

# On Interpreting the Scope of Negation in Korean\*

Seok Choong Song

For more than a decade, negation has been one of the most acrimoniously debated issues in the study of Korean. Despite continuous controversy surrounding the question, the subject has never been fully explored and many interesting aspects of negation still remain untouched today. The weakness of previous studies, including my own modest contributions, lies in their failure to link up syntax with the semantics of negation. The majority of works on Korean negation can be characterized as mere semantic speculations without syntax. Unfortunately, semantic speculations narrowly focus on the question of the synonymy of two types of negative sentences and the ambiguity on one of the two. My own endeavors in this area are essentially syntactic, and semantic questions have been begged. I would like, therefore, to address myself in this paper to the problem of the scope of negation.

There have been three papers (Cho, 1975; W. Kim, 1975; Kuno, 1980) dealing with this question and a brief examination of them is in order. Although I believe that syntactic aspects of Korean negation have been fairly adequately described and repeatedly presented in Song (1967, 1971, 1973, 1975, 1976a, 1976b), the myth surrounding the two types of negative sentences lingers on and is being reinforced by erroneous descriptions and misleading terminologies. In order to clear the mist that shields the facts from penetrating analysis, I will come directly to the heart of the matter and show where the problems lie in their descriptions. Take, for example, the latest description of Korean negation in Kuno (1980).

Korean has two ways of negating a sentence. One way is to add *an(i)* 'not' before the verb, the other way is to add *an(i) hada* 'not do' after the verbal stem+*ci/ji* form.<sup>1</sup> For example, observe the following sentences:

---

\* An abridged version of this paper was presented at the annual meeting of the Michigan Linguistic Society held at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan on October 16, 1981. I would like to thank Grover Hudson and David G. Lockwood for reading and commenting on the earlier version of the paper. Although I have profited from their criticism and have incorporated suggestions for stylistic improvement, I am solely responsible for the remaining errors.

<sup>1</sup> Kuno is not making any serious attempt to describe syntax of Korean negation here and simply reiterating the traditional view. As I will show later, it is a misleading statement to claim that Korean has two ways of negating a sentence.

<sup>2</sup> I will be using the Yale Romanization throughout. I have, therefore adapted Kuno's roma-

- (1) a. na nun pap ul meksupnita.<sup>2</sup>  
 I meal eat (polite)  
 'I have a meal; I am going to eat.'
- b. na nun pap un an(i) meksupnita.  
 I meal not eat  
 'I don't have a meal; I am not going to eat.'
- c. na nun pap un mek-ci an(i) hapnita.  
 meal eat not do (polite)  
 na nun pap un mek-ci anhsupnita.  
 eat not-do (polite)  
 'I don't have a meal; I am not going to eat.'

In (1b), the negative morpheme precedes the verb, while in (1c), it follows the verb.<sup>3</sup>

Kuno's straightforward description of two ways of negating a sentence is misleading. It implies that an affirmative sentence (1a) above can be negated in two different ways. Cho (1975) and W. Kim (1975) both employ the term pre-verbal and post-verbal negations to refer to (1b) and (1c) respectively. These terms are just as confusing as the description for its misleading implication that the negative morpheme in Korean can be freely placed either before or after a verb. Consider the following sentence in which the negative morpheme appears twice.

- (2) na nun pap ul ani mek-ci ani hapnita.  
 'It isn't the case that I am not going to eat.'

How are we going to account for the fact that the two ways of negating a sentence converge in a single sentence? How are we going to name this type of negation? Since both the pre-verbal and post-verbal negations are combined, a preposterous new name, pre-post-verbal negation suggests itself as the most appropriate candidate.

As I have repeatedly emphasized, there are not two ways of negation in Korean. There is only one way of negating a sentence and the rule is, syntactically speaking, very simple: place the negative morpheme directly before a verb.<sup>4</sup> I have claimed that only (1b) is a negative sentence corresponding to the affirmative sentence (1a). Where does the negative sentence (1c) come from? Before trying to answer this question, let us take a closer look at (2), which contains two negative morphemes. Since the negative morpheme must be

nization to the Yale system, leaving the hyphenation as in the original. When quoting examples from outside sources, I have retained the original glosses, leaving the responsibility for these squarely on the shoulders of the original authors.

<sup>3</sup> I believe that the proper underlying representation for the negative morpheme to be *ani*. When citing Korean sentences from other sources, I have given the negative morpheme as it was originally spelled.

placed directly before a verb, we must construe that (2) contains two verbs.

If there is only one main verb in a sentence, then (2) may contain a matrix verb that requires a sentential complement. Indeed, we find a complementizer *ci* that signals the existence of an embedded structure COMP S. Now we have a clue for the solution of the enigma of two types of negation in Korean. (1c) is not another negative counterpart of (1a) but the negation of a matrix verb which requires a sentential complement. I have postulated (3) as a source sentence of (1c).

- (3) na nun pap ul mek-ki lul hapnita.  
 I meal eat-COMP do  
 'I eat the meal.' (lit. I do the eating of the meal.)

When we negate the matrix verb of (3), we get (1c) but if we negate a constituent verb instead, we will get (4).

