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Abstract: In this paper I argue that the light verb be in Korean is an event realization of the v head. v's alternation in Korean psych verbs makes a strong case for DO-BECOME meanings of v, whose semantic contribution is undetermined and contextualized in English. For Korean, the absence of the class of English type deontal verbs is morphological evidence for this view. This study of Korean light verb constructions clarifies Harley’s (1995, 1999) suggestion that recognizing the complements of v’s vP in a predicator structure showing evocative, things, or states helps to contextualize the interpretation of v be along with its determining environments. But the argument that no lexical content for v be need be posited is challenged in Korean light verb na.

I. Demotion of VP and v head

The addition of v to the basic VP-shell in much recent work in Distributed Morphology (Holm & Kaye 1991, 1993) or Minimalist program of Chomsky (1995) has given an impression of a return to a Generative-Syntax-style analysis of causative-incative alternations as illustrated below in (1):

(1) a. John opened the door / The door opened.
b. John broke the window / The window broke.
c. John grew the vegetables in the garden / The vegetables grew in the garden.

The demotion of an alternating verb like “grow” does not allow an agentive interpretation, wherein this of a non-alternating verb like “destroy” does. This was noted by Chomsky (1970) and used as a counterexample against the Generalized Semantics argument for the identity between the Deaf structure and the semantic representation, as below:

(2) a. John’s growth of vegetables.
b. The army’s destruction of the city.
By arguing that the derived nominals, which are clearly nouns in surface structure, are not transformationally derived from verbs, but that they are invoked at deep structure in nouns, Chomsky (1975) proposes the Lexical Hypothesis for integrity of verbal items that transformations do not perform morphological derivation, but the latter belongs to the lexical component prior to syntactic underlying structure.

But Marantz (1977) and Harley & Neyes (1998) explain the difference by the different inputs in the verbal frame whereby the active passive is given an agentive non-agentive interpretation according to whether its input is either the simple v root selecting internal arguments, or the v head selecting an agent argument, respectively. The roots here are roots that are assumed to belong to basic event clauses (resulting state, change of state, achievements, accomplishments in the terms of Vendler 1967, and causation). V and Vn class denoting 'certainly caused change of state' is distinct from Vg-row class denoting 'essentially caused change of state' in contrast. The roots Vrow, Vg-row, or Vbreak themselves only rely on some kernel of meaning. We will get different types of predicates according to the structure in which the root is inserted. For example, Vg-row, inserted in a non-causative structure, yields the intransitive grow, and when it is embedded under a causative structure, it yields the causative transitive grow.

The contribution to meaning that the v subject makes seems to be the CAUSE in the underlying representation of the intransitive version of the verb, "grow" in (3), as Harley (1999) illustrates in (3).

Harley (1995) argues that VP decides the introduction of event (not eventuality but dynamicity) for three causative/intransitive verbs. For the intransitive version ("The vegetables grow"), VP headed by a transitive BECOME has as its complement VPg, a predicative structure denoting a state, the end result of the change of state introduced by the v head. On the other hand, the causative version ("John grow the vegetables") will have VP headed by a CAUSE, which replaces the BECOME v, rather than adding to it in a higher VP, and which selects maximal argument in its specifier. The agent argument that is projected brings up to the change-of-state introduced by the v head, a causative interpretation rather than a spontaneous meaning.
Harley's (1999) claim that the *BECOME* meaning *v* is replaced in causative by the *CAUSE* meaning *v* distinguishes it from the generative semantics and the generative lexicon style approach, where the *BECOME* meaning component is added on by the *CAUSE* meaning component (e.g. *CAUSE to BECOME*). From the study of Japanese lexical causatives and inchoatives (Harley 1990), she argues that the causatives the-er demonstrate stacking morphology and that the *CAUSE* morphology is rather in complementary distribution with the *BECOME* morphology.

2. Psych-verbs in Korean

The ease study which I will discuss here is that of Korean psych verbs relevant to the light verb *do*. Psych verbs, verbs denoting psychological states, usually fall into two main groups:

Subject Experience verbs (i.e. *feel*), which realize their experiencer participant as the subject and Object Experience verbs (i.e. *think*), which realize their Experience as the object. My discussion will be concerned only with Subject Experience verbs. Korean psych verbs exhibit unusual behavior in that a psych root can form three possible verbs.

