Against the post-syntactic node-sprouting for the Korean honorific morpheme

Taehoon Hendrik Kim
University of California, Los Angeles

1 Introduction

It is generally understood that the presence of the subject honorific agreement morpheme *-si* in Korean does not have semantic effects. If it did, we would expect it to give rise to or eliminate scope ambiguities when there are scope bearing elements. For example, (1) is scopally ambiguous between the wide scope universal reading ($\forall > \neg$) and the wide scope negation reading ($\neg > \forall$), as given in (3). Despite the presence of *-si*, (2) is ambiguous just like (1).

(1) *motun kyoswu-nim-i* saymphul-ul manci-ci *anh*-ass-ta.
every professor-HON-NOM sample-ACC touch-C NEG.do-PST-DEC

(2) *motun kyoswu-nim-i* saymphul-ul manci-**si**-ci *anh*-ass-ta.
every professor-HON-NOM sample-ACC touch-HON-C NEG.do-PST-DEC

(3) i. 'For every x, x a professor, x did not touch the sample.' ($\forall > \neg$)
[*Context*: There were five professors. *None* of them touched the sample.]
ii. 'Not every professor touched the sample.' ($\neg > \forall$)
[*Context*: There were five professors. *Two* of them touched the sample.]

This type of data would not conflict with analyzing *-si* as an agreement morpheme inserted after syntax (Choi & Harley 2019) and even as something that solely contributes to a non-propositional dimension of meaning (Kim & Sells 2007).

However, Kim (2023) argues that *-si*'s presence affects semantic interpretation. (4) is minimally different from (2) in that *-si* follows *anh-* (which is composed of the negation marker *an* and the verb *h-*; for a discussion of this decomposition, see Kim 2023, pp. 79–83), as opposed to the main verb *manci-*. This sentence is unambiguous.

(4) *motun kyoswu-nim-i* saymphul-ul manci-ci *anh*-**usy**-ess-ta.
every professor-HON-NOM sample-ACC touch-C NEG.do-HON-PST-DEC

The wide scope negation reading (3ii) is absent from (4) and only the wide scope universal reading (3i) is available.

The "double honorific" sentence (5), with *-si* simultaneously appearing in both possible places, shares the interpretation with (4), having the wide scope universal reading as the only possible interpretation.

(5) *motun kyoswu-nim-i* saymphul-ul manci-**si**-ci
every professor-HON-NOM sample-ACC touch-HON-C
anh-**usy**-ess-ta.
NEG.do-HON-PST-DEC

The existence of data like (4) and (5) runs contrary to any analysis which presupposes that *-si* does not affect semantic interpretation, because they clearly show that *-si* does. For example, Kim & Sells's (2007) analysis of *-si* as a contributor of non-propositional (expressive) meaning sans propositional meaning would have to explain not only why *-si* affects propositional meaning in (4) and (5) but also why only in a specific place (namely, when it appears after *anh-*) it does so. Another example of an analysis running counter to (4) and (5) is Choi & Harley's (2019) post-syntactic insertion analysis of *-si*. Working within the Distributed Morphology (DM) framework, Choi & Harley argue that *-si* is an agreement morpheme which gets inserted after Spell-Out at PF given the right syntactic configuration. Since *-si* would be absent from the syntactic structure before Spell-Out takes place under their analysis, the semantic effects of *-si* would be unexpected. It would not be convincing to argue that the PF-inserted *-si* can affect semantic interpretation, because the lack of interpretive effects is what characterizes operations at PF.

A crucial assumption which leads Choi & Harley to pursue their post-syntactic insertion analysis is that postverbal negation in Korean is monoclausal and involves a process akin to English *do*-insertion ("*ha*"-insertion) takes place (e.g., Han *et al.* 2007, Han & Lee 2007). Under this assumption, the double occurrence of *-si* in (5) is a problem assuming that *-si* is an Agr head (as Choi & Harley assume so), because one would have to resort to arguing that the identical AgrP can be merged more than once in a single clause (Yi 1994, Sells 1995). Choi & Harley's analysis inserts *-si* post-syntactically, thereby avoiding this problem. However, such analysis would not be motivated by the analysis in which postverbal negation involves a biclausal structure.

