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1.1 Introduction
Korean has two types of negation: long and short negation. Long negation occurs after the main verb followed by the light verb ha, as in (1a). Short negation occurs before the verb, as in (1b).

(1) a. Inho-nun hakkyo-ey ka-ci ani ha-yess-ta.
    Inho-TOP school-to go-CI NEG ha-PAST-DECL
    ‘Inho did not go to school.’

b. Inho-nun hakkyo-ey an ka-ss-ta.
    Inho-TOP school-to NEG go-PAST-DECL
    ‘Inho did not go to school.’

Negative imperatives however cannot be formed with short negation. They are instead formed with long negation, but its lexical form mal is different from the usual form ani.

(2) a. *hakkyo-ey an ka-la.
    school-to NEG go-IMP
    ‘Don’t go to school.’

b. *hakkyo-ey ka-ci ani ha-yela.
    school-to go-CI NEG ha-IMP
    ‘Don’t go to school.’

*We thank Jong-Bok Kim, Hee-Jeong Ko, and the audience at JK 13 for helpful questions and comments. All errors are ours.
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In this paper, we address two questions concerning negative imperatives in Korean: (i) what is the morphosyntactic nature of mal in negative imperatives and why is it impossible to form negative imperatives with long negation ani?; and (ii) why is it impossible to form negative imperatives with short negation an?¹

In section 1.2, our discussion on mal will lead us to the conclusion that the clause structure of imperatives includes a projection of deontic modality and a projection of imperative operator encoding illocutionary force, and that mal is a lexicalization of ani ha in the context of deontic modality. We then address the question why short negation is impossible in negative imperatives. In section 1.3, we will consider a few syntax and semantics based approaches as possible analyses and point out their limitations. In section 1.4, assuming the clause structure of imperatives with two separate projections for modality and force, we propose that the constraint responsible for ruling out a negative imperative with short negation is morphological in nature, and not syntactic or semantic. We will argue that the constraint follows from Subset Principle and Vocabulary Insertion in Distributed Morphology (Halle and Marantz 1993, 1994).

1.2 Morphosyntactic nature of mal

For an account of the morphosyntactic nature of mal, we will extend and refine the approach given in C. Lee (1978): i.e., 'long negation + ha' lexicalizes as mal in the context of imperatives and propositives.

Tellingly, mal can occur in non-imperatives as well, as long as they form deontic modality contexts. For example, it can occur in matrix clauses in which the verbs are affixed with deontic modal inflections as in (3), and in embedded clauses under directive/volitional verbs as in (4).

Given that the imperative also forms a deontic modality context, the proper generalization is that ani ha lexicalizes as mal in the context of deontic modality, and not

¹By imperatives, we refer to sentences with distinctive imperative morphology on the verb and/or distinctive imperative syntax. They canonically express the directive illocutionary force associated with commands and requests. Consequently, the term IMPERATIVE has often been used to refer to a sentence’s function rather than its form. However, we use the term IMPERATIVE to refer exclusively to a sentence’s form. For referring to a sentence’s function, we use terms such as COMMAND and REQUEST.

²It is possible to use short negation an as well as long form ani in the embedded clause of (4b). We take this to mean that the matrix verb pala (‘want’) has two selectional possibilities: it can select a deontic modal clause or a non-deontic modal clause. A similar situation is attested in Romance where some predicates can select a subjunctive or an indicative clause (Quer 1998).
just in the context of the imperative. We will formalize this in Distributed Morphology framework in section 1.4.

(3) Matrix clauses that constitute deontic modality context
   a. Cey-ka hakkyo-ey ka-ci mal-kkayo?
      I-NOM school-to go-CI NEG-Q
      ‘Should I not go to school?’
      I-TOP school-to go-CI NEG-should-DECL
      ‘I should not go to school.’
   c. Inho-nun hakkyo-ey ka-ci mal-aya ha-n-ta.
      you-TOP school-to go-CI NEG-should do-PRES-DECL
      ‘Inho should not go to school.’
   d. * Inho-nun hakkyo-ey ka-ci mal-n-ta.
      Inho-TOP school-to go-CI NEG-PRES-DECL
      ‘Inho does not go to school.’

