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Introduction

(Partial) syncretisms between negative markers/verbs in Korean provide a novel way of looking at *molu*. 
Some facts about Korean

- Korean: presumably an Altaic languages (Sohn 1999:11)
- Korean borrowed and adapted many words from Chinese in many different periods over time.
- Korean vocabulary consist of about 60% Sino-Korean (SK) words and 35% Native Korean (NK) words. 5% are borrowings from English and Japanese.
- most SK vocabulary are monosyllabic roots, which are combined into compounds.
- most SK vocabulary are nouns that can be transformed into predicates by means of a NK light verb *hata* ‘to do’ (Sohn 1999:247).
Korean *an* and *mos* (1)

- *an(i)* ‘not’
- *mos* ‘not possibly, cannot, unable’
Short form negation strategy (SFN)

(1) a. eysute-ka an(i) ca-n-ta.
   Esther-NOM NEG sleep-PRES-DECL
   ‘Esther doesn’t sleep/isn’t sleeping.’

b. eysute-ka mos ca-n-ta.
   Esther-NOM NEG sleep-PRES-DECL
   ‘Esther cannot/is not allowed to sleep.’
Long form negation strategy (LFN)

(2) a. eysute-ka ca-ci an(i) ha-n-ta.
   Esther-NOM sleep-CI NEG do-PRES-DECL
   ‘Esther doesn’t sleep.’ (Chung 2007:97)

b. eysute-ka ca-ci mos ha-n-ta.
   Esther-NOM sleep-CI NEG do-PRES-DECL
   ‘Esther cannot/is not allowed to sleep.’ (Chung 2007:98)
• LFN is almost always allowed;
• SFN is subject to various predicate related restrictions (Sohn 1999, Sells 2015:391-392).
• adjectives of three or more syllables are not acceptable with SFN
• the copula is not generally acceptable in LFN if the complement is a noun.
• when a verb is a compound, LFN is preferred.
• *mos* occurs with some adjectives, but only in the LFN, losing its modal meaning.

(Soh 1999:391)
‘Suppletive’ *molu* (2)

- *molu* ‘not know’ is considered the suppletive form of SFN\(+al\)-‘know’

(3) a. na-nun eysute-lul al-n-ta.
   \[\text{I-TOP Esther-ACC know-PRES-DECL}\]
   ‘I know Esther.’

   b. na-nun eysute-lul molu-n-ta.
   \[\text{I-TOP Esther-ACC not.know-PRES-DECL}\]
   ‘I dont know Esther.’
• Short form negation of *al- is not possible.

a. *na-nun eysute-lul an(i)/mos al-n-ta.
   I-TOP Esther-ACC NEG know-PRES-DECL
   (*‘I dont know Esther.’)

b. *na-nun ku wuhwa-lul an(i)/mos al-ass-ta.
   I-TOP the/that fable-ACC NEG know-PAST-DECL
   (*‘I didnt know the fable.’)

(Chung 2007:115-116)
• Stacking SFN on *molu* isn’t possible either.

(4) a. *na-nun eysute-lul an(i)/mos molu-n-ta.
   \[\text{L-TOP} \quad \text{Esther-ACC NEG not.know-PRES-DECL}\]

b. *na-nun ku wuhwa-lul an(i)/mos molu-n-ta.
   \[\text{L-TOP} \quad \text{the/that fable-ACC NEG not.know-PRES-DECL}\]
Chung 2007 (1)

(5)
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Chung 2007 (2)

- Chung proposes the following vocabulary items for insertion:

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

- These LIs never allow insertion of *molu* due to the Subset Principle (DM): both for V and Neg, there are matching VIs ((6b) and (6c)); (6c) *molu* does not qualify because the features of the VI are a superset of the features of the morpheme.

- Solution: a postsyntactic operation

- Fusion turns the Neg and V node into one node with two features [neg, KNOW]:
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(7) Neg → Neg

Neg

V

[+neg] [KNOW]

[+neg, KNOW]

• in order for Fusion to take place one already needs to have access to the lexicon before Fusion, i.e. look-ahead problem
### Korean *mol-* (3)