I will argue that postverbal negation involves restructuring and, specifically, two underlying clauses where the lower clause is a reduced one, following Kim (2023). Doing so will achieve two things. First, this will take away the way honorification interacts with postverbal negation from Choi & Harley's bases for their post-syntactic insertion analysis. Second, it will debunk the monoclausal, *do*-insertion analysis of postverbal negation, providing future researches that deal with postverbal negation food for thought.

2 *Do*-support analysis of postverbal negation

What Choi & Harley claim to be the "by-now standard view" of postverbal negation is based on several assumptions (as mostly laid out in Choi & Harley 2019, pp. 1331–1334). Those that are relevant to our discussion can be listed as follows.

(6) a. The negative element *anh-* which appears in postverbal negation is a reduced form of the combination of two morphemes, *an(i)* and *ha-*.
b. *an(i)* is a Neg head.
c. *ha-* is a dummy verb which is not present until after Spell-Out.

d. The main verb does not move outside of the VP domain.
e. The Neg head undergoes movement, forming a complex head with inflectional elements (e.g., tense and mood) above the VP domain.
f. At PF, *ha-* is inserted for morphological reasons (i.e., the complex head containing Neg^0 is an affix and therefore requires a verb).
g. The morpheme *-ci* is a "participializing" suffix (Choi & Harley 2019, p. 1338, fn. 20).

Choi & Harley do not independently defend each assumption and point to the literature for justification, while leaving the assumption (6g) completely unexplained.[1] I refer interested readers to the references cited in Choi & Harley (2019) for the rationale behind these assumptions. I concur with the assumptions (6a) and (6b). What I will challenge here are the assumption (6c), which will make the assumptions (6d–6f) moot if successfully debunked, and the assumption (6g).

3 Morpheme *ha-* in postverbal negation is a restructuring verb

In order to get closer to understanding exactly what *ha-* in postverbal negation is, it is important to determine whether this morpheme is identical to the light verb *ha-*. The question is not about whether *ha-* in postverbal negation is a dummy verb or not, because it is clear that it is, being semantically null and not assigning any theta roles. Rather, the question is about whether *ha-* in postverbal negation shares the morphosyntactic properties with the light verb *ha-*. Choi & Harley are noncommittal about this (see Choi & Harley 2019, p. 1331, fn. 9 for discussion). For them, the answer to this question may be of less importance because it would only decide what lexical entry gets inserted at PF. Regardless of which *ha-* does, the verb will retain its "dummy" features because it will be inserted post-syntactically. However, the half-century-old observation regarding the difference in the availability of the contracted form *anh-* when preverbal negation appears with *ha-* in contrast to when *ha-* appears in postverbal negation (first noted in Kim-Renaud 1974 and discussed in Han 1987, pp. 162–163, mentioned in Cho 1993, pp. 43–44, and independently discussed in Ahn 1991, pp. 15–17) strongly suggests that *ha-* in postverbal negation is not the light verb *ha-*. The observation is as follows.

The morpheme *ha-* typically functions as a light verb like Japanese *suru* and English *do*. As such, it can form verbs by suffixation to the roots of Chinese or foreign origins. For example:

(7) a. *kongpwu.ha-* 'to study'
b. *palley.ha-* 'to do ballet'
c. *insutha(kulaym).ha-* 'to instagram'

However, when the light verb *ha-* appears with the preverbal negator *an*, as in (8a) and (9a), the contracted form *anh-* is not available, as shown in (8b) and (9b).

[1] The assumption (6g) seems to be borrowed directly from Yi (1994:202–204), where Yi argues that *ci-* is akin to English participial *-ing* and is an Agr head, although Choi & Harley do not cite Yi (1994) with respect to this. The similar idea is adopted in Han *et al.* (2007:19, fn. 8), where *ci-* is assumed to be "an inflection on the verb".

