

Some Syntactic Properties of Noun Phrase Complementation in Korean and Japanese*

Nam-Kil Kim

0. Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to compare noun phrase sentential complements of Japanese and Korean involving the nominalizers *koto* and *no* in Japanese and *kes*, *ki*, and *um* in Korean. In this paper the historical aspects of the relationship between the two complement systems will not be considered. The main interest of study will focus on the contrastive aspects of the two complement systems. That is, in what respects Japanese and Korean Noun Phrase complements have similar or different syntactic properties. Here, no attempt will be made to explicate any new syntactic characteristics of noun phrase complements. Rather an attempt will be made to incorporate those syntactic facts noticed or explained already by other linguists and myself, especially Kuno (1973), Nakau (1973), Josephs (1976), Lee (1967), and Kim (1974), to compare the two complement systems.

In Section 1, four distributional characteristics, some similar and some different, of Japanese and Korean Noun Phrase sentential complements are presented. In Section 2, the semantic feature 'factivity' of matrix predicates is discussed. Syntactic differences between factive and nonfactive complements as well as transformational rules operating in NP complementation are presented. Finally in Section 3, three different syntactic characteristics between the two major groups of nonfactive predicates are discussed.

1. Some Characteristics of Korean and Japanese Noun Phrase Complementation

Although it is a well known fact that both Korean and Japanese have similar syntax, it will be appropriate to start the comparison of the two complement systems by presenting the general syntactic characteristics of the two complement systems. There are minor differences between the syntactic characteristics of the two complement systems. However, in the majority of cases, those characteristics are almost identical.

First, particles such as *wa*, *ga* or *o* in Japanese and *nun*, *ka* or *ul* in Korean

* An earlier version was delivered before the Association for Asian Studies held in New York on March 25-27, 1977.

I am grateful to Hiroshi Okano for valuable comments on Japanese examples. I alone am responsible for the content of the paper.

able from sentences (1)-(4). However, there is a minor difference between Japanese and Korean. In the case of Japanese, the future tense and the present tense are neutralized. That is, there is no phonological shape distinguishing the present tense from the future tense. The tense of a sentence, except for the case of the past tense, must be determined by the context or the element, such as time adverbials. In the case of Korean, three distinct tenses exist.¹ However, in the majority of cases in Korean, the occurrence of the neutralized tense form is more common.

The occurrence of the neutralized tense or the nonneutralized tense form in Korean sentential complements depends on the nominalizers. The neutralized tense form appears in the complement sentences containing nominalizers *um* and *ki*, while the non-neutralized tense forms, that is, all three tense forms, appear in the complement sentences containing the nominalizer *kes*. Observe the following:²

- (5) a. watakusi wa John ga *kyoo* ku-ru no o sitte iru.

today come Nom

'I know that John is coming today.'

- b. watasi wa John ga *asita* ku-ru no o sitte iru.

tomorrow

'I know that John will come tomorrow.'

- c. watasi wa John ga *kinoo* ki-ta no o sitte iru.

yesterday Past

'I know that John came yesterday.'

- (6) a. na nun John ka *onul* o-nun kes lul al-ko iss-ta.

today Pres

'I know that John is coming today.'

- b. na nun John ka *nayil* o-l kes lul al-ko iss-ta.

tomorrow Fut

'I know that John will come tomorrow.'

- c. na nun John ka *ecey* o-n kes lul al-ko iss-ta.

'I know that John came yesterday.'

¹ It may be correct to say that three tenses appear only in adnominal forms.

i) ka-l salam—

go Fut man

'A man who will go—'

ii) ka-nun salam—

go Pres

'Man who is going—'

iii) ka-n salam—

go Past man

'A man who went—'

² There exist allomorphs of past tense in Korean. The form *-n* occurs in adnominal form and *-ass* occurs in all other forms.

- (7) a. na nun John ka *onul* o- ϕ um lul al-ko iss-ta.
 Nom
 'I know that John is coming today.'
 b. na nun John ka *nayil* o- ϕ um lul al-ko iss-ta.
 'I know that John will come tomorrow.'
 c. na nun John ka *ecey* o-*ass* um lul al-ko iss-ta.
 'I know that John came yesterday.'
- (8) a. na nun John ka *onul* o- ϕ ki lul pala-nun-ta.
 Nom hope
 'I hope that John is coming today.'
 b. na nun John ka *nayil* o- ϕ ki lul pala-nun-ta.
 'I hope that John will come tomorrow.'
 c. na nun John ka *ecey* o-*ass* ki lul pala-nun-ta.
 'I hope that John came yesterday.'