- (4) na nun pap ul ani mek-ki lul hapnita  
 'It is the case that I do not eat.'

Of course, (2) illustrates a case in which both the matrix and constituent verbs are negated. For some strange reason, linguists have only noted the existence of the negative sentences (1b-c) and jumped to the conclusion that these are two different ways of negating the affirmative sentence (1a). Confronted with sentences like (2) and (4), the myth of the two types of negation evaporates. Since I have offered an extensive discussion relating (3) with three negative sentences (1c), (2) and (4) to be derived from it, no further justification will be necessary to support my own view of the syntax of negation.<sup>4</sup>

Since my syntactic descriptions of negation have not been based on meaning, semantic questions never posed a serious obstacle and I could hedge about the synonymy of the two negative sentences (1b) and (1c). All that I have previously offered has been indirect and negative evidence against the synonymy hypotheses of semanticists.<sup>5</sup> For the first time since the inception of the controversy on Korean negation, (cf. Song, 1967; S. Kim, 1967) the question of synonymy between (1b) and (1c) has been squarely dealt with by Kuno (1980). According to Kuno, for some speakers they are synonymous, but there are other speakers who feel that they are semantically distinct, though the difference is subtle.

<sup>4</sup> Strictly speaking, a negative sentence is not derived from its affirmative counterpart. Therefore, my statement to that import is a gross oversimplification. All three negative sentences are, of course, derived from three different underlying structures, with the negative morpheme placed in different positions. All that I am saying is that an affirmative sentence that corresponds to negative sentences (1c), (2), and (4) is (3).

<sup>5</sup> I use the term in its narrowest possible sense here to refer to the Korean linguists who have been involved in the negation controversy and taken a position to argue for the 'single underlying structure' hypothesis of one version or another on the ground that (1b) and (1c) are synonymous.

Kuno (1980: 162-63) states:

In fact, there are speakers, especially among the younger generation, who seem to be using the two forms interchangeably. However, there are speakers who draw a subtle distinction between the two forms. For these speakers, the form which has the negative morpheme before the verb is a verb negation, while the form which has the negative morpheme after the verb is a sentence negation. For example, observe the following discourses:

(5) Speaker A: 1960-nyen ey thayenasyessupni-kka?

year was-born Q

'Were you born in 1960?'

Speaker B: a) ?aniyo, 1960-nyen ey an thayenassupnita.

year not was-born

'No, I was not born in 1960.'

b) aniyo, 1960-nyen ey thayena-ci an hayssupnita.

(6) Speaker A: i kes ul phari eyse sassupni-kka?

this Paris in bought Q

'Did you buy this in Paris?'

Speaker B: a) aniyo, phari eyse(-nun) an sassupnita.

no not bought

'No, I didn't buy this in Paris.'

b) aniyo, phari eyse sa-ci an hayssupnita

For the speakers under discussion, (5Ba) is not as acceptable as (5Bb) as an answer to (5A). This seems to be due to the fact that what is negated in (5B) is not the verb *thayena-* 'be born', but the time adverb 'in 1960'. The same speakers report that there is a subtle difference in meaning between (6Ba) and (6Bb). They say that the latter is a simple negative answer to the question, while the former expresses Speaker B's willful action of 'not buying'. Namely, the implication of (6Ba), if exaggerated, is that of 'I refrained from buying it in Paris', and thus, this answer would be adequately (sic) only in the context that Speaker B could have bought the object under discussion both in Paris and, say, in London, and that he refrained from buying it in Paris, and bought it in London instead. This implication is consistent with the assumption that the negative version in which *an(i)* precedes the verb is verb negation, while the one in which *an(i) hada* follows the verb is a sentence negation.<sup>3</sup>

This is by far the best description of the semantic distinction in Korean negation that has ever been printed. Kuno's insightful analysis does not carry us very far, however. The 'willful action' of 'not doing' applies only to action/processive verbs and we encounter an insurmountable difficulty in differentiating verb negation from sentence negation when the same distinction is applied to description verbs that involve no action at all. This fact should not diminish the real and unique contribution found in Kuno's elucidation of the subtle distinction that occurs between (6Ba) and (6Bb) or between (1b) and (1c). I still

object to his phraseology referring to (6Ba) as 'the form which has the negative morpheme before the verb' and (6Bb) as 'the form which has the negative morpheme after the verb'. Various designations have been proposed to differentiate (1b) from (1c): Type I and Type II (Oh, 1971; Yang, 1976; H. Kim, 1977), Type A and Type B (Lee, 1970), and Short and Long (Martin, 1969), and finally Pre-verbal and Post-verbal (S. Kim, 1967; Cho, 1975; W. Kim, 1975). The underlying assumption common to all these designations is that there are two types of negative sentences or two ways of negating an affirmative sentence. I have repeatedly shown such an assumption to be a linguistic illusion. Since it would be preferable to avoid misleading terminology, I would like to recommend the less confusing and more natural terms **simplex** and **complex sentence negations**. The latter has three variations, the one with the negative morpheme associated with the constituent verb, the other with the matrix verb, and finally the third with both the constituent and the matrix verbs as illustrated by (4), (1c), and (2) respectively. Since we are concerned with the type of negative sentence (1c), we will ignore for the moment other possibilities and use the term complex sentence negation exclusively to refer to (1c) for an expository purpose. I would like to retain, however, the distinction between verb and sentence negations as semantic notions.