(4) Embedded clauses under directive/volitional verbs
   a. Inho-ka Yumi-eykey hakkyo-ey ka-ci mal-la-ko
      Inho-NOM Yumi-to school-to go-CI NEG-should-COMP
      tell-PAST-DECL
      ‘Inho told Yumi that she should not go to school.’
   b. Inho-nun Yumi-ka hakkyo-ey ka-ci mal-ki-lul
      Inho-TOP Yumi-NOM school-to go-CI NEG-NMZ-ACC
      pala-n-ta.
      want-PRES-DECL
      ‘Inho wants Yumi to not go to school.’
   c. * Inho-nun Yumi-ka hakkyo-ey ka-ci mal-ass-tako
      Inho-TOP Yumi-NOM school-to go-CI NEG-PAST-COMP
      mit-nun-ta.
      believe-PRES-DECL
      ‘Inho believes that Yumi did not go to school.’

What this implies for the clause structure is that the category for deontic modality and the category for the imperative need to be distinguished somehow. Although there may be different ways of implementing this idea, we will choose to do so by postulating two separate projections for each category: a projection for modality and a projection for illocutionary operator (cf. Sells 2003).
We will further assume that long negation projects \( \text{NegP} \), and short negation starts out as a left adjunct of \( \text{VP} \) but cliticizes to the verb, as in Neg-cliticization in Romance (Cinque 1999). The fact that a sentence can contain both short and long negation as in (6) supports two different positions for the two types of negation (see also A.-R. Kim 2000).

(6) Inho-nun amwu kes-to an masi-ci aní ha-yess-ta.
Inho-TOP any thing-even NEG drink-CI NEG do-PAST-DECL
‘Inho didn’t not drink anything. / Inho drank something.’

The fact that \textit{ha}, which is similar to English \textit{do}, is required with long negation supports that long negation is a head that projects a phrase of its own (NegP), and blocks the verb from coming together with inflections (see D.-I. Cho 1994; E.-Y. Yi 1994). Further, while in adult grammar, short negation must occur immediately before the verb, and nothing can intervene between them (see H.-S. Han 1987; Y.-K. No 1988; J.-B. Kim 1999), 2-3 year-old children often produce sentences in which short negation and the verb are separated by an object or an adverb, as in (7) (K.-J. Hahn 1981; Y.-M. Cho & K.-S. Hong
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This difference between adult and child grammar can be explained as follows: short negation, which heads its own projection, left-adjoined to VP, cliticizes onto the verb in the adult grammar, but fails to do so in the child grammar (H. Han & M.-K. Park 1994).

(7) a. na an pap mek-e.
    NEG I rice eat-DECL
    ‘I do not eat rice.’ (Y.-M. Cho & K.-S. Hong 1988:34 [2;2-6])

   b. an mak uwl-e.
    NEG much cry-DECL
    ‘(I) do not cry much.’ (Y.-M. Cho & K.-S. Hong 1988:35 [2;2-6])

Note that while identifying the correlation between mal and deontic modal context sheds light on why long form ani cannot be used in negative imperatives, it does not explain why short negation cannot be. Assuming the clause structure in (5), we propose an analysis that addresses this issue in section 1.4.

1.3 Possible analyses of the incompatibility of imperatives and short negation

Before we present our proposal, we will first rule out a few possible syntax and semantics based approaches, as a way of motivating our own analysis.

A series of works have been proposed to account for the (in)compatibility of negation and the imperative based on various Romance, Balkan, and Germanic languages (Zanuttini 1991, 1994, 1997; Rivero 1994; Rivero and Terzi 1994; Han 2000, 2001). Although the details are different, an idea shared by all these approaches is that in some languages (such as Italian, Spanish, Modern Greek), the syntax of the imperative and the syntax of negation are incompatible, ruling out negative imperative formation, and so negative commands are instead formed with another sentence type, such as subjunctives. Examples from Modern Greek are given in (8).

