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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.
occur after nominalizers. Note sentence (1) and (2):

(1) a. watakusi wa John ga ku-ru no o sitte iru.
   I come Nom know
   ‘I know that John is coming.’
   b. na nun John ka o-nun kes ul alko iss-ta
      come Nom know
      ‘I know that John is coming.’
(2) a. John ga ku-ru no ga mondai ni natta.
      come Nom problem became
      ‘That John is coming became a problem.’
      come Nom problem became
      ‘That John is coming became a problem.’

As shown in (1) and (2), the objective particles o and ul and the subjective articles ga and ka occur after the nominalizers no and kes. Needless to say, the function of case particles in (1) and (2) of both languages is identical.

Second, there is a difference between Japanese and Korean with respect to occurrence of declarative mood ending in complement sentences. While mood endings such as ru, u, or ta occur before nominalizers in the case of Japanese, no mood ending occurs before nominalizers in the case of Korean as shown in the following:

(3) watasi wa John ga (ku-ru) no o sitte iru.
    I came Nom know
    ‘I know that John comes.’
(4) a. na nun John ka o-nun kes lul al-ko iss-ta.
    came Nom know M
    ‘I know that John came.’
   b. na nun John ka o-ass um lul al ko iss-ta.
    came Nom M
    ‘I know that John came.’
   c. na nun John ka o ki lul pala-nun-ta.
    come Nom want Pres M
    ‘I want John to come.’

As the underlined parts indicate in (3) and (4), the ending form ta does not appear in Korean complement sentences, but ending forms such as ru and ta do appear in the case of Japanese.

Third, tense forms appear in complement sentences of both languages as predict-
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. 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 nonneutralized tense forms, that is, all three tense forms, appear in the complement sentences containing the nominalizer kes. Observe the following:

(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 eeey 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.
    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.
    soldier is forgot
    { koto }
    '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. 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 \{kes \*ki \} lul po-ass-ta.
    \{*um \} come saw
    ‘I saw John coming.’

b. na nun John eykey \{o-l kes \} lul myenglyengha-ass-ta.
    \{o *ki \*o um \} ordered
    ‘I ordered John to come.’

c. na nun John ka kunin \{i-nun-kes \} lul ic-ass-ta.
    soldier \{i *m *i ki \} 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 nominalizes *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-nun \{nun \} kes ka *swipta.
    \{l ass \}

ii) John ka o- \{o \} ki ka *swipta.
    \{ ass \} is coming
    ‘It is likely that John { will come. }’
Japanese. He showed that complements involving *koto/no have factive interpretation but complements with to do not have this interpretation as shown in (11):

(11) a. Mary wa John ga gunjin de aru { koto/no } o wasurete ita.  
   { *to }
   'Mary forgot that John was a soldier.'

b. Mary wa John ga kita { to } itta.  
   { *koto/no } said
   'Mary said that John came.'

The complement sentence with koto/no (11a) represents a proposition that the speaker presupposes to be true fact, while the complement sentence with to in (11b) does not have such a presupposition. The different interpretation of factive presupposition in the examples (11a-b) is due to the matrix predicates. A factive predicate wasureru 'forget' requires the complement sentence to take koto or no as a nominalizer, while a nonfactive predicate yuu 'say' require the complement sentence to take to as a nominalizer.

These findings apply to Korean complementation. The corresponding Korean examples are illustrated in the following:

(12) a. Mary nun John ka kunin { i-nun-kes lul } iko iss-ass-ta.  
   { i-um lul } *i-la-ko forgot
   'Mary forgot that John was a soldier.'

   { o-n-kes lul } { o-ass-um lul } *o-ass-um lul
   'Mary said that John came.'

The complement sentence of (12a) has a factive presupposition but that of (12b) does not have it. Also, the choice of nominalizers is due to the main predicates.