Let me briefly summarize Kuno's findings below:

- (i) For some speakers, simplex and complex sentence negations are synonymous.
- (ii) For other speakers, they are distinct and correspond to verb and sentence negations respectively.

Kuno's insightful analysis successfully links up syntactically different structures with subtle but undeniably distinct semantic interpretations. Although Kuno provides no systematic explanations how such an association is to be mediated through syntactic mechanism and semantic interpretive rules, clearly his astute observation marks the first step towards an explanatory model of description for Korean negation. His unintended contribution, though indirect, is to drive a decisive wedge into the cracks of semantically shaky and syntactically untenable single underlying structure hypothesis of semanticists (Lee, 1970; Oh, 1971; D. Yang, 1976). The semantic distinction between the simplex and complex sentence negations will become much clearer when negative sentences contain quantifiers or adverbial phrases, as I will show. Before proceeding any further, however, I will take a quick look at the other two papers mentioned earlier.

W. Kim (1975:2) avoids syntactic questions altogether as "not crucial for the purposes of this study." She provides the following description:

The surface forms of negative sentences have the negative morpheme *an* either prefixed or affixed (sic) to the verb. There are two ways of saying, "It is not raining." in Korean. (p. 1)

- (7) a) pi- ka an- on- ta.  
rain NM neg falls DSE  
'It is not raining.'
- b) pi- ka o-ji- an- nun-ta.  
rain NM falls neg. pres.  
'It is not raining.'

Without mentioning the source, she "assumes it (= *ji*) to be a nominal complementizer occurring in the negative contexts." (p. 2)

Thus, she contradicts herself by inadvertently admitting one of the two negative sentences to be a complex sentence with a sentential complement, while claiming that there are two ways of negating a sentence. It is hard to believe that the suffixation of the negative morpheme would generate a complex sentence which her own admission of the existence of a nominal complementizer inevitably entails.

After examining "various contexts with modifiers, quantifiers, cleft sentences, coordinate, and complex sentences," she concludes that "the two negation processes differ in their scope of influence." (p. 16) Her conclusion on the semantic difference between the two types of negative sentences is valid, but her argument, which is either non-existent or totally subjective, provides no logical grounds for her foregone conclusion. Furthermore, her grammatical judgment is often shaky and her example sentences are suspect so that they tend to cast doubt on her otherwise valid conclusion. In sum, she has "attempted to show the two distinct processes of negation in Korean: post-verbal and pre-verbal." (p. 16) Unfortunately, her gallant attempts only show that she is another victim of the aforementioned illusion. Her "central claim is that post-verbal negation results in sentence negation, negating all constituents preceding the verb, whereas pre-verbal negation simply negates the VP." (p. 16) This conclusion, as far as it goes, is correct and coincides with Kuno's, which I have cited earlier. Putting aside for a moment the question of the possible dialectal split between older and younger generations that Kuno suggests, there seems to be a semantic distinction between the simplex and complex sentence negations. This distinction can be appropriately captured in terms of such semantic notions as verb and sentence negation. There are other more interesting and complicated questions involving ambiguity of complex sentence negation which were brought out by Cho (1975) and will be dealt with directly. Before moving on to this important question, however, it would be helpful to recapitulate what has been discussed so far.

First, there is only one way of negating a sentence in Korean. What Korean speakers and linguists alike took to be an alternative way of negating is nothing other than a complex sentence negation with the negative morpheme placed before the matrix verb. Negative forms of simplex and complex sentences are semantically and syntactically distinct. This straightforward relation has been clouded by the alleged synonymy of simplex

and complex sentence negations and further complicated by ambiguous interpretations of complex sentence negation.

Cho (1975) quietly ignores the controversy "whether or not there are two ways of negating a sentence in Korean." He simply introduces the traditional view as well as my own, and without any further comment he proceeds directly to discuss the question of ambiguity. He slips in, however, his own view in a footnote:

Unlike most other languages, Korean has two ways of verbal negation: pre-verbal and post-verbal. Post-verbal negation applies to any sentences, but preverbal negation is defective in that it cannot apply to all imperative and propositive sentences and some declarative and interrogative sentences with certain verbs.<sup>6</sup> (p. 75)

He breaks his neutrality and sides with the traditional view which finds much support among semanticists and has emerged as a majority view. Since no further comment is necessary on his position, I will examine his central concern, that is, the ambiguity of the complex sentence negation. Cho states that "the aim of this paper is to present and discuss another interesting but thus-far almost neglected aspect of negation in Korean, namely, the scope of negation." (p. 64)

Cho's theoretical speculations on relative heights of quantifier and the negative, based on a now-defunct hypothesis of Lakoff's (1965), deserve no serious comment.<sup>7</sup> The underlying structures he postulates for Korean negations are exact replicas of English originals and reveal nothing about the structural peculiarity of Korean. Nowhere does he even once make an attempt to show how his underlying structures are to be mapped onto surface structures. Without going into the details of his uninteresting arguments, I will just summarize his conclusions and check the validity of his claims against Korean data

Consider the following examples from Cho (1976).

