

## Syntactic Features of the Japanese “-negau” and Korean “-himanghada” Sentence

Yong-Il Park<sup>1</sup>

### Abstract

*This study examined the syntactic structure and characteristics of the sentence constructions using the Japanese term “-negau” and the corresponding Korean term “-himanghada.” The data for the study were extracted from “Syouunagon” a corpus published by Japan’s National Institute of Japanese Language and Linguistics, and the example sentences were modified in a way that did not affect the study. Native Japanese and native Korean speakers assisted in determining the data’s sufficiency. The study’s results are summarized as follows. First, it is observed that the deep structure of the Japanese “-negau” and “-himanghada” sentence constructions are bi-clause structures in nature. These considerations were presented through the semantic domain and the phenomenon of honorific expression. Second, “-negau” and “-himanghada,” sentence constructions with a bi-clause sentence structure exhibit syntactic structures known as control and raising structures, depending on the functional characteristics of the sentence. The phenomenon of meaning interpretation of idiomatic expressions examined such conclusions. Third, the Japanese “-negau” and Korean “-himanghada” sentence constructions exhibit surface-level characteristics of the mono-clause sentence structure. This was suggested through the cleft sentence phenomenon that appears in the “-negau” and “-himanghada” sentence constructions. The results of the study, as described above, can be considered a universal characteristic that can be applied to other hopeful verb phrases found in Japanese and Korean.*

*Keywords: “-negau” Sentence, “-himanghada” Sentence, Syntactic Feature, Bi-clause, Mono-clause.*

### 1. Introduction

While studies on the mono-clause phenomenon have been actively conducted in the context of European and American languages, only a few studies have been conducted in Asian languages. Specifically, in the case of Japanese and Korean, discussion of the mono-clause phenomenon can only be found in Miyagawa (1986) [1], Choe (1988)

---

<sup>1</sup> Associate Professor, College of Language and Culture, Hanyang University ERICA, Korea, [ewsnews@hanyang.ac.kr](mailto:ewsnews@hanyang.ac.kr)

[2], Park (2017) [3], and Park (2017) [4]. While Park (2017) and Choe (1988) suggested that the mono-clause phenomenon occurs in Japanese and Korean auxiliary verb sentences, they did not mention it in the syntax of the main verb [3][2]. Miyagawa (1986) is the only study that clarified that the monocultural phenomenon appears in the main verb syntax of both Japanese and Korean languages. The discussion on the mono-clause phenomenon of main verb sentences in Japanese and Korean has not been active; unlike auxiliary verbs, the main verb is not required to combine with the antecedent verb. On the other hand, the auxiliary verbs in Japanese and Korean lose the meaning of the main verb, and their combination with the antecedent verb acts as a necessary condition to create meaning. There would have been no need for intuition. However, there seems to be no reason to consider only the relationship between the post-term verb and the antecedent verb in the case of the monoculture phenomenon since the post-term verb does not assert the union with the antecedent verb as a necessary condition. According to Miyagawa (1986), a mono-cultural phenomenon occurs in the objective expression syntax, which is the primary verb sentence in Japanese; the combination of the post-term verb and the pre-term verb does not determine the presence or absence of the mono-cultural phenomenon.

From now on, we will present the syntactic structure and characteristics of the "-negau" (main verb) sentence expressing hope in Japanese and the corresponding Korean "-himanghada" sentence in the deep structure, functional structure, and surface structure. The "-negau" sentence construction (1) is a representative expression among Japanese sentences expressing hope.

(1) a. Mokuyoubi, kinnyoubi, nanimo-nai-koto-o-negau.

Thursday Friday nothing-Neg-Cp-Acc-hope

"Thursday, Friday, I hope nothing happens"

b. Mokuyoubi, kinnyoubi, nanimo-nai-no-o-negau.

Thursday Friday nothing-Neg-Cp-Acc-hope

"Thursday, Friday, I hope nothing happens"

Japanese "-negau" sentences, demonstrated via (1), appear in Korean as (2).