(8) a. Pola-ka kongpwu-lul ***(an)*** ***ha***-*yss*-ta.
Bora-NOM study-ACC NEG do-PST-DEC
'Bora did not study.'
(without *an*:) 'Bora studied.'

b. * Pola-ka kongpwu-lul ***an.h***-*ass*-ta.
Bora-NOM study-ACC NEG.do-PST-DEC

(9) a. Pola-ka kongpwu-lul ***an*** ***ha***-*n*-ta.
Bora-NOM study-ACC NEG do-NPST-DEC
'Bora does not study.'

b. * Pola-ka kongpwu-lul ***an.h***-*nun*-ta.
Bora-NOM study-ACC NEG.do-NPST-DEC

Likewise, *anh-* in postverbal negation cannot be substituted for by *an ha-*, as shown in (10b) and (11b). If *ha-* in postverbal negation were equivalent to the light verb *ha-*, this substitution ought to have been possible.

(10) a. Pola-ka kongpwu-lul ha-ci ***an.h***-*ass*-ta.
Bora-NOM study-ACC do-C NEG.do-PST-DEC
'Bora did not study.'

b. * Pola-ka kongpwu-lul ha-ci ***an*** ***ha***-*yss*-ta.
Bora-NOM study-ACC do-C NEG do-PST-DEC

(11) a. Pola-ka kongpwu-lul ha-ci ***an.h***-*nun*-ta.
Bora-NOM study-ACC do-C NEG.do-NPST-DEC
'Bora does not study.'

b. * Pola-ka kongpwu-lul ha-ci ***an*** ***ha***-*n*-ta.
Bora-NOM study-ACC do-C NEG do-NPST-DEC

The observations above suggest that *ha-* in postverbal negation is morphosyntactically not equivalent to the light verb *ha-*. If it is not the light verb *ha-*, then what is it? I will argue that its function has to do with *-ci*. Contrary to Choi & Harley's assumption (6g), I adopt the view in which *-ci* is a complementizer (Cho & Sells 1995, Sells 1995). My proposal is that *ha-* in postverbal negation is a restructuring verb that selects for a TP-less reduced clause headed by *-ci*.

4 Morpheme *-ci* is a complementizer and heads a reduced clause

The *ci*-clause has properties of a reduced clause selected by a restructuring verb, as opposed to those of a full-fledged sentential complement.

For example, in (12) the complementizer *-ko* is the head of a full finite CP selected by the matrix verb *sayngkakha-*. Here, the adverb *cacwu*, modifying the matrix verb, can appear between the complementizer and the matrix verb.

(12) Hwun-un [casin-i pwucokha-ta-*ko*] **cacwu** *sayngkakha*-yss-ta.
Hoon-TOP self-NOM imperfect-DEC-C often think-PST-DEC
'Hoon often thinks that he is imperfect.'

Also possible is to strand the matrix subject between *-ko* and the matrix verb by scrambling the embedded CP headed by *-ko*, as shown in (13).

(13) [Pola-ka cha-lul hully-ess-ta-*ko*] **Hwun-i** *malha*-yss-ta.
Bora-NOM tea-ACC spill-PST-DEC-C Hoon-NOM say-PST-DEC
'Hoon said that Bora spilled the tea.'

In contrast, neither is possible in restructuring contexts, such as complex verb formation (as discussed in Sells 1998 and Koopman 2005).

As shown in (14), (15), and (16), none of the restructuring verbs *siph-*, *pw-*, and *po-* allows the adverb to immediately precede it.[2]

(14) *siph-* 'want' (selects for the clause headed by *-ko*)
a. * Pola-ka khephisyop-i ka-*ko* **cacwu** *siph*-ess-ta.
Bora-NOM coffee_shop-NOM go-C often want-PST-DEC
(Intended:) 'Bora often wanted to go to a coffee shop.'
b. Pola-ka khephisyop-i **cacwu** ka-*ko* *siph*-ess-ta.
Bora-NOM coffee_shop-NOM often go-C want-PST-DEC
'Bora often wanted to go to a coffee shop.'

(15) *pw-* 'want' (selects for the clause headed by *-e*)
a. * Pola-ka khulwuasang-ul mek-*e* **cacwu** *pw*-ass-ta.
Bora-NOM croissant-ACC eat-C often try-PST-DEC
(Intended:) 'Bora often tried to eat croissant.'
b. Pola-ka khulwuasang-ul **cacwu** mek-*e* *pw*-ass-ta.
Bora-NOM croissant-ACC often eat-C try-PST-DEC
'Bora tried to eat croissant often.'