- (8) a. John-man (-i) Mary-lul an ttayli-ess ta.  
           only SM           OM not beat-Past-DE  
           'Only John did not beat Mary.'
- b. John-man(-i) Mary-lul ttayli-ci an ha-ess ta.  
           'It is not the case that John beat Mary.'
- 'Only John did not beat Mary.'

<sup>6</sup> Kinds of restriction Cho mentions here are important and a full scale study of Korean negation must deal with these and other related problems. But they do not concern the problem I am interested in at the moment, namely, the interpretations of the scope of negation.

<sup>7</sup> Chomsky's detailed criticism of Lakoff's analysis of the interrelation between the NEG and quantifier in English is found in Chomsky (1972: 180-85). It does not necessarily follow that Chomsky's refutation of Lakoff's hypothesis unvalidates Cho's similar analysis applied to Korean data. Cho's proposal must be challenged separately and refuted on independent grounds. Unfortunately, Cho offers no argument and his only justification for espousing the theoretical framework proposed by Lakoff is the head-count of linguists who support a more or less similar position.

According to Cho, simplex sentence (=his pre-verbal) negation (8a) is unambiguous, whereas complex sentence (=his post-verbal) negation (8b) is subject to more than one interpretation. Furthermore, one reading of (8b) is synonymous with that of (8a). Note that negative sentences (8a-b) contain a presupposition-bearing element *man* 'only'. If this element is missing, Cho believes, both (8a) and (8b) are synonymous. Let us examine one more of his examples.

- (9) a. *sonnim-i manhi an o-ess ta.*  
 guest-SM a lot not come-Past DE  
 'Many guests did not come.'  
 ('Guests did not come in large numbrs.')
- b. *sonnim-i manhi o-ci an ha-ess ta*  
 NMZ not-do-Past DE  
 'It is is not the case that many guests came.'  
 'Many guests did not come.'

These negative sentences again contain an adverb *manhi* 'a lot'. (9a) is unambiguous whereas (9b) is ambiguous and one of its readings is synonymous with that of (9a). (9a) and (9b) are synonymous, if the adverb is missing. Cho draws the following conclusion on the basis of his observations.

In this paper, we have observed some of the interesting consequences of interaction between the negative and other lexical items such as *man*, *manhun*, *ttaymuney*, and *kkunh*. We have found that the pre-verbal negation of a sentence is invariably unambiguous, that it yields only Neg-verb readings under all circumstances. Secondly, it is clear that the post-verbal negations of sentences containing the delimiter *man*, the quantifier *manhuh*, etc., is potentially ambiguous between Neg-verb readings (narrow-scope readings) and Neg-delimiter (or quantifier) readings (wider-scope readings). Thirdly, the Neg-verb readings of the post-verbal negation is synonymous with those of pre-verbal negation since they have the same scope of negation, that is, they both yield narrower-scope readings. (p. 78)

Apparently, Cho's semantic description of Korean negation is somewhat more complex and different from those presented by Kuno and W. Kim. But once we discriminate between two different environments in which negations occur, we will find that the apparently confusing picture Cho presents fairly closely coincides with simpler descriptions offered by Kuno and W. Kim. Let us first draw a distinction between two different environments. For expository purposes I will call various contexts in which W. Kim has examined the two types of negative sentences "affected environments". Negative sentences which contain a quantifier, an adverbial phrase or a presupposition-bearing element, as discussed by Cho, also occur in the "affected environments". Sentences like (1b-c) and (7a-b) which contain none of the elements Cho enumerates and do not occur in the various contexts W. Kim

cites, may be said to occur in "neutral environments". In terms of this crucial distinction, the positions of three authors whose articles I have been examining can be charted in the following manner.

## I. Kuno (1980)

Environment Sentence Types	Neutral		Affected
	Older Speaker	Younger Speaker	
Simplex S Negation	V-negation	Non-distinct	(V-negation)
Complex S Negation	S-negation		(S-negation)

## II. W. Kim (1975)

Environment Sentence Types	Neutral	Affected
Simplex S Negation	(Non-distinct)	V-negation
Complex S Negation		S-negation

## III. Cho (1975)

Environment Sentence Types	Neutral	Affected
Simplex S Negation	Non-distinct	V-negation
Complex S Negation		S-negation, V-negation,

W. Kim seems to imply, though she nowhere explicitly states it, that the two types of negative sentences are semantically non-distinct unless they occur in the "affected environment".<sup>8</sup> When we compare the two charts representing W. Kim's and Cho's positions, we find only a slight difference. The complex sentence negation in the affected environment in Cho's chart is ambiguous and, furthermore, one of its readings coincides with that of a simplex sentence negation. In other words, the complex sentence negation in one of its readings becomes synonymous with that of the simplex sentence negation. Other than this complication, the two charts are practically identical. Despite this minor discrepancy, anyone comparing all three charts will notice a strikingly consistent pattern emerging from them. There seems to be an invariable connection between simplex sentence and verb negations on the one hand, and complex sentence and sentence negations on the other, whether in the affected or neutral environments where such a distinction is valid.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>8</sup> I have therefore, placed the term 'non-distinct' in parenthesis in the box under the heading *Neutral*.