(2) a. Mokyoil, gumyoil, amuildo-eopneun-geot-eul-himanghada.

Thursday Friday nothing-Neg-Cp-Acc-hope

b. mokyoil, gumyoil, amuildo-eop-gi-reul-himanghada.

Thursday Friday nothing-Neg-Cp-Acc-hope

As in the example sentences (1) and (2), the object to be considered is the Japanese “-negau” sentence that takes the complementizers “koto” and “no” and the corresponding Korean “-himanghada” sentence that takes the complementizers “geot” and “gi”

## 2. Structure and Features of the Hierarchical Structure

### 2.1. Syntactic structure of the deep structure of the Japanese “-negau” and Korean “-himanghada” sentence constructions

The lexical features of a given predicate determine the structure of the sentence construction. For example, in a sentence, if the verb “eat” is a predicate, the frame of a sentence will be created by the semantic domain of [eat] like (3a). A specific sentence (3b) will be created. Subsequently, after elements such as post/pre-position particles are added, it appears as a statement as demonstrated in (3c).

- (3) a. eat [who, what]  
 b. Who eats what.  
 c. Taro eats bread for breakfast.

As mentioned in (3), the deep structure of a sentence is determined via the semantic domain of the predicate. Therefore, the “-negau” and “-himanghada” constructs such as (4a) and (5a) can be considered to have the same syntactic structure as (4b) and (5b), respectively.

- (4) a. Saito kyouzyu-wa Yosida-ga sando-o taberu-koto-o negat-ta.  
 Saito professor-Top Yosida-Nom sandwich-Acc eat-Cp-Acc-want-Past  
 “Professor Saito wanted Yosida to eat the sandwich”  
 b. [s Saito kyouzyu-wa [cp [s Yosida-ga sanndo-o taberu]-koto]-o negat-ta]  
 (5) a. Saito gyosu-neun Yosida-ga sand-reul meokneun-geot-eul himanghe-t-da.  
 Saito professor-Top Yosida-Nom sandwich-Acc eat-Cp-Acc-want-Past-Em  
 “Professor Saito wanted Yosida to eat the sandwich”  
 b. [s Saito gyosu-neun [cp [s Yosida-ga sand-reul meokneun]-geot]-o himanghe-t-da]

The fact that (4a) and (5a) have bi-clause sentence structures like (4b) and (5b), the semantic domain of the predicate is supported by the phenomenon of honorification [5]. The same clause restriction, clause-mate constraint, exists in the treatment law phenomenon of both Japanese and Korean languages [3][4], which can be confirmed in (6) and (7).

(6) a. Sensei-wa gakusei-ga e-o kai-ta-koto-o kii-ta.

Teacher-Top student-Nom picture-Acc draw-Past-Cp-Acc hear-Past

“The teacher heard that the student drew a picture”

b. [s Sensei-wa [cp [s gakusei-ga e-o kai-ta]-koto]-o kii-ta]

c. \*Sensei-wa gakusei-ga e-o o-kaiki-ninat-ta-koto-o kii-ta.

Teacher-Top student-Nom picture-Acc H-draw-H-Past-Cp-Acc hear-Past

d. Sensei-wa gakusei-ga e-o kai-ta-koto-o o-kiki-ninat-ta.

Teacher-Top student-Nom picture-Acc draw-Past-Cp-Acc H-hear-H-Past

(6b) is the complex sentence structure of (6a) that can be considered according to the semantic domain of the predicate. In (6a), which has such a syntactic structure, when the Japanese honorific form “o-ninat” appears in the implied verb “kai(draw)”, it appears as an inappropriate sentence as in (6c), but (6d) appears in the main clause verb “kiki(hear)” Appears as a qualified door. This is because, while the subject corresponding to the honorific form “o-ninat” cannot be the subject of the implied clause “gakusei(student),” only the main clause subject “sensei” can respond. It shows that the corresponding subject must appear in the same clause. In the case of Korea, the same phenomenon as (6) is shown in (7).