The distinction between koto/no complements, on the one hand, and ko complement, on the other, is not only due to semantic property, 'factivity,' of matrix predicates, but also due to the different syntactic constructions of complement sentences. Nakau (1973) argued quite convincingly that koto/no sentential complements differ from to sentential complements. According to Nakau, koto/no complement sentences are immediately dominated by Noun Phrases but to complements are dominated by Predicate Phrases. To support his argument Nakau demonstrated that some transformational rules apply only to koto and no sentential complements, while others apply only to koto complements. The transformational rules which apply only to NP sentential complements are the Topicalization, the Cleft Formation, the NP Deletion, and the Pronominalization.4

All these transformational rules apply to Korean kes sentential complements but

---

4 See Nakau (1973:93-100 and 110-116) for more detailed argument.
not to *ko* complement sentences as demonstrated in the following examples (modeled after Nakau’s):5

i) The Topicalization

(13) a. watakusi wa [John ga kuru no o] mita.
   ‘I saw John coming.’
   b. [John ga kuru no wa] watashi ga mita.


   ‘I said that John came.’

ii) The Cleft Formation

(16) a. watasi ga wasureta no wa John ga kita koto da.
   ‘What I forgot was that John came.’
   b. na ka icun kes nun John ka on kes ita.

iii) The NP Deletion

(17) a. Mary wa [John ga kyoo kuru no o] wasurete ita;
   today came     forgot
   Susan mo [John ga kyoo kuru no o] wasurete ita.
   too
   ‘Mary forgot that John would come today, and Susan also forgot that
   John would come today.’
   b. Mary wa [John ga kyoo kuru no o] wasurete ita;
   Susan mo [φ] wasurete ita.
   ‘Mary forgot that John would come today and Susan also forgot it.’

(18) a. Mary nun [John ka onul o-nun kes lul] icko iss-ass-ta;
   today come     forgot
   Susan to [John ka onul o-nun kes lul] icko iss-ass-ta.
   too
   b. Mary nun [John ka onul o-nun kes lul] icko iss-ass-ta;
   Susan to [φ] icko iss-ass-ta.

   ‘Mary said that John would come today;
   Susan also said that John would come today.’

5 To *um* and *ki* sentential complements only the NP Deletion and the proninalization are applied.
Some of the rules mentioned by Nakau were also found in Korean syntax by Lee (1968) and Kim (1974).
   Susan to [ϕ] malha-ass-ta.

iv) The Pronominalization

(20) a. Mary wa [John ga kyoo kuru no o] wasurete ita;
    Susan mo [John ga kyoo kuru no o] wasurete ita.
   ‘Mary forgot that John would come today, and Susan also forgot that
   John would come today.’

b. Mary wa [John ga kyoo kuru no o] wasurete ita;
    Susan mo [sore o] wasurete ita.
   ‘Mary forgot that John would come, and Susan also forgot it.’

(21) a. Mary nun [John ka onul o-nun kes lul] icko iss-ass-ta;
    Susan to [[John ka onul o-nun kes lul] icko iss-ass-ta.

b. Mary nun [John ka onul o-nun kes lul] icko iss-ass-ta;
    Susan to [kukes lul] icko iss-ass-ta.

(22) a. Mary nun [John ka onul o-nun-ta ko] malha-ass-ta;

    Susan to [kukes lul] malha-ass-ta.

The application of the above four Transformational rules has nothing to do with the
semantic feature, ‘factivity’, of the matrix predicates. These rules apply to all Japanese
koto/no complements and Korean kes complements.

Now back to the consideration of presupposition and factivity. The distinction
between factive and nonfactive complements is rather simple in the case of koto/no complements versus to complements in Japanese and kes complements versus ko complements in Korean. However, there are several groups of Japanese and Korean predicates
which take koto/no and kes but cannot be treated as factive since they do not involve
any presupposition. Observe the following examples:

(23) a. John wa Mary ni atta [koto] o wasurete ita.
    met forgot
   ‘John forgot that he met Mary.’

    running
   ‘That John runs is fast.’

c. watakusi wa John ga asita kuru koto o kitai site iru.
    tomorrow come am expecting
   ‘I am expecting that John will come tomorrow.’
   met forgot
   'John forgot that he met Mary.'

b. na nun John ka ttwie kanun kes lul po-ass-ta.
   running go saw
   'I saw John running.'

c. na'nun John ka nayil o-l kes lul kitayhako issta.
   tomorrow am expecting
   'I am expecting that John will come tomorrow.'