<sup>9</sup> Kuno does not directly deal with the negation in the affected environment. But when he points out that (5Ba) is not as acceptable as (5Bb) and this is due to the fact that what is being negated in (5Bb) is the time adverb obviously he is making the distinction between verb and sentence negation in the affected environment. I have, however, placed parenthesis around the entries in the boxes under the heading *Affected* to show that it is my own inference.

On a slightly more abstract level, the charts unmistakably point to the important fact that there is a consistent and clear match between syntactic structural differences and distinct semantic readings.

The ambiguity of complex sentence negation in the affected environments has been noted before and informally discussed by other linguists. It is Cho's singular contribution to drag this fact out of the closet into the arena of controversy and discuss it explicitly in order to suggest what he believed to be a plausible solution. Granted that Cho was successful in his attempt to resolve the question of ambiguity, he will still have to face a formidable new question of similar ambiguity in simplex sentence negation, which I have noted in Song (1979). Consider the following example.

- (10) \* John i yelsimhi pule lul ani paywessta.<sup>10</sup>  
           eagerly French NEG studied  
       \* 'Eagerly John didn't study French.'

Although I first rejected this sentence, I soon discovered that some native speakers accepted it in the sentence-negation sense. In fact, it is not at all uncommon to use the simplex sentence negation with the sentence-negation reading. Consider the following:

- (11) Bill un il ul yelsimhi ani hanta.  
           work eagerly do  
       'Bill doesn't do the work eagerly.'  
       (=Bill is not an eager worker.)

Sentence (11) is not only readily acceptable but also entirely natural. Sentence (10) becomes less awkward if we move the adverb directly before the verb which is preceded by the negative morpheme as in (12). Normally, this type of scrambling does not make grammatical sentences out of ungrammatical ones. What it usually does is to make a sentence either more or less acceptable or natural.

- (12) John i pule lul yelsimhi ani paywessta.  
       'John didn't study French eagerly.'

Sentence (12) is a negation of simplex sentence in an affected environment. From the foregoing discussion, we would expect the verb negation reading, which will be semantic

<sup>10</sup> When I came across this example for the first time, my initial reaction was to reject it as ungrammatical. You do something enthusiastically but it makes no sense to say that you enthusiastically not-do something. I soon discovered, however, that some native speakers accepted the sentence without qualms. When reminded of a possible alternative interpretation, it began to dawn on me that we are actually using simplex sentence negation with sentence negation sense quite freely and frequently.



I do not doubt that the gloss given, which is the verb negation, is a natural as well as predominant reading. But (8) also allows another reading and that interpretation becomes clearer when we expand the sentence as follows.

- (9) John-man (Mary lul) ani ttayli-ko na-to ttayliessta.  
 beat-and I-also  
 'Not only John but I also beat (Mary).'

Undoubtedly, the more natural interpretation in the case of (9) is that of sentence negation. It would be absurd to claim that additional elements brought in to expand sentence (8) have caused the semantic shift from verb-negation to sentence-negation. It would make much more sense to claim that the latent but potential ambiguity of (8) has been brought out by expanding that sentence. As far as I can ascertain, all the examples Cho provides to demonstrate unambiguous verb-negation for simplex sentence (=his pre-verbal) negation are subject to ambiguous interpretations between verb and sentence negations. If we drew up another chart to show what is actually going on, we are likely to get a puzzling and confused picture that can only be described as "chaotic".

#### IV. Actual situation

Environment Sentence Types	Neutral		Affected
	Simplex S Negation	V-negation	Non-distinct
Complex S Negation	S-negation	S-negation	

It is interesting to note that both Kuno and W. Kim are unaware of the potential ambiguity of the complex sentence negation in the affected environment, as brought out by Cho. The crux of the problem for Cho and other semanticists is not only that it is ambiguous, but that one of its readings is synonymous with that of simplex sentence negation. My own investigation reveals simplex sentence negation is also ambiguous between verb and sentence negation readings. In sum, both simplex and complex sentence exhibit ambiguity and their interpretations completely overlap. Cho's complicated description fails to cover a full range of data and falls short of reaching even the level of observational adequacy. Even if all the facts were known to Cho, how would he go about describing the hopelessly confusing data? Is it really the case that two different readings or semantic structures are mapped indiscriminately onto two distinct syntactic structures in the affected environments? No one has ever explicitly claimed so, but that would be the only logical conclusion to be drawn on the basis of the observed data, if we are to follow the semanticists' argument. The facts that not only the complex sentence negation but the simplex sentence negation also is ambiguous, and, furthermore, that they are doubly synonymous practically nullify all the previous descriptions of negation in

Korean. The impact of the blow on the semanticists' position is apparent for everyone to see. If Cho's description is complicated, the actual situation seems to be hopelessly chaotic.