(16) *po-* 'seem' (selects for the clause headed by *-na* or *-(nu)nka*)
a. * Pola-ka khulwuasang-ul mek-*na* **cacwu** *po*-ta.
Bora-NOM croissant-ACC eat-C often seem-DEC
(Intended:) 'Bora often seems to eat croissant.'
b. Pola-ka khulwuasang-ul **cacwu** mek-*na* *po*-ta.
Bora-NOM croissant-ACC often eat-C seem-DEC
'Bora seems to eat croissant often.'

This is identical to what we observe in sentences with postverbal negation. (17a) shows that the adverb cannot appear between *-ci* and *anh-*, cf. (17b).

(17) a. * Pola-ka khephisyop-ul tani-*ci* **cacwu** *anh*-nun-ta.
Bora-NOM coffee_shop-ACC go-C often NEG.do-NPST-DEC
(Intended:) 'It is often not the case that Bora goes to a coffee shop'

[2]This is different from the behavior of restructuring verbs in Italian, where adverbs and floating quantifiers can appear between the lower verb and the higher verb (Roberts 1997, pp. 424–425).

b. Pola-ka khephisyop-ul **cacwu** tani-ci anh-nun-ta.
Bora-NOM coffee_shop-ACC go-C often NEG.do-NPST-DEC
'Bora does not often go to a coffee shop.'

Next, the external argument cannot be stranded between the complementizer and the complex-verb-forming restructuring verb, by scrambling the embedded clause. This is shown in (18–20), cf. (13).

(18) * khephisyop-i ka-*ko* **Pola-ka** *siph*-ess-ta.
coffee_shop-NOM go-C Bora-NOM want-PST-DEC

(19) * khulwuasang-ul mek-*e* **Pola-ka** *pw*-ass-ta.
croissant-ACC eat-C Bora-NOM try-PST-DEC

(20) * khulwuasang-ul mek-*na* **Pola-ka** *po*-ta.
croissant-ACC eat-C Bora-NOM seem-DEC

This is also observed with postverbal negation. In (21), the external argument cannot be stranded between *-ci* and *anh-*.

(21) * khephisyop-ul tani-*ci* **Pola-ka** *anh*-nun-ta.
coffee_shop-ACC go-C Bora-NOM NEG.do-NPST-DEC

The similarities between the behavior of the *ci*-clause in postverbal negation and that of the clause selected by a restructuring verb suggest that postverbal negation involves restructuring. If so, the *ci*-clause must be selected for by a restructuring verb. Where is a restructuring verb in postverbal negation? The answer is that it is *ha-* that is the restructuring verb and selects for the clause headed by *-ci*. We already established earlier that *ha-* in postverbal negation is morphosyntactically distinct from the light verb *ha-*. Now, the claim is that *ha-* in postverbal negation serves a role distinct from the light verb *ha-*, namely triggering restructuring.

What remains is the question about the size of a clausal constituent headed by *-ci*. The answer is that the *ci*-clause is a reduced clause without the TP layer, as opposed to a full-fledged CP. (22) shows that the tense marker suffixed to the main verb of the *ci*-clause renders the sentences unacceptable. This would be so if the tense of the *ci*-clause is dependent on the tense marking on *anh-* (i.e., on the tense of the "matrix" clause).[3] This suggests that the *ci*-clause lacks the TP layer.

(22) a. * Pola-ka khephi-lul masy-**ess**-ci anh*{-ass/-nun}*-ta.
Bora-NOM coffee-ACC drink-PST-C NEG.do{-PST/-NPST}-DEC
(Intended:) 'It was/is not the case that Bora drank coffee.'

b. * Pola-ka khephi-lul masi-**n**-ci anh*{-nun/-ass}*-ta.
Bora-NOM coffee-ACC drink-NPST-C NEG.do{-NPST/-PST}-DEC
(Intended:) 'It is/was not the case that Bora drinks coffee.'

[3] A similar line of argumentation is adopted by den Dikken (1996), where the possibility of tense marking (or temporal adverbial modification) in the complement clause independent of the matrix clause is taken to be evidence of the presence of TP in the embedded clause. See also, e.g., Wurmbrand (1998); Wurmbrand (2001).