The examples (23a) and (24a) show that the speaker presupposes that the embedded proposition is a true fact. However, the examples (23b-c) and (24b-c) show that the embedded propositions do not involve such a presupposition. Thus, it is apparent that factivity and nonfactivity of the embedded sentence is determined by the matrix predicates.

In Kim (1974: Chapter II) it was demonstrated that Korean factive and nonfactive predicates which take the kes complement as their object or subject have the following kinds of different syntactic characteristics:

First, factive predicates allow only um complement while nonfactive predicates allow ki:

   came Nom know
   'I know that John came.'

b. na nun [John ka o-ass um lul] alko iss-ta.
   Nom
   'I know that John came.'


   Nom want
   'I want John to come.'

b. na nun [John ka o ki lul] pala-nun-ta.
   'I want him to come.'


Second, only factive predicates allow nun-kes as a head of a complement sentence replacing nominalizers kes or um:

6 There are some exceptions in the case of nonfactive predicates. A certain class of nonfactive adjectival predicates such as ppaluta 'fast', minchephata 'quick', nulita 'slow' and yakta 'smart' does not take the ki nominalizer, but only the um nominalizer. Also, not all nonfactive predicates take ki or um. That is, there are some classes of nonfactive predicates which take only kes nominalizer as a head of a complement sentence. More detailed discussion of this matter is found in Section 3.
   'I know that John came.'
   

Sentence (27a) is a paraphrase of (25a-b), but the example (27b) indicates that (26a-b) can not be paraphrased in the same manner.

Third, factive adjectival predicates become the sentence modifying adverbials while nonfactive adjectival predicates become the verb modifying adverbials:

(28) a. na nun John ka sihem ey tteleci-n kes ka kayep-ta.
   examination failed pitiful
   'It is pitiful that John failed the examination.'
   
b. kayepketo, John ka sihem ey tteleci-ass-ta.
   'Pitifully, John failed the examination.'
   
   'John pitifully failed the examination.'

   running go fast
   '*That John is running is fast.'
   
b. *palli, John nun ttwie kanta.
   'Fast, John is running.'
   
c. John nun ppalli ttwie kanta.
   'John is running fast.'

The comma after adverbs in (28b) and (29b) indicates that the adverbs are the sentence modifiers, but not the verb modifiers.²

Fourth, only factive predicates allow the noun sasil 'fact' with a sentential complement to replace the simple kes-clause or um-clause:

   left [icko]
   [knew]
   [forgot]
   'I [knew] that John had left.'
   
   [ic]
   'John had ass-ta.'
   
c. na nun John ka ttena-n sasil lul [al] -ass-ta
   [ic]
   'John ass-ta.'

² Some persons may say that sentence (28c) is acceptable. This is due to the fact that a certain class of adverbials such as kayepkeyto can occur either in the sentence initial position or in the middle of the sentence. If (28c) is acceptable, it is because a sentential adverb is moved into the middle of the sentence in (28c).
'I knew the fact that John had left.

(31) a. na nun John ka ttena-1 kes lul {wenha }-ass-ta.
    {yokuha }{wanted}
    {demanded}
    'I wanted him to leave.'

b. na nun John ka ttena ki lul {wenha }-ass-ta.

c. *na nun John ka ttena {I }sasil lul {wenha }-ass-ta.
   {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.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Pres} \\
\text{Fut} \\
\text{Past}
\end{array}
\]

'I know that John {is leaving.}

(33) a. na nun John ekey ttena-1 kes lul yokiwha-ass-ta.

Fut

'I demanded that John leave.'


'*I demanded John to be leaving.'