(7) a. Sensengnim-eun hakseng-i geurim-eul geurin geot-eul deul-eot-da.

Teacher-Top student-Nom picture-Acc drew Cp-Acc hear-Past-Em

“The teacher heard that the student drew a picture”

b. [s Sensengnim-eun [cp [s hakseng-i geurim-eul geurin] geot]-eul deul-eot-da]

c. \*Seonsengnim-eun hakseng-i geurim-eul geuri-si-neun-geot-eul deul-eot-da.

Teacher-Top student-Nom picture-Acc draw-H-Past-Cp-  
Acc hear-Past-Em

d. Seonsengnim-eun hakseng-i geurim-eul geurin geot-eul  
deuleu-si-eot-da.

Teacher-Top student-Nom picture-Acc drew Cp-Acc  
hear-H-Past-Em

In the case of the Korean language, the honorific form is expressed as “si”. Through the disqualification of (7c) and the eligibility of (7d), it can be confirmed that the Korean language also has clause-mate restrictions as in the Japanese treatment law.

By examining the “-negau” and “-himanghada” sentence constructions using the above-mentioned restrictions on treatment laws in Japanese and Korean, it is possible to conclude that these sentences have bi-clause sentence structures as shown in (8) and (9) respectively.

(8) a. Sato kyouzyu-wa Huruta-ga sando-o taberu koto-o negat-ta.  
Sato professor-Top Huruta-Nom sandwich-Acc eat Cp-Acc-want-Past  
“Professor Sato wanted Huruta to eat the sandwich”

b. \*Sato kyouzyu-wa Huruta-ga sando-o mesiagaru koto-o negat-ta.  
Sato professor-Top Huruta-Nom sandwich-Acc H(eat) Cp-Acc-want-Past

c. Sato kyouzyu-wa Huruta-ga sando-o taberu koto-o nega-ware-ta.  
Sato professor-Top Huruta-Nom sandwich-Acc eat Cp-Acc want-H-Past

(9) a. Sato gyosu-neun Huruta-ga sando-reul meokneun geot-eul himangha-t-da.  
Sato professor-Top Huruta-Nom sandwich-Acc eat Cp-Acc-want-Past-Em

b. \*Sato gyosu-neun Huruta-ga sando-reul deusineun geot-eul himangha-t-da.  
Sato professor-Top Huruta-Nom sandwich-Acc H(eat) Cp-Acc-want-Past

c. Sato gyosu-neun Huruta-ga sando-reul meokneun geot-eul himangha-si-eot-da.  
Sato professor-Top Huruta-Nom sandwich-Acc eat Cp-Acc want-H-Past-Em

In bi-clause structures like (8a) and (9a), the subjects corresponding to the honorific forms “mesiagaru(eat)” and “deusi(eat)” are the main clause subjects “Sato kyouzyu(professor)” and “Sato gyosu(professor).” Therefore, honorific forms “mesiagaru(eat)” and “deusi(eat)” cannot appear in implied verbs as in (8b), (9b) and honorific conditions “-ware” and “-si” are the main clauses as in (8c), (9c). It can be explained that it can appear in a verb. The disqualification of (8b), (9b), and (8c), (9c) show that (8a) and (9a) have the same complex structure as (10a) and (10b), respectively.

(10) a. [s Sato kyouzyu-wa [cp [s Huruta-ga sando-o taberu] koto]-o negat-ta]

Sato professor-Top Huruta-Nom sandwich-Acc eat Cp-Acc-want-Past

b. [s Sato gkosu-neun [cp [s Huruta-ga sando-reul meokneun] geot]-eul himangha-eot-da]

Sato professor-Top Huruta-Nom sandwich-Acc eat Cp-Acc want-Past-Em

The “-negau” sentence (11) that takes complementizer “no” and the “-himanghada” sentence (12) that takes “gi” show the same phenomenon as (8) and (9), respectively.