**Table: Kim-Renaud (2009:132)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>prefix</th>
<th>meaning</th>
<th>example</th>
<th>meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mu-</td>
<td>absence</td>
<td>mu-sosok</td>
<td>independent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mi-</td>
<td>unattaining</td>
<td>mi-wansŏng</td>
<td>unfinished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mol-</td>
<td>demise</td>
<td>mol-sangsik</td>
<td>ignorance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pi-</td>
<td>counter</td>
<td>pi-jongsŏng</td>
<td>abnormality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pul-/pu-</td>
<td>absence</td>
<td>pu-jayu</td>
<td>lack of freedom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
General Claim

• *mol*, *mos* and *molu* negative markers/verbs share part of their feature composition:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>mol-</th>
<th>mos</th>
<th>molu-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘die, dead, not, no, -less’</td>
<td>‘not possibly, cannot, unable’</td>
<td>‘not know’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Claim (1)

- The suppletive marker *molu*- is actually the consequence of a phonological process between the prefixal negation *mol* - and *al* -.
Support (1)

- *mol+V+l
- mol(l)V

mol-al → moll

(8) molla pota ‘fail to recognize’
• the -u- in what looks like the stem is related to the present tense morphology (n)un
• -a has become -u under the influence of present tense
• -u- disappears when molu is inflected for past tense (a/ess) and the underlying -l- appears

(9) molu-n-ta
    not.know.pres.decl

(10) moll-ass-ta
    not.know-past-decl
Claim (2)

- Proposal: the diachronic origin of *mos* is *mol-* + *swu*
- compare to: *unable* in English
- fossilized form
Support (2)

(11) Na-nub keki-ey ka-l swu eps-ta
    I there-to go-ADNZ ability neg.exist-DEC
    ‘I can’t go there.’

(12) Na-nun keki-ey ka-ci mos-hata
    I there-to go-SU neg.can-AUX
    ‘I can’t go there.’

(Kim 2010)
Prerequisites (1)

- Nanosyntax
- Cyclic phrasal spell out
- Complex specifiers for negation
Prerequisites (2)

- Decomposition of vP and VP

- Only PredP and CauseP are involved in stative verbs; BecomeP and DoP are also involved in Process verbs
Prerequisite (3a)

(13) Yoon (1999): SFN

```
CP
  --- TP
  |   --- NegP
  |       --- VP
  |           --- Neg an
  |               --- pap
  |                   --- V (mek)
  |   --- T
  |       --- mek
  |         --- ess
```
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Prerequisite (3b)

(14) Yoon (1999): LFN

Prerequisite (3b)

Yoon (1999): LFN

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{NP} \quad \text{VP} \\
\text{pap} \quad \text{mek} \\
\text{Neg} \quad \text{T} \\
\text{an} \quad \text{ha} \quad \text{ess} \\
\text{NegP} \\
\text{TP} \\
\text{CP}
\end{array}
\]
Korean negation (1)

(15) \(< /mol/,\)

\[
\text{NegP} \quad \text{QP} \quad \text{PredP} \quad \text{Pred}
\]

\[
\text{Neg} \quad \text{Q}
\]
Korean negation (2)

(16) \(< \text{/an(i)/}, \quad \text{DoP} \quad >

\begin{align*}
\text{CAUSEP} & \quad \text{Do} \\
\text{BECOME} & \quad \text{CAUSE} \\
\text{PREDP} & \quad \text{BECOME} \\
\text{NegP} & \quad \text{PRED} \\
\text{Neg} &
\end{align*}
Korean negation (3)

(17) < /mos/,
Analysis

\( al \ (4) \)

\[ (18) \quad < /al/, \quad \text{PREDP} \quad > \]

\[ \text{KNOWP} \quad \text{PRED} \]

\[ \text{KNOW} \]
Spelling out *molu*

(19)

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>mol-</th>
<th>PREDP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QP</td>
<td>PRED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NegP</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>al-</th>
<th>PREDP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KNOWP</td>
<td>PRED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNOW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```
Causative *li* (1)

(20) a. al-li-
    know-CAUS-
    ‘let know, inform’

b. con-i yenghi-eykey ku sasil-ul mos/ani
    John-NOM Younghee-DAT the fact-ACC NEG
    al-li-ess-ta (*mol(u)liessta)
    know-CAUS-PAST-DECL
    ‘John couldn’t/didn’t inform Younghee of the fact.’
$ani + \text{causative } li$ (2)

(21)
mos + causative li (3)

(22)

NegP

mol ← DoP

CAUSEP DO

BECOMEP CAUSE

NegP BECOME

Neg

li- ← CAUSEP Neg

al- ← PredP CAUSE

KNOWP Pred

KNOW
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