The examples (7a-b) and (8a-b) contain the ϕ form of tense in the complement sentences. This ϕ form is a neutralized form of the present and future tenses. This neutralized tense can be interpreted either as a future or a present according to the time adverbials appearing in the complement sentences. Contrary to this, examples (6a) and (6b) show that the present tense and the future tense are realized separately in the surface structures.

From the above observation, we can conclude that the phenomena of tense occurrence in Korean and Japanese complement sentences are similar between *koto* and *no* complements and *um* and *ki* complements, but different between *koto* and *no* complements and *kes* complements.

Fourth, in both Korean and Japanese the occurrence of nominalizers is restricted depending on the predicates of the matrix sentences, except for the Korean nominalizer *kes*. In the case of Japanese, some predicates take noun phrase complements with *koto* as their object or subject, certain others take those with *no* and still others take those with both *no* and *koto* as shown in the following examples:

- (9) a. watakusi wa John ga kuru { no } o mita.
 I come { *koto }
 'I saw John coming.'
 d. watakusi wa John ni kuru { koto } o meizita.
 { *no }
 ordered
 'I ordered John to come.'
 c. watakusi wa John ga gunjin de aru { no } o wasurete ita.
 { koto }
 soldier is forgot
 'I forgot that John was a soldier.'

However, in the case of Korean the choice of nominalizers is a little different than Japanese. The occurrence of the nominalizer *kes* is not restricted. All predicates take *kes* complements as either object or subject.³ In other words, the choice of the nominalizer *kes* does not depend on the predicates. Contrary to *kes*, the occurrence of the nominalizers *um* and *ki* depends on the matrix predicates. Certain predicates take *um* complements as their subject or object, others take *ki* complements, and still others take only *kes* but not *um* or *ki* complements. The nominalizers *ki* and *um* cannot occur with the same predicates. That is, they are mutually exclusive.

The following sentences show the choice of nominalizers:

- (10) a. na nun John ka o-nun $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{kes} \\ *ki \\ *um \end{array} \right\}$ lul po-ass-ta.

come saw

'I saw John coming.'

- b. na nun John eykey $\left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \text{o-l kes} \\ \text{o ki} \\ *o um \end{array} \right\}$ lul myenglyengha-ass-ta.

ordered

'I ordered John to come.'

- c. na nun John ka kunin $\left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \text{i-nun-kes} \\ \text{i m} \\ *i ki \end{array} \right\}$ lul ic-ass-ta.

soldier forgot

'I forgot that John was a soldier.'

The example (10a) indicates that only *kes* nominalizer occurs, but *um* and *ki* nominalizers cannot. The example (10b) indicates that only *kes* and *ki* nominalizers occur but *um* nominalizer cannot, while (10c) indicate that only *kes* and *um* nominalizers occur but not *ki* nominalizer. Finally, the examples (10b) and (10c) show that nominalizers *um* and *ki* are mutually exclusive. The detailed explanation for occurrence and nonoccurrence of nominalizers with respect to the matrix predicates will be presented in the next two sections.

2. Factivity in Korean and Japanese Complementation

By using the concepts of presupposition and factivity Kuno (1973) demonstrated that a clear-cut distinction exists between *koto/no* complements and *to* complements in

³ There is one exception, which occurs in my mind. The predicate *swipta* 'likely' does not take *kes* complement, but only *ki* complement.

i) *John ka o- $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{nun} \\ \text{l} \\ \text{ass} \end{array} \right\}$ kes ka swipta.

ii) John ka o- $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \phi \\ \text{ass} \end{array} \right\}$ ki ka swipta.

is coming

'It is likely that John $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{will come.} \\ \text{came.} \end{array} \right\}$ '

- 'I { knew } the fact that John had left.
 { forgot }
- (31) a. na nun John ka ttena-l kes lul { wenha } -ass-ta.
 { yokuha }
 { wanted }
 { demanded }
- 'I { wanted } him to leave.'
 { demanded }
- b. na nun John ka ttena ki lul { wenha } -ass-ta.
 { yokuha }
- c. *na nun John ka ttena { l } sasil lul { wenha } -ass-ta.
 { nun } { yokuha }
 { n }
- '*I demanded the fact that John will leave.'