(11) a. Sato kyouzyu-wa Huruta-ga sando-o taberu no-o negat-ta.

Sato professor-Top Huruta-Nom sandwich-Acc eat Cp-Acc-want-Past

“Professor Sato wanted Huruta to eat the sandwich”

b. \*Sato kyouzyu-wa Huruta-ga sando-o mesiagaru no-o negat-ta.

Sato professor-Top Huruta-Nom sandwich-Acc H(eat) Cp-Acc-want-Past

c. Sato kyouzyu-wa Huruta-ga sando-o taberu koto-o nega-ware-ta.

Sato professor-Top Huruta-Nom sandwich-Acc eat Cp-Acc want-H-Past

(12) a. Sato gyosu-neun Huruta-ga sando-reul meok gi-reul himangha-t-da.

Sato professor-Top Huruta-Nom sandwich-Acc eat Cp-Acc-want-Past-Em

b. \*Sato gyosu-neun Huruta-ga sando-reul deusineun geot-eul himangha-t-da.

Sato professor-Top Huruta-Nom sandwich-Acc H(eat) Cp-Acc-want-Past

c. Sato gyosu-neun Huruta-ga sando-reul meok gi-reul himangha-si-eot-da.

Sato professor-Top Huruta-Nom sandwich-Acc eat Cp-Acc want-H-Past-Em

From the same facts as (11) and (12), the sentence “-negau” that takes the complementizer “no” and the sentence “-himanghada” that takes the complement “gi” can also be said to have the same bi-clause structure as (10).

## **2.2. Functional structure in the derivation process**

Bi-clause sentences are divided into a control structure and a raising structure according to how the subject functions in a deep structure. For example, the subjects “Aoki kyouzyu(professor)” and “Arasi(storm)” appearing in (11a) and (11b) have different functions.

(13) a. Aoki kyouzyu-ga ranchi-o tabe-hazime-ta.

Aoki professor-Nom lunch-Acc eat-start-Past

“Professor Aoki started eating lunch”

b. Arasi-ga huki-hazime-ta.

Storm-Nom blow-begin-Past

“A storm began to blow”

The subject “Aoki kyouzyu(professor)” in (13a) includes the subject of eating lunch as well as the subject of starting the work of eating lunch, as demonstrated in “Professor Aoki eats lunch.” In other words, “Aoki kyouzyu(professor)” is both the subject of “tabe(eat)” and “hazime(begin).” On the other hand, the subject “Arasi(storm)” of (13b) is not the subject of “hazime(begin).” In other words, “Arasi(storm)” is the subject of the verb “huku(blow),” but it is not the subject of “hazime(begin).” From this perspective, (13a) and (13b) can be considered to have the syntactic structure as (14a) and (14b), respectively [6].

(14) a. [s Aokii kyouzyu-wa [s PROi ranchi-o tabe] hazime-ta]

Aoki professor-Top PRO lunch-Acc eat begin-Past

b. [s Arasii-ga [s ti huki] hazime-ta]

Stom-Nom t blow begin-Past

The difference between (14a) and (14b) is that in (14a), the main clause subject (subject of “hazime(begin)”) “Aoki kyouzyu(professor)” appears as an accomplice of PRO in the nested clause, so it functions as the subject of the nested verb “tabe(eat).” On the other hand, in

the case of (14b), the subject(arasi) of the nested verb “huku(blow),” is moving to the position of the subject of the main clause, leaving a trace “t.” In other words, “Arasi(storm)” can be said to be a formal subject, not an actual subject of “hazime(begin).” As described above, depending on the functional role of the subject, a complex sentence structure like (14a) can be called a control structure, and a complex sentence structure like (14b) can be called a subject-raising structure. Subsequently, we examine whether the Japanese “-negau” and Korean “-himanghada” sentence constructions, which appear as a bi-clause structure when considering the deep structure, are a control or raising structure.