With the use of time adverbs, it can be further shown that the tense of the *ci*-clause is determined by the tense marking on *anh-*. The time adverb that mismatches with the tense marking on *anh-* as in (23a) cannot occur within the *ci*-clause, as opposed to the one that matches, as in (23b).

(23) a. * Pola-ka **nayil** khephi-lul masy-ci anh-*ass*-ta.
Bora-NOM tomorrow coffee-ACC drink-C NEG.do-PST-DEC
(Intended:) 'It was not the case that Bora will drink coffee tomorrow.'

b. Pola-ka **ecey** khephi-lul masy-ci anh-*ass*-ta.
Bora-NOM yesterday coffee-ACC drink-C NEG.do-NPST-DEC
'Bora did not drink coffee yesterday.'

To summarize, the observations above suggest that postverbal negation involves restructuring, in which *ha-* selects for a TP-less reduced clause headed by *-ci*.

5 Futile bases for dummy *ha-*

Before moving on, this would be a good place to discuss some of the reasons why the proponents of the *do*-support analysis assume that *ha-* cannot be in syntax. Choi & Harley (2019:1332, fn. 11) mention in a footnote that Yi (1994) argues that "it is not the case that *ha-* selects VP-*ci* as its complement" because "*ci*-phrases cannot undergo passivization, nor can they be fronted in verb copy constructions". The argument falls through because neither of the suggested bases has anything to do with the lexical status of *ha-*. First, the example relating to passivization is as follows (from Yi 1994, p. 203, (24); glosses and translation hers).

(24) * chayk ilk-ci-ka an haye-ci-ess-ta.
book read-ci-Nom Neg do-Pass-Past-Dec
'The book was not read.'

However, this observation is as expected given that *ha-* in postverbal negation is a restructuring verb. Other restructuring verbs also do not allow passivization of the clause they select for, as shown below.[4]

(25) * khephisyop-i ka-*ko***-ka** *siph***-ecy**-ess-ta.
coffee_shop-NOM go-C-NOM want-PASS-PST-DEC

(26) * khulwuasang-ul mek-*e***-ka** *pw***-acy**-ess-ta.
croissant-ACC eat-C-NOM try-PASS-PST-DEC

(27) * khulwuasang-ul mek-*na***-ka** *po***-aci**-ta.
croissant-ACC eat-C-NOM seem-PASS-DEC

[4] In Yi (1994:203), (24) is shown together as a pair with another sentence involving a nominalized constituent headed by *-ki*, which is grammatical. This pair seems to originate from Han (1987:164, (15–16)), where it is shown as part of his argument to refute Song's (1967) claim that *-ci* in postverbal negation is an allomorph of the nominalizer *-ki*. Yi (1994) does not cite Han (1987).

It would not be convincing to argue that the ungrammaticality of (25–27) results from the restructuring verbs being inserted after syntax. The restructuring verbs are clearly in syntax, while the ungrammaticality stem from other factors.

Second, the example concerning verb copying constructions is shown below (from Yi 1994, p. 203, (26); glosses and translation hers, emphasis mine).

(28) * Chelswu-ka chayk-ul ilk-ci-lul **an** **ha**-ki-nun ha-yess-ta
Chelswu-Nom book-Acc read-ci-ACC Neg do-D/C-Top do-Past-Dec
'Chelswu did not read a book.'

Yi's argument seems to be that a constituent containing postverbal negation cannot participate in forming a verb copying construction. However, this is false. (29) shows that the constituent which contains postverbal negation can show up in this context.

(29) Chelswu-ka chayk-ul ilk-ci(-lul) **anh**-ki-nun ha-yss-ta.
Cheolsu-NOM book-ACC read-C-ACC NEG.do-NMLZ-FOC do-PST-DEC
'(All I know is that) Cheolsu did not read a book.'

The difference between (28) and (29) is that (28) involves *an ha-*, while (29) substitutes it for *anh-*. This shows that the ungrammaticality of (28) is dictated by the morphosyntactic property of *ha-* in postverbal negation as we discussed in §3 (with the relevant examples in (10b) and (11b)): *anh-* in postverbal negation cannot be substituted for by *an ha-*. Therefore, (28) says nothing about whether *ha-* is absent from syntax.

6 Restructuring analysis of postverbal negation

Given the conclusions above, the assumptions that would form the basis of a restructuring analysis are as follows.

