

Morphological Fusion Analysis of Negation Suppletion in Korean
Inkie Chung
University of Connecticut

Negation (short-form) in Korean is done by placing the negator, *an(i)*, before the predicate.

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>(1) a. eysute-ka ka-n-ta.
Esther-NOM go-PRES-DECL
'Esther is going.'</p> <p>b. eysute-nun sengsilha-ta.
Esther-TOP sincere-DECL
'Esther is sincere.'</p> | <p>(2) a. eysute-ka an(i) ka-n-ta.
Esther-NOM NEG go-PRES-DECL
'Esther is not going.'</p> <p>b. eysute-nun an(i) sengsilha-ta.
Esther-TOP NEG sincere-DECL
'Esther is not sincere.'</p> |
|---|---|

Negator distribution (3) (*cf.* negative prefixes (4)), negative polarity item licensing (5), and scope interactions with quantifiers (6) show that short-form negation is syntactic.

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>(3) a. *eysute-ka <i>an(i)</i> an(i) ka-n-ta.
Esther-NOM NEG NEG go-PRES-DECL</p> <p>b. *eysute-nun <i>an(i)</i> an(i) sengsilha-ta.
Esther-TOP NEG NEG sincere-DECL</p> | <p>(4) a. chayk-i <i>an(i)</i> mikanhayngtoy-ess-ta.
book-NOM NEG yet-publish-PAST-DECL
'The book was not unpublished.'</p> <p>b. con-un <i>an(i)</i> pulsengsilha-ta.
John-TOP NEG insincere-DECL
'John is not insincere.'</p> |
| <p>(5) a. eysute-nun <i>amu-to</i> an(i) manna-ss-ta.
Esther-TOP any-NPI NEG meet-PAST-DECL
'I didn't meet anybody.'</p> | <p>b. *eysute-nun <i>amu-to</i> manna-ss-ta.
Esther-TOP any-NPI meet-PAST-DECL</p> |
| <p>(6) a. eysute-nun <i>motun</i> chinkwu-lul an(i) manna-ss-ta.
Esther-TOP all friend-ACC NEG meet-PAST-DECL</p> <p>b. <i>motun</i> haksayng-i an(i) sengsilha-ta.
all student-NOM NEG sincere-DECL</p> | <p>$\forall > \text{Neg}$: 'no friend'
$\text{Neg} > \forall$: 'not all friends'
$\forall > \text{Neg}$: 'no student'
$\text{Neg} > \forall$: 'not all students'</p> |

Two predicates show a suppletive negative form not related to the affirmative counterpart in form (*al-* 'know' → *molu-* 'not know' (**an(i) al-*); *iss-* 'exist/present' → *eps-* 'not exist/present' (**an(i) iss-*)). The suppletive negative predicates behave just like short-form negation cases, without the responsible negator.

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>(7) a. *eysute-ka na-lul <i>an(i)</i> molu-n-ta.
Esther-NOM I-ACC NEG know-PRES-DECL</p> <p>(8) a. na-nun <i>amu</i> tap-to moll-ass-ta.
I-TOP any answer-NPI not.know-PAST-DECL
'I didn't know any answer.'</p> <p>(9) a. <i>motun</i> haksayng-i tap-ul molu-n-ta.
all student-NOM answer-ACC not.know-PRES-DECL</p> <p>b. <i>motun</i> haksayng-i eps-ta.
all student-NOM not.present-DECL</p> | <p>b. *cha-ka pakk-ey <i>an(i)</i> eps-ta.
car-NOM rice-ACC NEG not.present-DECL</p> <p>b. *na-nun <i>amu</i> tap-to al-ess-ta.
I-TOP any answer-NPI know-PAST-DECL</p> <p>$\forall > \text{Neg}$: 'no student'
$\text{Neg} > \forall$: 'not all students'
$\forall > \text{Neg}$: 'no student'
$\text{Neg} > \forall$: 'not all students'</p> |
|--|---|

This paper proposes an analysis of suppletive negation in the framework of Distributed Mor-

phology. The analysis is morphological fusion that takes two terminal nodes (negation and the predicate node under consideration) and turns them into one single node that contains all the morpho-syntactic features of the two original nodes. Fusion occurs in the postsyntactic morphological component within PF after overt syntax. In syntax, the regular short-form negation constructions and the suppletive negation constructions are identical in configuration, because nodes consist of morphological, syntactic and semantic features in syntax free of phonological features.

Assuming that predicate roots undergo head movement to C adjoining the intervening functional heads, the morphosyntactic structure of *molu-n-ta* ‘not.know-PRES-DECL’ prior to vocabulary insertion looks like (10), which is structurally identical to the regular short-form negations like *an(i) manna-n-ta* ‘not meet-PRES-DECL’ in (11). The fusion operation is illustrated in (12). Then, vocabulary insertion applies to the fused node, with the vocabulary items in (13).

(10) [C [T [Neg [+neg] [KNOW] Neg] [+pres] T] [+decl] C]

(11) [C [T [Neg [+neg] [MEET] Neg] [+pres] T] [+decl] C]

(12) [Neg [+neg] [KNOW] Neg] → [Neg [+neg, KNOW] Neg]

(13) a. [+neg, KNOW] ↔ /molu/ b. [KNOW] ↔ /al/ c. [+neg] ↔ /an(i)/

Because (13a) is the most highly specified among the compatible vocabulary items with the features for the fused node, it is chosen to be inserted to this node, resulting in *molu-n-ta*.

The fusion operation is sensitive to the syntactico-semantic features of the terminal nodes and the structural relationship (sisterhood) of these nodes. For example, if the node [_v +caus] intervenes between the root and the Neg nodes the fusion does not apply.

(14) [C [T [Neg [+neg] [_v [KNOW] [+caus] _v] Neg] [+pres] T] C] → realized as *an(i) al-li-n-ta*

This treatment explains the same syntactic and semantic behaviors of the suppletive negations and the usual short-form negation constructions (negator distribution, negative polarity item licensing, and scope ambiguity). Also, this account allows syntactic structure and operations (overt and covert) to be uniform regardless of the predicate chosen in a clause for the syntactic representation and derivation. It also explains why these suppletive negative forms lack the negator. One theoretical consequence is that morphology does not derive syntax, but interprets it. The proposed analysis also copes with the problem of blocking in a lexicalist approach, the problem of blocking between a lexical entry (*molu-*) and a syntactic construction (**an(i) al-*).

Bobaljik, J. 2000. The ins and outs of contextual allomorphy. In K. K. Grohmann and C. Struijke, eds., *University of Maryland Working Papers in Linguistics* 10, 35-71.

Chomsky, N. 1995. *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Halle, M. and A. Marantz. 1993. Distributed morphology and the pieces of inflection. In K. Hale, and S. J. Keyser, eds., *The View from Building 20*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 111-176.

Han, C.-H. and C. Lee. 2003. A morphological constraint on negation in imperatives in Korean. The 13th Japanese/Korean Linguistics Conference, Michigan State Univ., August 1-3, 2003.

Koopman, H. 2004. Korean (and Japanese) morphology from a syntactic perspective. Ms., UCLA.

Sohn, K.-W. 1995. Negative Polarity Items, Scope, and Economy. Doctoral dissertation, Univ. of Connecticut, Storrs.

Sells, P. 2001. Three aspects of negation in Korean. *Journal of Linguistic Studies* (Linguistic Society of Cheju) 6, 1-15.