(8) Modern Greek (C.-H. Han 2001:1)

   a. * Mi graipse to! b. (Na) mi to grapsis!
      Neg write-2sg.Imp it NA Neg it write-2sg.Subj
      ‘Don’t write it!’ ‘Don’t write it!’

This approach however cannot be extended to Korean because it would miss the generalization that short negation cannot occur in a wider range of sentences which can be characterized as deontic modal sentences.

Another possible approach is to exploit the assumption that there is scope difference between long and short negation, and formulate an analysis based
on this assumption. C.-H. Han & C. Lee (2002) pursue this approach and propose that semantics of short negation restricted by the scope possibility is incompatible with the semantics of negative imperatives. But the problem is that there is no consensus in the literature or among speakers as to what the scope facts are (see C.-H. Cho 1975; J.-H. Suh 1989; H.-H. Park 1998; K. Lee 1989; J.-B. Kim 2000; S.-C. Song 1982; Y.-K. Baek 1998; Hagstrom 2002; Han, Lidz and Musolino 2003). Crucially, the speakers that report that there is no scope difference reject negative imperatives with short negation. Given this, it is doubtful that scope of short negation can tell us anything about why short negation is impossible in imperatives (or deontic modal sentences).³

A related approach is to formulate an analysis based on the assumption that there is a semantic difference between short and long negation. But it is doubtful that this will work because as far as semantics is concerned, they are the same type of objects, a function from propositions to propositions (\(\lambda p. \neg p\)).

1.4 Our proposal: a morphological constraint

We propose that what is at work is a morphological constraint that applies post-syntactically to the verbal complex, which is formed either through V-raising (D.-I. Cho 1994; Y.-S. Choi 1999) or INFL-lowering (J. Yoon 1994; H. Han and M.-K. Park 1994). The verbal complex will include negation as well as tense, modality and illocutionary (sentence type) morphology because negation behaves like a clitic on the verb in Korean. Within the framework of Distributed Morphology (DM), this verbal complex will have been formed once the structure (e.g., (5)) is shipped off to the morphological component. In what follows, we will argue that the fact that negative imperatives (as well as other types of deontic modal sentences) cannot be formed with short negation follows from Subset Principle and Vocabulary Insertion in DM.

In DM, the output of syntax is a structure with a bundle of morphosyntactic (and semantic) features on each node, as in (9), and that vocabulary insertion takes place post-syntactically, in the morphological component. So, assuming (5), the node dominating the verbal complex in sentences with long negation will include \([+\text{Neg}, +\text{Modality}, +\text{Illoc}]\), and in sentences with short negation will include \([+\text{V}]\) as well as \([+\text{Neg}, +\text{Modality}, +\text{Illoc}]\) because the negation node cliticizes to \(V^0\) which further incorporates with \(\text{Mod}^0\) and \(C^0\).

³See C. Lee (1978) for a discussion on scope interaction between modal and other quantificational elements in negative imperatives.
(9) Feature bundles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbal complex in long negation sentence</th>
<th>Verbal complex in short negation sentence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[+Neg, +Modality, +Illoc]</td>
<td>[+Neg, +V, +Modality, +Illoc]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vocabulary item</th>
<th>Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>an</td>
<td>+Neg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mal</td>
<td>+Neg, +Deontic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vocabulary items are also specified with features. For example, as in (10), *an* is specified with [+Neg], and *mal* is specified with [+Neg, +Deontic] (given that it is the negation form in deontic contexts). Vocabulary insertion obeys Subset Principle: for a feature bundle of a given node, the vocabulary item that has the most number of matching features is inserted.