(30) a. *anh-* is bimorphemic, a contraction of *an(i)* and *ha-*.
b. *an(i)* is a Neg head.
c. *ha-* is a restructuring verb.
d. *-ci* is a complementizer which heads a TP-less reduced clause.
e. *ha-* selects for the clause headed by *-ci*.

Contrary to the *do*-support analysis of postverbal negation adopted by Choi & Harley, the restructuring analysis does away with post-syntactic operations by placing *ha-* back in syntax. A mysterious nature of *-ci* under the *do*-support analysis, for which the proponents only offer a few words, cannot be clearer under the restructuring analysis: it is a complementizer which heads a reduced clause.

However, the question remains as to whether the restructuring analysis can form the basis for accounting for the difference in scopal readings between (2) and (4) as we discussed at the beginning of this paper. Kim (2023) is not only the first to note this difference but also the first work that accounts for it, given the restructuring analysis of postverbal negation. In what follows, I will briefly introduce Kim's theory and show how it accounts for the difference without presenting the full range of derivational details.

7 Prelude to Kim's analysis

Kim (2023) incorporates in his theory a restructuring analysis of postverbal negation which shares all of the assumptions in (30). Working within the frameworks of antisymmetry (Kayne 1994) and cartography (Cinque & Rizzi 2015), Kim builds on the works of Koopman & Szabolcsi (2000), Cinque (2005), and Koopman (2005), with the following notable assumptions.

- The linear order of elements reflects their hierarchical order, with the only possible order being the Spec-Head-Complement order (i.e., directionality parameters do not exist).
- Every movement is leftward, phrasal, and overt, obeying the Extension Condition (i.e., head movement and Quantifier Raising do not exist).
- There is no distinction between "narrow" syntax and "post-syntactic" syntax.
- Agreement is established under a "Spec$^+$-head" configuration, where Spec$^+$ is the transitive closure of the specifier relation (Stabler 1999) and a feature of XP in Spec$^+$ of Y$^\circ$ can check the matching feature of Y$^\circ$.

Building on Kayne's (2005) analysis of postpositions, Kim proposes that a "head-final" head (or the properties of being such) is a consequence of having a pair of heads in the structure. The relevant details of this proposal are as follows.

- One head (call it X) is overt and meaningful.
- The other head (call it X$^\Delta$; read as "X delta") is silent and meaningless.
- X is merged lower than X$^\Delta$ and ordered with respect to other heads in the functional sequence.
- X carries a feature α which triggers movement of an element bearing α into its Spec.
- X$^\Delta$ always triggers movement of the complement of X$^\circ$, regardless of the type of the complement.

A Korean-specific assumption in his proposal is that the nominative marker *-ka/-i* and the accusative case marker *-(l)ul* are heads in the clausal spine (as Nom^0 and Acc^0 respectively), inspired by Whitman (2001) and Koopman (2005). These heads are important because Kim assumes their Spec to be scope positions and that the scope relations are determined in syntax. For example, if a DP moves into SpecNom or SpecAcc, it would be assigned case and take scope from that position.

8 Kim's analysis

The way the subject honorific agreement works in Kim's theory is based on the following assumptions.

(31) a. The honorific agreement morpheme *-si* is $\text{Agr}_{\text{HON}}{}^0$.
b. $\text{Agr}_{\text{HON}}{}^0$ carries the honorific feature [$*$HON$*$], which must be discharged by being matched with [HON].[5]

[5]For details about the feature system adopted in Kim's theory, see Kim (2023:8–9).

c. Honorific subjects carry [HON].

As a result, the presence of *-si* in postverbal negation will force the external argument (the embedded subject) to be in Spec^{+} of AgrP at some point in the derivation. Otherwise, the derivation will crash.

Now, it is possible to update the assumptions (30) regarding postverbal negation in accordance with Kim's theory as follows.

(32) a. *an(i)* is Neg^{0} and *h(a)-* is v^{0}.
b. *h(a)-* is a raising restructuring verb which does not assign any theta roles.
c. *an(i)* selects for vP headed by *ha-* and the reduced clause headed by *-ci* (i.e., Neg^{0} is merged in a position higher than the *ci*-clause).
d. *-ci* is a complementizer which heads a TP-less reduced clause.

