an   mekessta.
     John-NOM any meat   cook-E-CONJ NOT ate
     'John cooked any meat and did not eat it.'

---

9) Recall that Lee (1976) and Yang (1976), among others propose that *V-e V* is biclausal in nature. The proposal is only partly correct as we saw thus far. Type I is ambiguous in structure, monoclausal or biclausal. Type II is always mono-clausal.

(36) *John-i [CP amwukokito   ikhy-**e**] ppalli   an
     John-NOM any meat-ACC cook-E   quickly   NOT
     mekessta.
     ate
   *'John cooked any meat and did not eat it quickly.'

To summarize, I suggest that type I is ambiguous in structure. It is either monoclausal or biclausal, with the two verbs in *V-e V* belonging to the same clause and forming a single predicate, or belonging to a separate clause, forming a separate predicate. Meanwhile, type II as I suggest is necessarily monoclausal with the two verbs forming a single predicate. I also argue that the linking morpheme *e* in type I is ambiguous, given its structural ambiguity. When type I is construed as monoclausal, the morpheme has no syntactic function, and when construed as biclausal, it serves as a subordinate conjunction. I showed that the present proposal for the structures of type I and type II can give an empirically more satisfactory account of the various data as presented in the paper as compared with the various proposals in the literature.

4. Conclusion

I discussed two types of verbal concatenations in Korean in the form of *V-e V*, arguing that type I is ambiguous in structure, construed as either monoclausal or biclausal, and that type II is necessarily monoclausal. I thus crucially diverge from the common view in the literature, according to which the two types are either monoclausal or biclausal across the board (Lee 1976, Yang 1976, Lee 1993, Kim 199 Choi 2001, among others). I also argued that the linking morpheme *e* is ambiguous. The morpheme *e* in type I does not serve any grammatical function when it is construed as monoclausal, whereas when construed as biclausal, it serves as a subordinate conjunction. In the meantime, the same morpheme serves to mark aspect in type II. A variety of data in the paper supports the present proposal for the structures of two types of *V-e V* construction in Korean.

References

Anderson, G. (2006). *Auxiliary verb constructions*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Aikhenvald, A. (2006). Serial verb constructions in typological perspective. In A. Alexandra, & R. M. W. Dixon (Eds.), *Serial verb constructions* (pp.1-68). New York: Oxford University Press.

Ansre, G. (1966). The verbid-A caveat to serial verbs. *Journal of West African Languages, 3*(1), 29-32.

Baker, M. (1989). Object sharing and projection in serial verb construction. *Linguistic Inquiry, 20*(4), 513-553.

Baker, M. (1991). On the relation of serialization to verb extensions. In C. Lefebvre (Ed.), *Serial verbs: Grammatical, comparative, and cognitive approaches* (pp.79-102). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Campbell, R. (1989). *The grammatical structure of verbal predicates*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, CA.

Choe, H.-S. (1988). *Restructuring parameters and complex predicates; A transformational approach*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge. MA.

Choi, Y. (2001). Reexamination of syntactic approaches to Korean V-e V compounds. In *Proceedings of Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics 9*, 386-399.

Choi, Y.-S. (1999). Negation, Its Scope and NPI licensing in Korean. In R. Daly & A. Riehl (Eds.), In *Proceedings of Eastern States Conference on Linguistics*, 25-36.

Choi, Y.-S. (2000). The syntax and semantics of NPI licensing in Korean. In *Proceedings of WECOL 12*, 164-175.

Choi, Y.-S. (2011). Two types of NPIs: Universal vs. existential. *The Linguistic Association of Korea Journal, 19*(1), 137-157.

Choi, Y.-S. (2013). Verb raising in Korean redux. *The Linguistic Association of Korea Journal, 21*(3), 31-53.

Christaller, Rev. J.G. (1875). *A grammar of the Asante and Fante language called Tshi*.

Chung, D., & Park, H.-K. (1998). NPIs Outside of Negation Scope. In *Proceedings of Japanese/Korean Linguistics 6*, 415-435.

Collins, C. (1997). Argument sharing in serial verb construction. *Linguistic Inquiry, 28*(3), 461-497.

Huang, C.T. J. (1982). *Logical Relations in Chinese and the theory of Grammar*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, MA.

Joseph, D., & Arnold M. Z. (1990). When verbs collide. Paper presented at the 1990 Ohio State mini-conference on serial verbs. Department of Linguistics, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

Kang, M.-Y. (1988). *Topics in Korean syntax: Phrase structure, variable binding and movement*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, MA.

Kim, B.-K. (1993). The structure and the argument linking convention of V-V compounds in Korean. In *Proceedings of Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics 5*, 180-192.

Kuno, S. (1998). Negative Polarity Items in Korean and English. In R. King (Ed.), *Description and explanation in Korean linguistics* (pp. 87-131), Ithaca, NY: East Asia Program, Cornell University.

Ladusaw, W. (1979). *Polarity sensitivity as inherent scope relations*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX.

Lee, H.-B. (1976). Notes on pronouns, reflexives, and pronominalization. *Ehak Yunkwu (Linguistic Research), 12*(2), 253-263.

Lee, J.-S. (1992). *Case alternation in Korean: Case minimality*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT.

Lee, S. (1993). The syntax of serialization in Korean. In *Proceedings of Japanese Korean Linguistics 2*, 447-463.

Lefebvre, C. (1991). Take serial verb constructions in Fon. In C. Lefebvre (Ed.), *Serial verbs: Grammatical, comparative, and cognitive approaches* (pp. 37-78). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Lord, C. (1974). Causative constructions in Yorùbá. *Studies in African Linguistics, Supplement, 5*, 195-204.

Manfredi, V. (1991). *Ágbò and Éhugbò Ìgbo linguistic consciousness, its origins and limits*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA.

Nishiyama, K. (1995). Serialization across languages. Paper presented at the 26th annual conference on African Linguistics, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York.

Payne, T. (2011). *Understanding English grammar*, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Peseksky, D. (1977). Double verb constructions, markedness, and a fake construction. In *Proceedings of Chicago Linguistics Society 13*, 82-92.

Sebba, M. (1987). *The syntax of serial verbs*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.

Sohn, H.-M. (1994). *Korean*. New York and London: Routledge.

Stewart, O. T. (2001). *The serial verb construction parameter*. New York and London: Garland Publishing.

Suh, C.-S. (2013). *A Korean grammar*. Seoul: Jipmoon Publishing.

Suh, J. (1990). *Scope phenomena and aspects of Korean syntax.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, Los Angeles. CA.

Tellerman, M. (1998). *Understanding syntax.* New York and London: Oxford University Press

Westerman, D. (1930). *A study of the Ewe language*. London: Oxford University Press.

Yang, D.-W. (1976). Korean negation revisited. *Ene* (Language), *1*(1), 121-141.

YoungSik Choi

Dept. of English Language and Literature

Soonchunhyang University, Asan, Chungnam, 336-745

Phone: 82-41-530-1124

Email: youngsic@sch.ac.kr