Although it is by no means any easier for a syntactician to account for the complex situation, there is a sharp difference between the syntactic and semantic approaches to the question. The semanticists start out with a description of meaning and any new evidence that invalidates their earlier hypotheses on semantic grounds will have a serious impact on them. Syntacticians, on the other hand, have a tremendous advantage over semanticists. The former set out to describe syntactic structure independently of meanings and assign appropriate readings to separately generated underlying structures. Their descriptions of syntax may or may not be affected by new semantic discoveries. I find, therefore, no compelling reasons to give up, modify, or revise my own battered hypothesis which has withstood the arrows and slings of outrageous onslaught by semanticists. All that needs be done is to unravel the entangled mess of semantic structure and impose a semblance of order or system that underlies competence of native speakers. This is easier said than done. I have no magic formulae to apply to untangle the apparent complications. All that I have to count on is my own gut-feeling as a native speaker, lots of speculations, and a common sense belief in some fundamental linguistic notions like opposition, neutralization, analogy, drift, etc., and, above all, good luck. I also believe in the dichotomy of grammar and language and the parallel distinction between competence and performance, however controversial these notions may be.

Language is an enormously complex entity, biologically endowed and socially conditioned and constantly changing through time. A linguistic system at a particular stage in time can be the end result of various factors operating concurrently, some holding it together and some pulling it apart. The complex picture I have presented can be best viewed as a result of double exposure, one system overlaid over another system. I conjecture that there is a neat one-to-one correspondence between semantics and syntax in the underlying system. For various reasons still not very clear, a sub-system has developed and overlapped with the previous system. Historically, according to H. Kim (1977), complex sentence negation is a later development, coming into existence around the early part of the sixteenth century. When both simplex and complex sentence negations had first come to peacefully coexist, it is probably that they were semantically as well as syntactically distinct. I will call the two distinct interpretations corresponding to different syntactic structures at this stage of development as their primary readings and further postulate that this primary reading still underlies the grammar of negation in Korean. I will

#### V. Primary Readings

Sentence Types	Environment	Neutral	Affected
Simplex S Negation		Verb-negation	
Complex S Negation		Sentence-negation	

represent the situation in the above chart.

If we compare this chart with that of Kuno given earlier, we see that they are practically identical. The only difference lies in the neutral environment and the dialectal split shown by Kuno among speakers of different age groups. In the charts of W. Kim and Cho, we find the distinct reading has been entirely taken over by the non-distinct reading in the same environment. Although I am not totally convinced by their analysis, it is a clear indication that the language is drifting in that direction. It further reflects how strong the judgment of synonymy of the two negative sentences in the neutral environment is among linguists, as well as a majority of native speakers. The reason for this strong feeling can be quite simply accounted for. Without quantifiers, adverbs, and other such elements that contribute in differentiating verb from sentence negations, the distinction becomes so subtle and blurred, or, even better said, neutralized, that native speakers are usually unaware of such a distinction until they are reminded of its existence with convincing examples. I believe that semantic distinction between simplex and complex sentence negations in the neutral environment has not yet been completely lost, but is steadily losing ground. The semanticists' claim of their synonymy, I must admit, is not totally unwarranted. But it is a far cry from their insistent claim that the two negative sentences must be derived from a single underlying structure because they are synonymous. For expository purposes, I will designate this neutralized or non-distinct reading of simplex and complex negative sentences in the neutral environment as the secondary reading. My "double exposure" hypothesis neatly accounts for the situation described by Kuno, showing distinct (between verb and sentence negation) and non-distinct (neutralized) readings coexisting side by side.

Now let us turn to the affected environment, which is much more problematic and complicated. Although Cho concludes that only complex sentence negation is ambiguous, data I have examined contradict his hasty conclusion. As I have shown earlier, it is no longer controvertible that similar ambiguity also exists in simplex sentence negation. Furthermore, the alternative interpretation of the simplex sentence negation is synonymous with the primary reading of the complex sentence negation. In other words, the simplex sentence negation allows a secondary reading of sentence-negation. This is precisely the case in reverse that Cho has claimed to exist in interpreting the ambiguity of the complex sentence negation. To repeat, Cho states that the post-verbal (=complex sentence) negation is ambiguous and one of its readings, i.e., the Neg-verb reading, is synonymous with that of pre-verbal (=simplex sentence) negation. In the case of the complex sentence negation

#### VI. Secondary Reading

Environment		Neutral	Affected
Sentence Types			
Simplex S Negation	Non-distinct		Sentence-negation
Complex S Negation			Verb-negation

in the affected environment, the primary reading will be sentence negation, and an alternative reading of verb negation, its secondary reading. If we draw another chart to represent the secondary readings, it will look something like the above.

When we overlay the chart V of the Primary Reading on the above chart of the Secondary Reading, we will get the chart IV of the actual situation. It looks very much like a blurry and confusing picture developed from a double-exposed frame of a negative. Once we succeed in separating the two layers of the semantic readings in operation, we can see a clear picture of underlying system beneath the complex surface. My "double exposure" hypothesis neatly accounts for a puzzling ambiguity of two negative sentences and the even more enigmatic relation of double synonymy between them.