The restructuring nature of postverbal negation allows *-si* in sentences with postverbal negation to be merged inside or outside the clause headed by *-ci*, or one *-si* each at the same time (assuming that there is one postverbal negation with a single predicate in the *ci*-clause). Similarly, it is also possible for the nominative case head Nom to be merged inside or outside the *ci*-clause. These are two important factors which precondition the difference in scopal readings between (2) and (4)

In (2), *-si* is merged inside the *ci*-clause so that the external argument will always be in Spec^{+} of AgrP regardless of whether it receives case inside or outside the *ci*-clause. However, where it receives case will affect the scope relations. If it receives case inside the *ci*-clause, the result would be a wide scope negation reading because Neg^{0} is merged higher than the *ci*-clause. On the other hand, if it receives case outside the *ci*-clause, a narrow scope negation reading will arise from it because the case position (i.e., SpecNom) outside the *ci*-clause is merged higher than Neg^{0}.

On the contrary, (4) has *-si* merged outside of the *ci*-clause. This results in a situation where the external argument will not be in Spec^{+} of AgrP if it receives case inside the *ci*-clause, although it can. Such derivation will give rise to a wide scope negation reading. However, that derivation will crash because the honorific feature of $\text{Agr}_{\text{HON}}{}^{0}$ cannot be discharged. Consequently, the derivation in which the external argument receives case outside the *ci*-clause is the only possible derivation, because the external argument would be in Spec^{+} of AgrP in that derivation. This derivation will result in a narrow scope negation reading, which is the only available interpretation.

In summary, the restructuring analysis of postverbal negation, which provides a space for AgrP inside and outside the *ci*-clause, in combination with Kim's theory's ways in which scope is determined and agreement relations are established, can account for the surprising contrast in scopal possibilities between (2) and (4), without requiring any post-syntactic operations.

9 Conclusion

This paper began with a set of rather unusual examples relating to subject honorification, which shows that the honorific agreement morpheme *-si* affects semantic

interpretation. Such examples served to be empirical evidence directly running counter to the post-syntactic insertion analysis of *-si* by Choi & Harley (2019). The basis of their analysis was the post-syntactic insertion (*do*-insertion) analysis of *ha-*. That analysis was also debunked on the empirical grounds. What appears to be a pertinent question then is whether other analyses which adopt post-syntactic operations are correct. Then, we may ask whether all of such analyses can be substituted for by analyses devoid of post-syntactic operations. Going further, if so, can we do away with post-syntactic operations at PF? This last question, as widely known, has been a research goal for Nanosyntax (see Starke 2009, Baunaz *et al.* 2018).

Nevertheless, what appears to be clear is that having the right analysis of postverbal negation is a precondition for arriving at the right analysis of subject honorific agreement. More often than not, it seems easy to fall into the trap of forming an analysis based on traditional, un(der)challenged assumptions using one's go-to theoretical tools, perhaps, out of convenience. I hope to have shown that healthy skepticism wins the day in the end.

Acknowledgements

I am grateful to Hilda Koopman, Anoop Mahajan, Tim Hunter, and Carson Schütze for their invaluable advice. I would also like to thank Bum-Sik Park, Heesun Yang, Jaehong Shim, Myung-Kwan Park, Youngdong Cho, Soo-Hwan Lee, Dongwoo Park, and the audiences of and reviewers for CLS 60 and GLOW in Asia XIV for questions, feedback, and comments. Special thanks to Zhuo Chen, Yu Tanaka, and Hashmita Agarwal.

References

Ahn, H.-D. 1991. *Light Verbs, VP-movement, Negation and Clausal Architecture in Korean and English*. University of Wisconsin–Madison dissertation.

Baunaz, L., K. De Clercq, L. Haegeman, & E. Lander (eds.) 2018. *Exploring Nanosyntax*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Cho, D.-I. 1993. Emphasis, Negation, and Verb Movement. In *Papers from the Fifth Student Conference in Linguistics (SCIL 5)*, ed. by V. M. Lindblad & M. Gamon, number 20 in MIT Working Papers in Linguistics, 35–49, Cambridge, MA. MIT Working Papers in Linguistics.