2.1. Psych verbs and Property adjectives

There are three classes of psych verbs that share the same root but differ only with respect to the presence / absence of light verb *do* and inchoative verb *be*. They constitute minimal pairs of predicates exhibiting different case marking as below:

![Image](image.png)

As in the case of regular transitive verbs, (4c) has its Theme VP marked with accusative case, while (4a) and (4b) take nominative case for the Theme, and Direct case for Experiencer even though they take two arguments (Experiencer, Theme) just like regular transitive. I will refer to the former type (4c) as "do form" psych verbs, and to latter two (4a) as "be form" psych verbs, and, finally, to the root type (4c) as "bare form" psych verbs. [marked] is characteristic of *do form* (4c) and [stative] of bare form psych verbs (4a), which is attested by Progressive formation universally known to be a test for stative. The agentivity test (Kim 1990:74-75) including Imperative, Propositional, Embedding under agentive control
verbs, and embedding under coeval verbs, make Ky form psych verbs distinct from τμ form and
bim form psych verbs.

Note that there often exists a possibility of confusing the ιγενσεως of psych verbs with
(pseudo-)proposition property verbs (i.e., adjectives) due to their having the same surface forms, as in the
following examples:

(5) a. ky-epv pev-ke-ri-ka eoko-te-tra-

τμ voice-vor good, (relative reading at a slot)

b. ky-epv ma-ke-ri-ka eoko-te-tra-

τμ voice-Vor good-BECOME-Past-Dec

The relationship between the psych verbs and perceptible property verbs can be captured with
the same root in a shared piece of lexical material between form and complex syntactic structure; when the root is combined with another verbal head "Βείβ" predicate (Vav) suggested
in Harley (1995), it yields a "prog" meaning ("believable") from a property meaning ("good"). The
head is always static and its complement attests a property (be a place/mental state or have
a property) which is predicated on its existential argument. The structural difference can be
illustrated as below:

2.2. Three-semantic interpretations for V-DO v. BECOME-DO v. Vav.

Harley's (1999) proposition that Vp structure is responsible for "BECAUSE/BECOME" meaning
dissociatively can be applied in the analysis of the alternation of hetr/τμ forms on the bim/τμ form
psych verbs shown in (4). Further examination of where the event occurs (τμ or in the
representation is Vp structure, however, does not support the original assumption that Vp denotes
a state and the verb denotes "CAUSE" introducing evportences. When the incorporated root
remains as an event, the "head noun DO, as in "Mary, stabbed," and the evportence
seems likely to be introduced by the "rooted root itself. On the other hand, when the nominal
denotes a thing, the verb seems to be interpreted to MAKE, as in "the man solved." So, at
least, we have four different interpretations (BECOME-CAUSE, MAKE-DO) for v. Harley
(1999) argues that the semantic "primitive" associated with v is fully determinable in context and thus no lexical content for v need be posited. But Korean Morphology shows the other way of linking, as we will see in the next section. For v in Korean, the light verb to corresponds to agentive head DO v or VAG "BE predicate". Inchoative verbs imply are associated with BECOME v while all the verbs can be involved in characterizing CAUSATIVE/PASSIVE v, but an extended discussion will be beyond the scope of this paper. It suffices to grasp the double linking nature (DO v or VAG) of la for v head in IP structure.

Harley's (1995) additional concept of "BE" predicate (VAG), as mentioned above, also allows us to make a distinction between bare form psych verbs and non-psych property verbs, which are perceived as objective rather than subjective. A "psych" noun can thus form three possible verbs: it can combine with a DO v / a BECOME v, thus forming [v-agentive / [v-agentive] non-active, or with another verbal head VAG forming [v-narvive] psych verbs. The following are the syntactic structures corresponding to the three types of psych verbs in (4), respectively.

(7) a.

b.
I argue that the composite entries of \( V_{\text{good}} + V_{\text{be}} \) go through another ontologization, which induces a slightly different meaning due to the "psych flavor" as a material process of lexical decomposition like \( \Lambda' \) ("FEEL good at \( \Lambda' \)). The morphological spell-out here for \( V_{\text{be}} \) in (8) so that the bare form psychology verb is (6) and the property verb are homophonous. However, alternation of bare in a class of Korean verbs whose roots originate from antonymic adjectives shows the evidence for the morphological existence of \( V_{\text{be}} \) as well as the \( \Lambda' \) \( \text{COMP} \) of head.