(15) a. Gatyou-wa syatyouni au koto-o negat-ta.

manager-Top boss meet Cp-Acc want-Past

“The manager hoped to meet the boss”

b. [s Gatyou-wa [cp [s syatyouni au]-koto]-o negat-ta]

Manager-Top boss meet-Cp-Acc-want-Past

c. Gatyou-wa syatyouno kaoni doro-o nuru koto-o negat-ta.

manager-Top boss face mud-Acc smear Cp-Acc want-Past

“The manager wished to smear the boss’s face with mud”

(16) a. Gatyou-wa syatyouni au no-o negat-ta.

manager-Top boss meet Cp-Acc want-Past

“The manager hoped to meet the boss”

b. [s Gatyou-wa [cp [s syatyouni au] no]-o negat-ta]

manager-Top boss meet Cp-Acc-want-Past

c. Gatyou-wa syatyouno kaoni doro-o nuru no-o negat-ta.

manager-Top boss face mud-Acc smear Cp-Acc want-Past

“The manager wished to smear the boss’s face with mud”

“The manager humiliated the boss”

(15a) is a “-negau” sentence that takes the “koto” complementizer, and (16a) is a “-negau” sentence that takes the “no” complementizer. Additionally, the syntactic structure of these sentences can be considered as a bi-clause sentence structure such as (15b) and (16b), respectively, according to the semantic domain standard of the predicate. When the idiomatic expression “kaoni doroo nuru(embarrassing)” appears in the implied clause of the statement as in (15c), (15c) of “kaoni doroo nuru” appears as a literal interpretation

of “applying physical mud to the face of the boss.” Therefore, the “-negau” sentence (15a) shows the control structure as (17).

(17) [s Gatyoui-wa [cp [s PRO<sub>i</sub> syatyouni au] koto]-o negat-ta]  
 manager-Top                      boss meet Cp-Acc want-Past

On the other hand, when the idiomatic expression “kaoni doroo nuru” with the meaning of ‘embarrassing’ appears in the implied clause of the sentence as in (16c), the ‘kaoni doroo nuru’ in (16c) appears as a literal meaning “applying physical mud on the boss's face” or the interpretation as “embarrassing,” a semantic interpretation of an idiomatic expression. Therefore, it can be said that the “-negau” sentence (16a) represents both a control structure as in (18a) and a raising structure as in (18b) according to functional characteristics.

(18) a. [s Gatyoui-wa [cp [s PRO<sub>i</sub> syatyouni au]-no]-o negat-ta]  
 manager-Top                      boss meet-Cp-Acc-want-Past  
       b. [s Gatyoui-wa [cp [s ti syatyouni au]-no]-o negat-ta]  
 manager-Top                      boss meet-Cp-Acc-want-Past

The reason for suggesting the conclusion of (18b) for (16c) is that, as in (18b), if the main clause and embedded clause subjects are different “-negau” constructs, the main clause subjects cannot control the embedded subjects. Therefore, the idiomatic expression “kaoni doroo nuru” in the text can be expressed in one's idiomatic interpretation rather than a literal interpretation.

The same phenomenon as the “-negau” sentence (15c) and (16c) is also observed in the Korean “-himanghada” sentence.

(19) a. Menijeo-neun sajanggwa mannaneun-geot-eul himanghe-t-da.

manager-Top boss                      meet-Cp-Acc want-Past-Em

“The manager wanted to meet the boss”

b. [s Menijeo-neun [cp [s sajanggwa mannaneun]-geot]-eul himanghe-t-da]

manager-Top                      boss                      meet-Cp-Acc-want-Past-Em

c. Menijeo-neun sajanggwa eolgule meokchilhaneun-geot-eul himanghe-t-da.

manager-Top boss                      face                      paint-Cp-Acc want-Past-Em