'*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
Sixth, in many cases, the relativization of a Noun Phrase from the complement sentences is allowed only by nonfactive predicates:

\[(34)\]  
a. na nun John ka ku sosel lul ilk-n kes lul alko iss-ta.  
   ‘I know that John has read the novel.’  
b. *na ka John ka ilk-n kes lul alko issmun ku sosel nun eyep-ta.  
   ‘*The novel which I know John read is difficult to read.’

\[(35)\]  
a. na ka John ka ku sosel lul ilk-ass um lul alko iss-ta.  
b. *Na ka John ka ilk-ass um lul alko issmun...’

\[(36)\]  
a. na ka John eykey ku sosel lul ilk-ass um lul kwenha-ass-ta.  
   ‘I recommended that John read the novel.’  
b. na ka John ekey ilk-l kes lul kwenha-n ku sosel....’  
   ‘The novel which I recommended John to read....’

\[(37)\]  
a. na ka John eykey ku sosel lul ilk ki lul kwenha-ass-ta.  
b. na ka John ekey ilk ki lul kwenha-n ku sosel....’

Sentences (34b) and (35b) indicate that the noun phrase cannot be moved by

\[\text{Past} \]

‘I hope that John will come.’

b. na nun John ka o-ass ki lul pala-nun-ta.  
   ‘I hope that John came.’

However, the past tense in (ib) is not the regular past occurring in indicative sentences, but rather the past occurring in the subjunctive sentence. Predicate \textit{palata} ‘hope’ is a subjunctive verb which expresses the speaker’s desire, supposition or hypothesis rather than an actual fact. We can find, in the following examples, that this observation is correct:

\[(ii)\]  
a. na nun John ka o- {1 \{nun\}} kes lul pala-nun-ta.  
   ‘I hope that John will come.’  
b. *nam nun John ka o-n kes lul pala-nun-ta.  
   ‘I hope that John came.’  
c. na nun John ka o-ass-l kes lul pala-nun-ta.  
   ‘I hope that John came.’

If (ia) and (iia) are acceptable and, furthermore, if (ib) is acceptable, it is expected that (iib) is also acceptable. However, as (iib) indicates, it is not acceptable, but rather (iic) is acceptable. The example (iic) shows that the complement sentence contains a subjunctive aspect. Accordingly, the past tense is not the regular past, but rather the subjunctive past. Therefore it seems that predicates such as \textit{palata} and \textit{pilta} do not constitute a counter example to the generalization of tense restriction.

\[9\] There are some examples of NP relativization whose acceptability is doubtful. However, in most of the cases sentences derived from nonfactive complements by relativization are more comfortable in acceptability than those derived from factive complements.
relativization from both *kes and *um complement sentences whose main predicate is factive. Meanwhile, sentences (36b) and (37b) show that the NP movement out of the complement sentence is not blocked by relativization because of a nonfactive predicate.

All of the characteristics of factive predicates revealed in Korean complementation except the first one are also found in Japanese complementation. Some of these were discussed in Kuno (1973) and Nakau (1973). Let us examine now the case of Japanese.

i) *To yuu koto* and *to yuu no* can substitute for *koto* and *no* in factive complements in a more productive way than in nonfactive complements:

(38) a. watasi wa John ga kita [no] o sitte iru.
   \[ koto \]
   ‘I know that John had come.’

   b. watasi wa John ga kita *to yuu* [no] o sitte iru.
   \[ koto \]

(39) a. watasi wa John ga kuru no o mita.
   ‘I saw John coming.’

   b. *watasi wa John ga kuru *to yuu* no o mita.

In conjunction with the substitution of *to yuu koto/ to yuu no* for *koto/no*. Kuno (1973) discussed a case in which only *to yuu koto/to yuu no* but no *koto/no* is possible. When the predicate of a subject noun clause does not contain the presupposition of the truth of the clause, only *to yuu koto/to yuu no* is used as shown in the following examples (based on Kuno’s example):

(40) John ga Mary o naguta \{*koto*/no \} wa uso da.
   hit \{ to yuu koto/no \} lie
   ‘It is false that John hit Mary.’