(8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic Form</th>
<th>Contracted Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. are-ba ta</td>
<td>ire-ba ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>like that LV-Dec</td>
<td>be like that-Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. are-ba ta</td>
<td>qee-ba ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>like that LV-Dec</td>
<td>be like that-Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. lore-ba ta</td>
<td>lunge-ba ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>like so LV-Dec</td>
<td>be like so-Dec</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(9)

A composite predicate as demonstratives B. Composite predicates as other adjectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a.</th>
<th>b.</th>
<th>c.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>liv-e + ha</td>
<td>vone-e + ha</td>
<td>luce-e + ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in LV be (like) this</td>
<td>in LV be (like) that</td>
<td>in LV be (like) white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>like this-Mod</td>
<td>like that-Mod</td>
<td>like so-Mod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yellow-Mod LV</td>
<td>blue-Mod LV</td>
<td>white-Mod LV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be yellow</td>
<td>be blue</td>
<td>be white</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(10) cf form non-stative verb formation from demonstrative and color adjectives

a. kore-f / kore-ci
b. hayasa-f / hayasa-ci

like-as Inductive "become to so" white Inductive "become to white"

(the other verbs in (9) follow the same pattern in forming the ci form non-statives)

As Jung (2001) noted the parallelism between the adjectives (or stative verbs) derived from demonstrative and post-verbal (for long-form) negations in Korean, we can extend the parallelism in the alternation of attributive color adjectives and their derived loci form verbs, as shown in (9) and (10). This observation provides additional evidence for lexical specifications for Giem, BECOME ɣ, and DO ɣ that we have disowned so far.

3. Demonstrative Adjectival Verbs and Light Verb constructions

In English, there is a substantial class of demonstrative verbs which can be sub-classified according to the kinds of derivation of their nominal bases, including events, things to make, locations to put, things to be put, and activities to do with. They exhibit different properties in relation to the spatial dimension of the count/mass distinction and the temporal dimension of the bounded/unbounded distinction (as noted by Grober 1987 and Tulley 1978, Temny 1992, Dowty 1991 among others as shown below:

(11) a. Man danced *in an hour* for an hour. (event activity)
b. The rate fueled in an hour *for an hour. (thing)
c. Bill evaded the computer in an hour *for an hour. (location)
d. John pressed the chain in an hour *for an hour. (location)
e. Amy brushed the horse in an hour *for an hour. (activity)

It is a surprising fact that Korean doesn’t have any class of demonstrative verbs whose nominal forms exhibit no specific morphology but are homophonous with their bare verb. That is why in English, they are aligned to be formed by conversion (2nd derivation) from noun to verb. As for Korean, it reveals much morphological work to have verbs derived from the nominal base. What is most interesting is that the light verbs are always involved in such morphological derivation.

3.1. Demonstrative Activity verbs with light verb ban

An issue that I raise here in the nature of the parametric difference responsible for this phenomenon. My solution is that the way of composing Voot and the little v accounts for such a difference between English and Korean. Since we have already seen the English way even
though it is not superficial, let us consider the Korean way of how to deal with such concepts like even, things, location/locus, activity, and even priority into lexicogrammatical verbs.

(12) a. Vhammer → VP(hammer) → hammer
    activity
    manchi → mangle→cl → mangle-cl ha-(a) = DO w/ hammer (Korean)
    cf. ¬ mangle ha-cl

b. Vwhore → VP(whore) → whore →
    activity
    manchi → kyocip-cl → kyocip-cl ha-(a) = DO w/ whores/women
donu '↓'
    cf. * kyocip ha-(a) (Korean)

Examples (12) contrast the ways of composing Vinit and its head and of realizing the spell-out of x in English and Korean. Korean adds a full morpheme-indicating 'activity' to the root before combining with → x and has a monothematical realization for x whose default meaning is 'DO'. Without resorting to Morphology, English seems to choose the underdetermination approach for the spelling of x, letting the syntactic, semantic environment provide the cues necessary for the appropriate interpretation.

The following example in Korean light verbs shows a case of ambiguity in interpretation, based on whether the incorporated noun denotes an event (activity) of a thing: it indicates that even pragmatic information is needed to get a contrastively correct meaning when the information given by the incorporated noun can be equivocal as in (13).

