3.

Sky Sang-Geun Lee – *University of Wisconsin-Madison*

Japanese/Koean possessive verbal nouns as inherently intensional

slee16@wisc.edu

Inspired by Grimshaw (1990), who claims that English argument-taking derived nominals (DNs) should be analyzed as denoting a complex event with the same aspectual properties as their verbal counterparts, researchers like Jung (1997) and Miyamoto (1999) classify Japanese/Korean possessive verbal nouns (VNs) into the same group denoting a complex event. They do this mainly based on the fact that both types of nominals show the same distinctive pattern of the aspectual modifiers -- the culminatory modifier 'in' is compatible with telics while the durational modifier 'for' is with atelics, as in (1):

(1) a [NP Mina-uy hansikan-tongan-uy/*hansikan-nay-uy hwanca-uy kwanchal]   (atelic VN)
      Mina-Gen one hour-for-Gen/one hour-in-Gen   patient-Gen observation
      'Mina's observation of the patient for an hour/*in an hour'

  b [NP Mina-uy *hansikan-tongan-uy/hansikan-nay-uy tali-uy   phakoy]   (telic VN)
      Mina-Gen one hour-for-Gen/one hour-in-Gen bridge-Gen destruction
      'Mina's destruction of the bridge *for an hour/in an hour

  c. [NP Mina-uy *hansikan-tongan-uy/hansikan-nay-uy kichayek-ey-uy tochak] (telic VN)
      Mina-Gen one hour-for-Gen/one hour-in-Gen train station-at-Gen arrival
      'Mina's arrival at the station *for an hour/in an hour'

      There is, however, a distinction between English argument-taking DNs and Japanese/Korean possessive VNs: the former are compatible with extensional verbs like *see*, which take as complements entities (or events) that exist (or occur) in the actual world (cf. Higginbotham 1983), while the latter are not:

(2)   a.   *Nami-nun [cekkwun-uy tosi-uy   *phakoy*]-lul poassta.   (Korean)
        Nami -Top enemy-Gen city-Gen destruction-Acc saw
        'Nami saw the enemy's destruction of the city.'

    b.   *Nami-wa [teki-no   toshi-no *hakai*]-o   mita.   (Japanese)
        Nami-Top enemy-Gen city-Gen destruction-Acc saw
        'Nami saw the enemy's destruction of the city.'

      Rather, it turns out that Japanese/Korean possessive VNs are compatible with intensional verbs that do not necessarily take actual-world entities (or events) as their complements. This is shown in (3), where the Japanese example is taken from Matsumoto (1996):

(3) a.   Nami-nun [pro tali-uy   *phakoy*]-lul *uenhayssta/helakhayssta/sitohayssta.*

Nami-Top bridge -Gen destruction-Acc wished/permitted/attempted
'Nami wished/permitted/attempted to destroy a bridge.'   (Korean)

b.   Nami-wa kare-ni keesatsusho-made [pro *shuttoo*]-o *nozondeiru/meejita*.
Nami-Top he-Dat police station-as far as appearance-Acc desires/ordered
'Nami desires/ordered him to appear at the police station.'   (Japanese)

The data above suggest that Japanese/Korean possessive VNs are inherently intensional, but that English argument-taking DNs are extensional, which has been rarely recognized up to now, even by Jung (1997) and Miyamoto (1999).

This difference could be related to a parameter in word formation: English argument-taking DNs are derived from verb roots by adding a nominalizing suffix while Japanese/Korean possessive VNs are roots by themselves (cf. Grimshaw 1990, Takano 2003). Possibly, the perfective aspect of Latinate nominalizing suffixes (e.g., -*ion*) in English contributes to the semantics of extensionality (cf. Bonomi 1995, Snyder 1998). In contrast, one might suppose that the aspectual properties intrinsic to Japanese/Korean possessive VNs as roots – whether they characterize a *process* or a *transition* from one state to another (cf. Pustejovsky 1991) – remain undetermined with respect to perfectivity. This "undeterminedness" gives rise to a hypothetical future, eventually contributing to intensionality.

References

Bonomi, Andrea. 1997. Aspect, Quantification and When-Clauses in Italian, *Linguistics and Philosophy* 20: 469-514.

Grimshaw, Jane. 1990. *Argument Structure*, Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Higginbotham, James. 1983. "The Logic of Perceptual Reports: An Extensional Alternative to Situation Semantics". *The Journal of Philosophy* 80: 100-127.

Jung, Y-S. 1997. *Interpretation of Noun Phrases and Its Syntactic and Semantic Implications*, Doctoral dissertation, Harvard University.

Matsumoto, Masumi. 1996. "The Syntax and Semantics of the Cognate Object Construction". *English Linguistics* 13: 199-220.

Miyamoto, T. 1999. *The Light Verb Construction in Japanese: The Role of the Verbal Noun*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Pustejovsky, James. 1991. "The Syntax of Event Structure". *Cognition* 41: 47-81.

Ramchand, Gillian Catriona. 1997. *Aspect and Predication*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Snyder, William. 1998. "On the Aspectual Properties of English Derived Nominals". *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 25: 125-139.

Takano, Yuji. 2003. "Why Japanese Is Different" *Linguistic Variation Yearbook* 3: 179-211, John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Tenny, Carol. 1987. *Grammaticalizing Aspect and Affectedness*, Doctoral dissertation, MIT.

Travis, Lisa deMena. 1991. "Derived Objects, Inner Aspect and the Structure of VP". Talk given at *NELS*.