The corresponding Korean example reveals that this is also true in Korean complementation as shown in the following:

(41) John ga Mary lul \{*ttayli-n kes \}
   {ttayli-ass *um. \} nun kecis ita.
   \{ttayli-ass-ta nun kes \} lie Cop
   ‘It is false that John hit Mary.’

ii) The sentence modifying adverbials vs. the verb modifying adverbials:

(42) a. watakusi wa John ga siken ni otita \{ koto \} ga kawai soo da.
   \{no \}
   examination fail pitiful
   ‘It is pitiful that John failed the examination.’

   b. kawai soo ni, John ga siken ni otita.
   ‘Pitifully, John failed the examination.’

   c. *John ga siken ni kawai soo ni otita.
"*John failed pitifully the examination.'

(43) a. John wa hasiru { no } ga hayai.
run   fast
"*That John runs is fast.'
b. *Hayaku, John ga hasiru.
"Fast, John runs.'
c. John ga hayaku hasiru.
'John runs fast.'

iii) The substitutability of zizitu 'fact' for koto/no in factive complements: (This fact is noticed by Nakau (1973).)

(44) a. watasi wa John ga deta { no } o { sitte } ita.
left   { knew }  
'I {knew } that John had left.'
{ forgot }
b. watasi wa John ga deta zizitu o { sitte } ita.
{ knew }  { wasurete }  
'I {knew } the fact that John had left.'
{ forgot }

(45) a. watasi wa John ga deru koto o yookyuusita.
leave demanded
'I demanded John to leave'
b. *watasi wa John ga deru zizitu o yookyuusita.
'*I demanded the fact that John will leave.'

iv) The tense restriction in nonfactive complements: (See Nakau (1973: 225-227) and Josephs (1976) for a more detailed discussion on tense restriction in Japanese)

(46) a. watasi wa John ga deru koto o sitte ita.
' I knew that John will leave.
b. Watasi wa John ga deta koto o sitte ita.
'I knew that John had left.'

(47) a. watasi wa John ni deru koto o yookyuusita.
'I demanded John to leave.'
b. *watasi wa John ni deta koto o yookyuusita.
'*I demanded John to have left.'

v) The relativization of Noun Phrase from the complement sentences:
Noun Phrase Complementation

(48) a. watasi wa John ga sono syoo setu o yonda koto o sitte iru.
   'I know that John read the novel.'
   The novel read know
   b. *John ga yonda koto o watasi ga sitte iru sono syoo setu wa muzukasii.
   *The novel which I know John read is difficult.'
(49) a. watasi wa John ni sono syoo setu o yomu koto o suisensita.
   'I recommended John to read the novel.'
   b. *John ni yomu koto o watasi ga suisensita sono syoo setu wa.....'
   'The novel which I recommend John to read is.....'

Another different syntactic characteristic between factive and nonfactive complements which was not discussed in the above is the identity condition between the complement sentence subject and a noun phrase of matrix sentences. Josephs (1976) notes that factive predicates taking S koto/no in object position, except one or two cases, never require that the complement subject be identical in deep structure to some noun phrase of the matrix sentence, while some nonfactive predicates do. In all the factive examples illustrated in this paper, it is found that the subjects of the complement and that of the matrix sentence are not identical. If the subject of a factive complement is identical to a noun phrase of the matrix sentence, it can be deleted or reflexivized by zibun ‘self’ in Japanese and casin ‘self’ in Korean as shown in below (modeled after Josephs (1976:320)):

(50) a. John wa [φ tegami o dasita koto/no o] wasurete ita.
   letter mailed forgot
   'John forgot that he (John) had mailed a letter.'
   b. John wa [zibun ga tegami o dasita koto/no o] wasurete ita.
   John forgot that he had mailed the letter.'
   letter mailed forgot
   'John forgot that he (John) had mailed the letter.'
   'John forgot that he had mailed the letter.'