We propose that in the imperative with long negation, the feature bundle of the verbal complex node includes [+Neg, +Deontic, +Imp], where [+Deontic] is a feature value for [+Modality], and [+Imp] is a feature value for [+Illoc]. Through Subset Principle, *mal* is inserted for [+Neg, +Deontic]. This rules out negative imperatives with long negation *ani*. Further, because *mal* is a verbal element, the morpheme for [+Imp] can be inflected on it, generating imperative prohibitive verb *mal-ala*. On the other hand, the verbal complex node in the imperative with short negation would include [+V, Neg, +Deontic, +Imp]. Since the feature bundle includes [+Neg, +Deontic], *mal* should be inserted, instead of *an* which is simply associated with [+Neg]. Further, a lexical verb will be inserted for [+V]. But then, the verbal complex will end up with two verbal elements, *mal* and the lexical verb, resulting in an ill-formed morphological object. This thus rules out negative imperatives as well as other types of deontic modal sentences with short negation.

Our main supporting argument for the proposed analysis comes from acquisition data. C. Lee (1988, 1993) points out that young children (2-3 years of age) sometimes produce negative imperatives with short negation (11). There are two possible accounts consistent with the proposed morphological analysis. First, notably, children in the same age range sometimes fail to cliticize short negation onto the verb, as was illustrated in (7) (K.-J. Hahn 1981; Y.-M. Cho & K.-S. Hong 1988; Y.-J. Kim 1997; Y.-K. Baek 1998; Hagstrom 2002). What this means is that for the children who have not yet acquired the clitic status of short negation, [+Neg] will not be included in the feature bundle for the verbal complex of an imperative with short negation. That is, the feature bundle for the verbal complex would be [+V, +Deontic, +Imp],
and separately, the node for short negation will have [+Neg]. Thus, the condition for inserting *mal* will not be met. Instead *an* will be inserted under Neg⁰, and the lexical verb and the corresponding inflections will be inserted for the verbal complex, without any morphological violation.

(11) a. To the father leaving for school
    appa, hakkyo an ka!
    Daddy, school NEG go
    ‘Daddy, don’t go to school!’ (C. Lee 1993:8 [2;5])

b. an pwul kkeyo.
    NEG light turn-off
    ‘Don’t turn off the light.’ (C. Lee 1993:8 [2;1])

Another possible account has to do with the fact that Korean children acquire short negation before long negation. H.-H. Park (1998a) shows that 3 year-olds in general can only produce short negation, whereas 5 year-olds can produce both short and long negation. Given that *mal* has the syntax of long form negation, children who have not yet acquired long form *ani* would not have acquired *mal* either. At this stage, if the child has not yet learned the clitic-status of short negation, then *an* will be inserted for [+Neg] without any violation, as explained above. And if the child has learned the clitic-status of short negation, then the feature bundle for the verbal complex would include [+Neg, +V, +Deontic, +Imp]. But since *mal* specified with [+Deontic, +Neg] is not in the Vocabulary, the next best choice is *an* with [+Neg] (Subset Principle). This then allows the insertion of lexical verb as well as corresponding inflections.

A prediction that emerges from our proposal is that an imperative should be able to contain short negation if it also contains long form *mal*.

(12) amwu kes-to an masi-ci mal-ala.
    any thing-even NEG drink-CI NEG-IMP
    ‘Don’t not drink anything.’

This is because in a sentence with both long and short negations, the lexical verb with cliticized short negation, and the verbal complex with long negation are in separate nodes. Hence, *an* specified with [+Neg], and *mal* specified with [+Neg, +Deontic] can be inserted in separate nodes without any violation. The prediction is borne out in (12).

1.5 Conclusion

To conclude, we have argued that imperatives project a projection of deontic modality and a projection of the imperative operator contributing the illocu-
tionary force. Assuming this clause structure, we proposed that mal in negative imperatives is a lexicalization of long form negation and deontic modality. Assuming further that long and short negations occur in two different positions in a clause structure, we proposed that the reason why short negation is incompatible with imperatives (and other deontic modal sentences) is morphological, not syntactic or semantic. We argued that this incompatibility follows from Subset Principle and Vocabulary Insertion in Distributed Morphology. It remains to be seen whether it is feasible to extend a similar morphology-based analysis to other languages that do not allow negative imperatives, such as Italian, Spanish and Modern Greek.
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