Cho, Y.-M. Y., & P. Sells. 1995. A Lexical Account of Inflectional Suffixes in Korean. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 4. 119–174.

Choi, J., & H. Harley. 2019. Locality domains and morphological rules: Phases, heads, node-sprouting and suppletion in Korean honorification. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 37. 1319–1365.

Cinque, G. 2005. Deriving Greenberg's Universal 20 and Its Exceptions. *Linguistic Inquiry* 36. 315–332.

Cinque, G., & L. Rizzi. 2015. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures. In *The Oxford Handbook of Linguistic Analysis, Second Edition*, ed. by B. Heine & H. Narrog, chapter 4, 65–78. Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.

den Dikken, M. 1996. The Minimal Links of Verb (Projection) Raising. In *Minimal Ideas: Syntactic studies in the minimalist framework*, ed. by W. Abraham, S. D. Epstein, H. Thráinsson, & C. J.-W. Zwart, number 12 in Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today, 67–96. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Co.

Han, C.-h., & C. Lee. 2007. On Negative Imperatives in Korean. *Linguistic Inquiry* 38. 373–395.
Han, C.-h., J. Lidz, & J. Musolino. 2007. V-Raising and Grammar Competition in Korean: Evidence from Negation and Quantifier Scope. *Linguistic Inquiry* 38. 1–47.
Han, H.-S. 1987. *The configurational structure of the Korean language*. University of Texas at Austin dissertation.
Kayne, R. S. 1994. *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*. Number 25 in Linguistic Inquiry Monographs. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
Kayne, R. S. 2005. Some Notes on Comparative Syntax, with Special Reference to English and French. In *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Syntax*, ed. by G. Cinque & R. S. Kayne, chapter 1, 3–69. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
Kim, J.-B., & P. Sells. 2007. Korean honorification: a kind of expressive meaning. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 16. 303–336.
Kim, T. H. 2023. *The syntax of negation in Korean given an antisymmetric and cartographic framework*. UCLA dissertation.
Kim-Renaud, Y.-K. 1974. *Korean Consonantal Phonology*. University of Hawai'i dissertation.
Koopman, H. 2005. Korean (and Japanese) Morphology from a Syntactic Perspective. *Linguistic Inquiry* 36. 601–633.
Koopman, H., & A. Szabolcsi. 2000. *Verbal Complexes*. Number 34 in Current Studies in Linguistics. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
Roberts, I. 1997. Restructuring, Head Movement, and Locality. *Linguistic Inquiry* 28. 423–460.
Sells, P. 1995. Korean and Japanese Morphology from a Lexical Perspective. *Linguistic Inquiry* 26. 277–325.
Sells, P. 1998. Structural Relationships Within Complex Predicates. In *Selected Papers from the 11th International Conference on Korean Linguistics*, ed. by B.-S. Park & J. H. S. Yoon, 115–147, Seoul, South Korea. International Circle of Korean Linguistics.
Song, S. C. 1967. *Some Transformational Rules in Korean*. Indiana University dissertation.
Stabler, E. 1999. Remnant Movement and Complexity. In *Constraints and Resources in Natural Language Syntax and Semantics*, ed. by G. Bouma, E. Hinrichs, G.-J. M. Kruijff, & R. Oehrle, chapter 16, 299–326. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
Starke, M. 2009. Nanosyntax: A short primer to a new approach to language. *Nordlyd* 36. 1–6.
Whitman, J. 2001. Kayne 1994: p. 143, fn. 3. In *The Minimalist Parameter: Selected papers from the Open Linguistics Forum, Ottawa, 21–23 March 1997*, ed. by G. M. Alexandrova & O. Arnaudova, number 192 in Current Issues in Linguistic Theory, 77–100. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
Wurmbrand, S. 1998. *Infinitives*. MIT dissertation.
Wurmbrand, S. 2001. *Infinitives: Restructuring and Clause Structure*. Number 55 in Studies in Generative Grammar. Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter.
Yi, E.-Y. 1994. NegP in Korean. In *Cornell Working Papers in Linguistics: Volume 12, Papers on Negation*, ed. by H. Grabois, D. Parkinson, & D. Yeager, 193–208. Ithaca, NY: DMLL Publications.