As examples of exceptional factive predicates which obey the deep structure identity condition, Josephs (1976) gives kookai suru ‘regret’ and kuiru ‘regret’ in Japanese. It is found that the corresponding Korean verbs huhoyhata ‘regret’ and nwiuwchita ‘regret’ also obey the identity condition as presented in the following (the examples are Josephs'):
(52) a. watakusi wa hooritu o manabanakatta koto/no o kookai
   law didn’t learn am
   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 lun sanghakey han kes lun
   teacher’s feeling hurt
   nwiuchi-ass-ta.
   regreted
   ‘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.\footnote{This section heavily relies on the findings of Josephs (1976: 322-338).} Josephs (1976) made a pains-taking effort to establish the semantic difference between \textit{n\~o} and \textit{koto} based on the observations made by Kuno (1973). He argued that the occurrence of a nominalizer \textit{koto} or
no with a certain group of predicates not only depends on those characteristics of the predicate but also on the inherent semantic characteristic of the nominalizer itself. Thus, according to Josephs (1976), no has a meaning something like ‘directly perceived, simultaneous occurring, or imminent action, event, etc.’ While koto means ‘nonsimultaneous, nonrealized, or abstractly perceived action, event, state, etc.’ He further argued that only nominalizer no co-occurs with verbs of sense perception, discovery, helping, and stopping which have a connotation of directness, simultaneity, immediacy or urgency, because the inherent semantic feature of the nominalizer no are compatible with that of the verb. Conversely, only nominalizer koto co-occurs with verbs of ordering or request and verbs of proposal or advice connoting indirectness, abstractness, nonsimultaneity, or nonrealization.

When we compare Korean and Japanese, it is again striking to see that the verbs of sense perception, discovery, helping, and stopping, on the one hand, and verbs of ordering, request, proposal and advice, on the other, have similar syntactic behaviour in both languages. (Henceforward, I will identify Group 1 verbs as those verbs of perception, discovery, helping and stopping, and Group 2 as those verbs of ordering, request, proposal and advice.) However, it is not certain whether it is possible to establish similar semantic distinctions among the three types of nominalizers kes, ki and um in Korean. Since the purpose of this paper is to investigate the syntactic properties of the two languages, I will not pursue any more the semantic nature of nominalizers.

There exists three major syntactic differences between Group 1 and Group 2 verbs. First, the choice of nominalizer is different. Second, the specific tense restriction is different. Third, the identity condition between the complement subject and the noun phrase of the matrix sentence applies only to Group 2 verbs.

Let us now examine these syntactic differences with examples. (In examples, (a) is Japanese and (b) is correspondingly in Korean.)

i) The choice of nominalizer:
Japanese-Group 1 verbs take no as a nominalizer while Group 2 verbs take koto in Japanese.
Korean-Group 1 verbs take only kes as a nominalizer while Group 2 verbs take both kes and ki.

Verbs of sense perception:

(54) a. watakusi wa John ga oyogu { no } o mita.

\[ \text{swim} \quad \text{saw} \]

'I saw John swimming.'

b. na nun John ga suwyengha-nun \[ kes \] lul po-ass-ta.

\[ ki \]
Verbs of discovery:

(56) a. keisatu wa doroboo ga Mary no saihu o totteiru { no } { *koto }
    police     thief     purse
    caught
    'The police caught a thief just as he was stealing Mary's purse.'

b. kyengchal nun totuwk ka Mary uy cikap lul humchiko
    police     thief     purse
    is stealing
    caught
    'Iss nun { kes } lul cap-ass-ta. { *ki }

Verbs of helping:

(57) a. boku wa haha ga sara o arau { no } { *koto }
    mother    dishes    wash    helped
    'I helped mother wash the dishes.'

b. na nun emeni ka cepsi lul takk-nun { kes } lul towa cu-ass-ta. { *ki }
    mother    dishes    wash    helped

Verbs of stopping:

(58) a. kesatu wa gakusei ga demo ni sanka suru { no } { *koto }
    police     student     participate     stopped
    'The police stopped the students from participating in the demonstration.'

b. kyeongchal nun haksayng ka demo ey chamka { ha nun kes } { *ha ki }
    police     student     participate
    mik-ass-ta.
    stopped

Verbs of ordering and request:
Noun Phrase Complementation

(59) a. watakusi wa John ni yoku hatarauk [ koto ] o meizita.

     well work       ordered

'I ordered John to work diligently.'