Sentence (30c) indicates that factive predicates such as *alta* 'know' and *icta* 'forget' allow *sasil* 'fact' to replace *kes* and *um*. However, sentence (31c) shows that the replacing of *sasil* 'fact' with *kes* and *um* is not allowed by nonfactive verbs such as *wenhata* 'want' and *yokuhata* 'demand'.

Fifth, the occurrence of tense in complement sentences is restricted by nonfactive predicates, whereas it is not restricted by factive predicates.

- (32) na nun John ka ttena- { nun } kes lul al-nun-ta.
 { l }
 { n }
- { Pres }
 { Fut }
 { Past }
- 'I know that John { is leaving. }
 { will leave }
 { left. }
- (33) a. na nun John ekey ttena-l kes lul yokiwha-ass-ta.
 Fut
 'I demanded that John leave.'
- b. *na nun John ekey ttena-nun kes lul yokuwha-ass-ta.
 '*I demanded John to be leaving.'
- c. *na nun John eykey ttena-n kes lul yokuwha-ass-ta.
 '*I demanded John to have left.'

Sentence (32) shows that all tenses can occur in the complement sentences whose main predicate is factive. However, sentences of (33) show that only the future is allowed to occur in the context of the nonfactive predicate in the complement sentence.⁸

⁸ There are a very small number of nonfactive predicates which seem to be exceptions to this generalization. Predicates such as *palata* 'hope' and *pilta* 'pray' do allow the past tense in complement sentences as shown in the following:

(i) a. na nun John ka o ki lul pala-nun-ta.
 come hope

- (52) a. watakusi wa hooritu o manabanakatta koto/no o kookai
 law didn't learn am
 site iru.
 regretting
- b. John wa sensei no kanzyoo o gaisita koto/no o kuita.
 teacher's feeling hurt regret
 'John regretted that he hurt the teacher's feelings.'
- (53) a. na nun peplyul lul kongpuha-ci anhun kes lul
 law study didn't
 huhoyhako iss-ta.
 regret
 'I regret the fact that I didn't study.'
- b. John nun sensayngnim uy kamceng lul sanghakey han kes lul
 teacher's feeling hurt
 nwiuchi-ass-ta.
 regretted
 'John regretted that he hurt the teacher's feelings.'

In contrast with factive predicates, some nonfactive predicates require the identity condition between the complement subject and the subject or indirect object of the matrix sentence in the deep structure. The subject of the complement sentence is deleted in the deep structure since the rules of complement subject deletion has applied. Examples (10b), (33a) and (36a) of Korean sentences and (47a) and (49a) of Japanese sentences show that the subjects of complement sentences are deleted by the identity condition with the objects of matrix sentences. And examples (29a) and (43a) show that the deep structure identity exists between the complement subject and the matrix subject.

Thus far, I have shown that factive and nonfactive predicates of Japanese and Korean have similar syntactic characteristics. In the following section, I will present syntactic characteristics of certain groups of nonfactive predicates in Korean and Japanese.

3. Nonfactive Predicates

In the previous section, we have seen that nonfactive predicates have different syntactic characteristics. In this section, I will show that different groups of nonfactive predicates have slightly different syntactic behaviours.¹¹ Josephs (1976) made a painstaking effort to establish the semantic difference between *na* and *koto* based on the observations made by Kuno (1973). He argued that the occurrence of a nominalizer *koto* or

¹¹ This section heavily relies on the findings of Josephs (1976: 322-338).

- Kim, Nam-Kil (1974) *Studies in the Syntax of Korean Complementation*, Ph. D. Dissertation, University of Washington.
- Kiparsky, Paul, and Kiparsky, Carol (1971) 'Fact,' in D. Steinberg and L. Jakobovits, eds. *Semantics: An Interdisciplinary Reader in Philosophy, Linguistics, and Psychology*, Cambridge University Press, New York.
- Kuno, Susumu (1973) *The Structure of the Japanese Language*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Lee, Maeng Sung (1968) 'Nominalization,' *Language Research*, special issue, Seoul.
- Martin, Samuel (1975) *A Reference Grammar of Japanese*, Yale University Press, New Haven, Conn.
- Nakau, Minoru (1973) *Sentential Complementation in Japanese*, Kaitakusha, Tokyo.
- Shibatani, M. (1976) *Syntax and Semantics Vol. 5: Japanese Generative Grammar*, Academic Press, New York.

Department of East Asian Languages

University of Southern California

Los Angeles, California 90007

U. S. A.

(Received 9 March 1979)