In the past, a great deal has been said about the ambiguity of complex sentence negation in the affected environment and the synonymy relation of one of its readings with the simplex sentence negation in the same environment. The semanticists' claim of the alleged synonymy between the simplex and the complex sentence negations has been the cornerstone of their "single underlying structure" hypothesis. But there has been no discussion of why such an ambiguity and synonymy relation occurs between the two negative sentences. Although I have no clear picture of how the Korean language has evolved, it may not be unprofitable to speculate on its possible course of development.

As I have hypothesized earlier, there must have been a stage when the two negative sentences were semantically as well as syntactically distinct. Then two things seem to have happened. First, in the neutral environment, they began to lose the semantic distinction, a case of semantic neutralization as I called it. Secondly, in the affected environment, syntactically well-formed but semantically incongruous (in the verb-negation sense), instead of being rejected as ungrammatical, began to be reinterpreted by analogical pressure as sentence negation. I have already given an example of such a sentence in (15). When they were few, native speakers might have rejected them as ungrammatical. As their numbers grew, native speakers' reactions could have changed gradually. Consider the following.

- (16) a. Bill un il ul yelsimhi ani hanta.  
           work eagerly do  
           'Bill doesn't work hard.'
- b. Joe nun ton ul manhi ani pelessta.  
           money a lot earned  
           'Joe didn't earn a lot of money.'
- c. Sue nun tayhak ey tani ciman mayil ani nakanta.  
           college to go but everyday attend  
           'Sue goes to college but she doesn't attend class every day.'

In (16a), the adverb *yelsimhi* 'eagerly' implies some action and it is inconceivable that

Bill can eagerly 'not do the work'. Although (16a) is a simplex sentence negation, the verb negation reading is blocked due to semantic incongruity. In case of (16b), if you rule out the case where Joe is counting his yet-to-be-earned big money in a daydream, the verb negation reading is impossible. If we assume that a college coed normally attends school, although not everyday, the verb negation reading of (16c) is also blocked. But all these three sentences are grammatical and readily interpretable in the sense of sentence negation. When the expected verb negation reading is blocked, instead of rejecting syntactically well-formed sentences, native speakers seem to strive to provide a possible alternative interpretation. When adverbial elements in these sentences are associated with the negative, we get the sentence negation reading. Thus, an alternative reading of verb negation must have begun to develop for simplex sentence negation.

It is not clear how the complex sentence negation also developed its secondary reading. But it does not seem extraordinary when we take into account the new developments both in the neutral and affected environments. As a consequence of the secondary reading of a simplex negation in the affected environment, a partial overlap in semantic readings between simplex and complex negations in the same environment resulted. The semantic overlapping has already taken place in the neutral environment due to neutralization of scope of negation. It is only one step away from the total overlap in semantic readings of the simplex and complex negations in the affected environment. A further corruption is inevitable in due course. If the construction *Neg V* is felt to be non-distinct from *V-ci Neg-ha* in one environment, it is little wonder that their distinction in the other environment could eventually be affected and become blurred. What has begun as an innovation in simplex sentence negation in the affected environment repeats itself in complex sentence negation as well. As a result, the two negative sentences have become non-distinct semantically regardless of their environments.

Today, we have two syntactically distinct negative sentences, each with ambiguous readings which overlap. This asymmetric relation between syntax and semantics has been a real thorn in a description of negation in Korean, and controversy continues with little sign of settlement. But synonymy induced by semantic overlapping is a coincidence of mathematical necessity of limited choice of option. If there are only two possible readings allowed by the difference in the scope of negation, it is inevitable that two readings, primary and secondary, of simplex sentence negation coincide with two readings, secondary and primary, of complex sentence negation.

The imaginary course of development of the two negative sentences in Korean that I have outlined is nothing more than speculation. Actual history could be otherwise and much more complex than we can idly speculate on. Verisimilitude, not truth, is at issue here. Whatever the actual history of the language may have been, the inexorable fact remains unaffected. Negative sentences have developed to the present state of apparent confusion in which syntax and semantics clash. Let me once again recapitulate briefly

what has been already said more than once. The two negative sentences in the neutral environment are felt to be semantically non-distinct by most native speakers today. In the affected environment, speakers are sometimes conscious of semantic distinction in terms of the difference in the scope of negation. At other times, however, these sentences in the neutral environment may be felt to be ambiguous.

In summary, I proposed the "double exposure" hypothesis to account for the confusing situation created by discrepancy between the syntax and semantics of the two negative sentences. Further, I speculated on the possible course of development of ambiguity of each of these negative sentences and resulting synonymy relation between them. Now, I will conclude this paper by considering the theoretical implications of the solution I have proposed to link up syntax with semantics in the description of Korean negation.