Verbs of proposal and advice:

(60) a. watasi wa John ni sono kurabu ni hairu koto o susumeta.

     club       enter        advised

'I advised him to join the club.'


     club       enter        advise

ii) The tense restriction:

Japanese: the tense of complement sentences taking Group 1 verbs as their matrix predicates is interpreted as being identical with that of matrix sentence while the tense of complement sentences taking Group 2 verbs is interpreted as future. Just looking at the tense of nonfactive complement sentences, it is hard to tell whether they are present or future since the neutralized tense form (in other words, nonpast tense form) appears in the surface structure. Thus, the tense of the complement sentence can be determined by the presence of time adverbials. The tense of the complement sentences taking Group 1 verbs as their matrix predicates is interpreted as being identical with that of the main sentence, because the time of the embedded sentence is simultaneous with that of the matrix sentence. However, the tense of the complement sentences taking Group 2 verbs as their matrix predicates is interpreted as future since the time of the complement sentences is earlier than that of the matrix sentence.\(^{12}\)

Korean: as mentioned already in Section 1, tense phenomena of Korean complement sentences is slightly different than Japanese. The main reason is that the present and future tenses appear in \(kes\) complements. However, \(ki\) complement sentences do not have this tense distinction as in the case of Japanese. Thus, the tense of the complement sentences taking Group 1 verbs as their matrix predicates must be interpreted as identical with that of matrix sentences since only the present tense appears in surface structure of \(kes\) complement sentences. In contrast to this, the tense of the complement sentences taking Group 2 verbs as their matrix predicates is future since the future tense appears in surface structure of \(kes\) complements.

\(^{12}\) Here the notion 'earlier' seems to require an explanation. If the complement sentence contains time adverbial \(today\) or \(tomorrow\), and the matrix sentence \(yesterday\), then the time of the complement sentence is interpreted earlier than that of the matrix sentence.
Group 1 verb:

(61) a. watasi wa John ga kinoo gakkoo ni kuru no mita.
   Yesterday school going saw
   'Yesterday I saw John going to school.'

   b. na nun John ka ecey hakkyoey kanun kes lul po-ass-ta.
   I yesterday school going saw

(62) a. *kinoo watasi wa John ga { kyoo } gakkoo ni kuru no o mita.
   Yesterday { today } school going saw
   'Yesterday I saw John going to school { today. },

   b. *ecey na nun John ka { onul } hakkyo ey kanun ke lul po-ass-ta.
   NaY1I today { Fut } Pres
   'Yesterday I ordered John to come.'

Group 2 verbs:

(63) a. kinoo watasi wa John ni kyoo kuru koto o meizjta.
   Yesterday today come ordered
   'Yesterday I ordered John to come today.'

   b. ecey na nun John eykey onul { o-1 kes } lul myenglyengha-ass-ta.
   *o nun
   today { Fut } ordered
   'Yesterday I ordered John to come.'

iii) The identity condition:
In both Korean and Japanese, the identity condition between the complement subject and the noun phrase of the matrix sentence applies only to Group 2 verbs. As examples (54–57) show, the subject of the embedded sentence is not deleted or reflexivised. Thus, it is apparent that the identity condition does not apply to Group 1 verbs. However, in examples (59) and (60) it is found that the subject of the complement sentence is deleted under the identity condition. With regard to the characteristics of Group 2 verbs, it is noticed that most of these verbs also take verb phrase complementizers to and yooni in Japanese and ko and tolok in Korean.
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