(13) a. Vcyo'okeu
    AC 'evening'
    VP dinner '600' of dinner → cyo'okeu ha-(a) = Make Vdinner (i.e. cook)

b. cyo'okeu-ba
    AC 'evening'
    VP dinner '600' of dinner → cyo'okeu ha-(a) = 30 Vdinner (i.e. eat)

    Do you make dinner?

c. cyo'okeu-ba
    AC 'evening'
    activity of getting → cyo'okeu ha-(a) = 30 Vdinner (i.e. eat)
    'Did you eat dinner?'
This ambiguity in meaning of MAKE/DO also implies the asymmetric status of τ for An in Korean light verb constructions. To some degree, DO itself has an underspecified meaning sensitive to context, which may cause a kind of maximization of sentence efficiency (i.e., use of core vocabulary or harmonic principle). If there are some cues given as in (13b) c), such ambiguity disappears in interpreting the sentences.

3.2. Verbal Nouns (VN) and Light verb constructions

Korean Japane light verb constructions are composed of nomin comp elements so-called Verbal Nouns (VN) and light verb suffixes. For some literature (i.e., Grittshaw & Matte 1988), the term (Japanese) light verb construction may be confined to such a certain pattern as "VN-verb", and be distinguished from inchoative forms of "VN-ary" or Accessive case -free forms of "VN-sam". As recent studies (Umehata 1991 and Takahata 1992, 2000, Jung 2002 among them) argue against the distinction between heacy verb and light verb in Japanese, however, it will be no problem to use the term "light verb construction" in general to refer to these constructions involving light verbs with an incomplete or skeletal argument structure and Verbal Nouns (VN) or Adjectival Noun (AN) or any -ing nominal category.

The class of lexical items called Verbal Nouns (VN) in Japanese as well as in Korean has a hybrid nature, in the sense that it includes some verb-like properties and some noun-like properties. In efforts to solve the basic puzzle, some linguists like Ruts (1987), Park (1989), Aka (1991), and Takahara (2000) argue that VNs in Japanese/Korean are verbs, contrary to the widely held standard assumption regarding them as nouns: they are listed as verbs and head a VP unless they are incorporated into a noun before lexical insertion. Takahara (2000) shows that the full-verb properties are consistent with the VN-V view, while there are some facts unexplainable under the VN-N view:

- VNs have the meaning of verbs and can be used as the main predicate of clauses, which cannot be explained by the traditional view of VN=NS.
- VNs have identical syntactic structures as the corresponding regular verb sentences.

But VNs are unlike regular verbs in that VN cannot support verbal affixes (i.e., Tense, Aspect, Hootific mark) directly and that the dummy verb "de" must be inserted between the VN and the verbal affix whenever a VN is used in the place of a regular verb. The verb-like item which follows the VN, as, will be inserted in the phonological component to support the tense marker, similar in many respects to the dummy verb "do" in English. The reason why an insertion is necessary in the simple VN-sentence is that the tense-marker is a bound morpheme and it needs to form a part of a prosodic word with another morpheme, but the VN refuses to be its own prosodic word because it is a free morpheme. So-insertion is the only way to satisfy both the selectional properties of the VN and the tense-marker, while in the whole regular verb sentence, the verb and the tense-marker can be parsed into a single prosodic word, making insertion unnecessary.
(14) a. simple regular verb sentence

kōsatsu-wa [sono jōbo]-no yasashii.[
police-TOP [the incident]-ACC investigating-Past
'The police investigated the incident.'

b. simple VP-noun phrase

kōsatsu-wa [bunbo oka]-no yūyōsha-sa.[
yōyōsha-sa.
police-TOP [the incident]-ACC investigator-Past
'The police investigated the incident.'

Takahashi (2006) claims that the nouns that properties are a consequence of the fact that VNs are 
are morphemes (required to form a productive word) of their own whereas regular verbs are 
bound morphemes, which are unable to form a productive word on their own. The reason why 
VNs are accessible like nouns rather than regular verbs (the location of the recent to the-accented 
VN is unpredictable similar to nouns but unlike regular verbs which can be optionally with the 
intensifying bar VN undergo positive de-continuation and form 'VN-nominalized' whose 
surface-form gloss the impression that VNs can have BPs, supporting the view of VN-VN with 
that fact that regular verbs in Japanese cannot form an NP without overt suffixation. But 
Takahashi again that it is possible for the VN to bind a VP within the VP-nominal, a behavior 
explained only under the VN-VN view. This view assumes that the head of the VP-nominal (a 
null noun or noun that was or nomination only) VNs because it is invisible to phonology.

In the "Case-marking light-on construction," such as in (15), the main predicate of the 
construction is an Agentive verb, which assigns an Agent meta-argument to the subject and 
An Animative One to the VN-nominal which provides it.