The first step towards a reasonably clear and linguistically plausible account of negation is to separate syntax and semantics. The next step is to unravel the entangled strands in the semantic component to impose a semblance of order. The final step is to relate syntax and semantics by assigning appropriate readings to sentences generated in the syntactic component independently of meaning. Of course, a full account of negation will include other factors such as pragmatics, usage, dialectal split, the direction of drift and the analogical operation, etc. Over the last fifteen years, I have striven to provide syntactic description of negative sentences, especially, of the structural relationship between the simplex and complex sentence negations. I believe that the linguistic evidence I have accumulated to support my syntactic arguments through these years is overwhelming. If it has failed to proselytize unbelievers of the semantic school, no amount of persuasion will ever move their deaf ears to listen. I have, therefore, shifted my tactical ground to semantics to show how vulnerable the semanticists' position is in their own stronghold. To claim, because the two negative sentences are ambiguous and furthermore they are doubly synonymous, that two separate semantic structures have to be mapped onto two distinct syntactic structures in an ad hoc manner will verge on the ludicrous. Such a move will also nullify an important distinction of simplex and complex sentences altogether. Although the field has been flooded with semantically oriented discussion of negation, no attempt has been made to explore the nature of the alleged ambiguity and the resulting synonymy. I have shown how these problems can be systematically explained by holding on to the position of autonomous syntax, which has become a byword for some, and the semantic interpretive principle. There still remain other aspects of negation which demand further study, but I feel I have presented for the first time a fairly comprehensive proposal to link up syntax with semantics in order to provide a more satisfactory account of negation in Korean. My integrated description incorporating "separate underlying structure" hypothesis in syntax and "double exposure" hypothesis in semantics will finally put to rest the spectre of time-honored but decrepit Korean grammatical tradition that proclaims two ways of negating sentences and its modern reincarnation in the guise of "single underlying

structure" hypothesis. I believe that iconoclasm is a painful cure but the only effective one for an obscurantism that blocks the path for free inquiry and hinders the advancement of knowledge in the study of Korean grammar, just as in any other intellectual endeavors in Korean society.

## REFERENCES

- Cho, Choon-Hak (1975) 'The Scope of Negation in Korean,' in Ho-min Sohn, ed., *The Korean Language: Its Structure and Social Projection*, the Center for Korean Studies, University of Hawaii.
- Chomsky, Noam (1972) *Studies on Semantics in Generative Grammar*, Mouton, The Hague.
- (1977) *Essays on Form and Interpretation*, North-Holland, Amsterdam, the Netherlands.
- (1980) *Rules and Representations*, Columbia University Press, New York.
- and H. Lasnik (1977) 'Filters and Control,' *Linguistic Inquiry* 8.3.
- Jackendoff, Ray (1972) *Semantic Interpretation in Generative Grammar*, The MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Kim, Hyum-Oak A. (1977) 'The Role of Word Order in Syntactic Change—Sentence Final Prominency in Negation in Korean,' *Proceedings of the Third Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, Berkeley Linguistics Society, Berkeley, California.
- Kim, Soon-Ham Park (1967) *A Transformational Analysis of Negation in Korean*, Paekhap, Seoul.
- Kim Wha-Chun (1975) 'A Note on Negation in Korean,' unpublished ms., Department of Linguistics, MIT.
- Kim-Renaud, Yong-ki (1974) 'Variations in Korean Negation,' *Language Research* 10.1.
- Kuno, Susumu (1980) 'The Scope of the Question and Negation in Some Verb-final Languages,' *CLS* 16.
- Lee, Hong-Bae (1970) *A Study of Korean Syntax*, Pan Korean Book Corporation, Seoul.
- (1970) 'On Negation in Korean,' *Language Research* 6.2, 33-59.
- (1972) 'Problems in the Description of Korean Negation,' *Language Research* 8.2, 60-75.
- Oh, Choon-Kyu, (1971) *Aspects of Korean Syntax: Working Papers in Linguistics III*. 6, University of Hawaii.
- (1971) 'On the Negation of Korean,' *Language Research* 7.2, 45-66.
- Song, Seok Choong (1966) 'Two Types of Negative Sentences in Korean,' a paper presented at the 41st annual meeting of the Linguistic Society of America in New York.
- (1967) 'Some Transformational Rules in Korean,' unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana.
- (1971) 'A Note on Negation,' *Linguistics* 76, 59-76.

- \_\_\_\_\_ (1973) 'Some Negative Remarks on Negation in Korean,' *Language Research* 9.2, 252-263.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1975) 'Review of H.B. Lee, *A Study of Korean Syntax*, Pan Korean Book Corporation, Seoul, 1970,' *Linguistics Sciences* XXXIV.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1976a) 'Synchronic Alternation and Diachronic Change,' in P. Reich, ed., *The Second LACUS Forum*, Hornbeam Press, Inc., Columbia, S. Carolina. 549-556.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1976b) 'Confessions of an Ordinary Working Grammarian,' in *Problems in Linguistic Metatheory*, Department of Linguistics, Michigan State University, 116-158.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1979) 'Positive Remarks on Korean Negation,' *Language Research* 15.2, 155-168.
- Yang, Dong Whee (1976) 'Korean Negation Revisited,' *Linguistic Journal of Korea*, I. 1, 183-217.

Dept. of Linguistics  
Michigan State University  
East Lansing, Michigan 48823  
U.S.A.

(Received 10, December 1981)