(15) kōsatsu-wa [kōsatsu-zuketsu]-no yūyōsha-sa. [-no si-te]
police-TOP [police-action]-ACC investigator-Past -do-ndo
'The police continued-investigating the incident.'

Regarding the VN-nominal as a modifier of VP, with which it often a sermonic complex 
predicate, explains many various properties of the construction. For instance, the "argument-
reversing phenomenon", which can be explained only if the VN-nominal contains a VP where the 
arguments to the VN can be assigned. This light verb construction can provide another piece of 
supporting evidence for the VN-VN view.

As for the Korean light verb constructions, the alternation of DGREGOME shown in the 
Korean noun verb constructions again reveals a similar pattern here, with the VPs "as predicates.
"The difference between the two constructions is that in the light verb construction, the 
co-occurrence of deverbal Nouns (VN) instead of states verbs (i.e., adjectives), the
morphological realizations of \textit{case have(s)-} instead of \textit{have(s) the}, and the meaning of \textit{to} is \textit{BECOME-PASSIVE}.

(16) A. Korean verbal nouns (VN) and their Chinese gloss counterparts

\begin{itemize}
\item VN: [kwan-ri], [bun-de], [phun-myung], [hyum-myung], [hyun-myung] \textit{become-clear}, \textit{wise-clear}, \textit{be-great,}
\item CHN: [control-govern], [enlarge-big], [spread], [become-clear], [wise-clear], \textit{be-great,}
\end{itemize}

\begin{itemize}
\item a. John`s \textit{Nom} \textit{operation-\textit{Acc}} \textit{by} \textit{control-governers-\textit{(A)}} \textit{DO-Pass-Dec}
\item b. \textit{mikan-nai} \textit{America-\textit{Nom}} \textit{war-\textit{Acc}} \textit{America spread the war.}
\item c. \textit{cecan-yi} \textit{America-\textit{Nom}} \textit{war-\textit{Acc}} \textit{The war was enlarged by America.}
\item d. \textit{John`s} \textit{Nom} \textit{wise-clear} \textit{John is wise.}
\end{itemize}

It is possible to analyze \textit{to} as a lexical passive marker rather than \textit{the}. But it is much more productive and constitutes consistent oppositions on \textit{[\textit{active}] VN vs. \textit{the}}. The authentic light verb. It can apply to any \textit{[\textit{active}] VN except a few Achievement\textit{(enomous event) VNs, which seem to be due only to a semantic restriction of BECOME, which seems negatively to be \textit{[\textit{instantaneous}]}. The following exhibits a paradigmatic \textit{“big picture”} of relations between causatives and passives in Korean:

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{The man} \textit{cause(s) the motor to run.}
\item \textit{The man} \textit{cause(s) the motor to be run.}
\end{itemize}
(17) Morphological realizations of \( \eta \) in the paradigms of Korean causative/passive:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MORMEUMES</th>
<th>FUNCTION/MEANING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \eta ), lexical head of ( \mu )</td>
<td>DO-BE/BECOME-PASSIVE/BECOME-CASE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synatonic (Peripheral) causative/passive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \eta ), lexical head of ( \mu )</td>
<td>Causative [+agentive]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \eta ), lexical head of ( \mu )</td>
<td>Passive [+Affected]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexical causative/passive</td>
<td>Passive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Along the lines of such reasoning, I will assume that \( \eta \)-is also one of the morphological realizations of \( \eta \). It will be beyond the scope of this short paper to go further in an extended discussion.

With the \( \phi \)-structure and the morphological realization of \( \eta \) head for the light verb, combining light verbs with \( \varrho \)-verbs to the Verb-Non verb itself is more plausible in the light verb constructions. This approach to the complex predicate of \( \varrho \)-verb-s can explain the whole class of light verb constructions in Korean. Most [literature (All 1991), allowing others] about Korean light verb constructions has observed three subclasses as follows:

(18) a. KOYLGaw{Wl} (inśl) ha-ta - - - - Type I [traceative] ha-ta-
    (X) studies.
    b. PHIRKON t-neances hta ta - - - - Type II [traceative] ha-ta-
    (X) is tired.
    c. raum-ul CENG mind-Acc fix ha-ta - - - - Type III [1-syllabic] ha-ta-
    (X) decides one's mind.
    c' raum-ul KYLL-CeNw{Wl} mind-Acc fix ha-ta - - - - Type I ha-ta-
    (name in place (X)).

In example (18), which is interesting and important to note is the Type I subclass, whose members are monosyllabic Chinese verbs or adjectives. Its light verb construction shows different behavior: it does not allow any particles (i.e., case-markers, delimiters) to intervene
Another piece of evidence for the reasoning that no Ω-nominalization is employed in the light verb-constructions comes from the variations of Type II, which are regarded as native Korean adjectives with no connection to Chinese adjective counterparts. Some of these words can function as roots of the mirrors, which usually are expressed by the repetition of the root. It is also hard to suppose a Ω-nominalization on roots themselves, because they are never used as Nouns.

(14) a. bancak-ha be shiny/flashy/twinkling' b. banseul-ha be slippery/slippery/soft' c. samma-ha 'be neat/fresh/vivid' d. skayulki-ha be clean' e. maknak-ha be clever' f. dandam-ha be hard/drawn' (15) Vclever,adj → Vp[clever,adj] → be clever = V → Vp (English) property state 'be clever' toktok → toktok → toktok ha(na) → VNK clever (Korean)

These examples illustrate that the analysis of light verb constructions as complex predicates of [Vp → V] explains a wider range of environments for light verbs to occur than the approach of V-incorporation from VN in lexicon or LF.

4. Conclusion

I have argued that the light verb ha in Korean is the overt realization of the v head. Further, the Vπ̃ ' s realization in Korean psych verbs makes a strong case for DO-BECOME meanings for v. whose semantic contribution is heavily contextualized in English. The relationship between the psych verbs and perceptible property verbs can be captured with the same root as a shared piece of lexical material between them, and complex syntactic structures, yielding a "psych" meaning (‘likable’ from a property meaning ‘good’) when the root is combined with another verbal head ‘be’ produces (Vπ̃).

For Korean, the absence of the class of English denominal verbs like "bammie" or "cumbie," which are alleged to be formed by derivation (V-derivation) from noun to verb in morphological evidence for this view. English and Korean contrast the ways of composing Vπ̃ and v head and of realizing the spell-out of v. Korean adds a suffix morpheme indicating ‘activity’ to the root before combining with v and has a morphological realization for v, whose
default meaning is `DO'. Without resorting to Morphology, English seems to choose the underdetermination approach for the meaning of `y', leaving the syntactic, semantic environment to provide the cues necessary for the appropriate interpretation.

As for the Korean light verb constructions, the alternation of `DO/BECOME' shown in the Korean light verb constructions needs a similar, albeit more tenuous, token with the V + `BE' predicate. The difference between the two constructions is that in the light verb construction the subject is always verbal Nominal (VNV) instead of static verb v.e. adjective), and the morphological realisations of the two constructions instead of `BE'/`DO', and that the meaning of `y' is `BECOME-ADVANCE'.

This, my study of a few Korean light verb constructions supports (Harley, 1995; 1999) claims that the BECOME y's are complementary distribution with CAUSE y's that non-sustaining events are always expressed in a structure containing a `y', and that recognizing the complements of `y' as a predicate, aspect, and temporal events, things, or state helps to contextualize the interpretation of these in an appropriate way along with its determining environments.

NOTES

1. I would like to thank Raul Valentine, Gregory E. Raledge, Yuje 1. Nana Gibler, Mission Macalay, Sang Sung Lee, and an anonymous KOREAN reviewer for their corrections, valuable suggestions, and kind help. As always, the author is responsible for all mistakes, should any appear, in the article.

2. Proposals for events means that representing the `y' predicate is concerned with change of state, but just against occurrence of accidents or events (cf. Harley 1999:73).

3. This notation follows Pinkstik 1999 to indicate the root form of the verb, it is read as `Root PC'.

4. Proposal for `y' in Korean is equivalent to `y' in English.

5. (With this `y') it is clear we used `y' vocative, play-Propositive.

6. `Let's play tennis.'

7. This is the same as `Japanese light verb constructions' labeled by Grimes & Haskes (1988).

8. Each argument originates from Old Chinese and each has its own meaning.

9. See Jung (1999) for details of the distinction between gestalt/lexical conceptualization and propositional in KOREAN.

10. I did not discuss about this morpheme `sake'. Without argument I will just assume it for the morphological realization of CAUSE part of y. The precise characterization of `y' will be left for future research.

11. In the traditional way of glossing, `DO' is always given to y, without considering its semantic content.