“The manager wanted to paint the boss’s face with paint”

(20) a. Menijeo-neun sajanggwa manna-gi-reul himanghe-t-da.

manager-Top boss meet-Cp-Acc want-Past-Em

“The manager wanted to meet the boss”

b. [s Menijeo-neun [cp [s sajanggwa manna]-gi]-reul himanghe-t-da]

manager-Top boss meet-Cp-Acc-want-Past-Em

c. Menijeo-neun sajang eolgule meokchilha-gi-reul himanghe-t-da.

manager-Top boss face paint-Cp-Acc want-Past-Em

“The manager wanted to paint the boss’s face with paint”

“The manager humiliated the boss”

A “-himanghada” sentence (19a) has the complementizer “geot,” and (20a) has the complementizer “gi.” The sentence (19b) shows the syntactic structure of the “-himanghada” sentence construction (19a), and when the idiomatic expression “meokchilhada” appears in the nested clause of (19a), as in (19c), the literal meaning of “to paint the face” appears. Since this is the same phenomenon as the “-negau” sentence (15c) discussed above, the Korean “geot-himanghada” sentence can also be considered as a control structure. On the other hand, in the “gi-himanghada” sentence (20a), as shown in (20c), the idiomatic expression “meokchilhada” can express both the literal meaning and the interpretation of the idiomatic expression “embarrassed,” therefore the “gi-himanghada” sentence has two syntactic structures: control and raising structures.

### **2.3. Syntactic structure of the surface structure**

The Japanese “koto” sentence exhibits the typical bi-clause sentence structures. In general, the Japanese complementizer “koto” has been regarded as a marker that distinguishes typical bi-clause sentence structures. There seems to be no disagreement with this opinion. Because, as in (21), several syntactic phenomena with the clause-mate constraint are observed in sentences using the complementizer “koto.”

(21) a. Tani sensei-wa Maru-ga tegami-o kai-ta-koto-o tutae-ta.

Tani teacher-Top Maru-Nom letter-Acc write-Past-Cp-Acc inform-Past

“Teacher Tani informed that Maru had written the letter.”

b. [s Tani sensei-wa [cp [s Maru-ga tegami-o kai-ta]-koto]-o tutae-ta]

Tani teacher-Top Maru-Nom letter-Acc write-Past-Cp-Acc inform-Past

c. [s Tani sensei-wa [cp [s Maru-ga tegami-o kai-ta]-koto]-o o-tutae-ninat-ta]

Tani teacher-Top Maru-Nom letter-Acc write-Past-Cp-Acc H-inform-H-Past

d.\*[s Tani sensei-wa [cp [s Maru-ga tegami-o o-kai-ninat-ta]-koto]-o tutae-ta]

Tani teacher-Top Maru-Nom letter-Acc H-write-H-Past-Cp-Acc inform-Past

In Korean studies, the Korean complementizer "geot", which corresponds to the Japanese complementizer "koto", is also considered a marker of a typical compound sentence. The same phenomenon as (21) can also be seen in the Korean complementizer "geot."

(22) a. Sajangnim-eun Hira-ga pyeonji-reul sse-un-geot-eul jeonha-eot-da.

president-Top Hira-Nom letter-Acc write-Past-Cp-Acc inform-Past-Em

"President informed that Hira had written the letter."

b. [s Sajangnim-eun [cp [s Hira-ga pyeonji-reul sse-un]-geot]-eul jeonha-eot-da.

president-Top Hira-Nom letter-Acc write-Past-Cp-Acc inform-Past-Em

c. [s Sajangnim-eun [cp [s Hira-ga pyeonji-reul sse-un]-geot]-eul jeonha-si-eot-da.

president-Top Hira-Nom letter-Acc write-Past-Cp-Acc inform-H-Past-Em

d.\*[s Sajangnim-eun [cp [s Hira-ga pyeonji-reul sseu-si-un]-geot]-eul jeonha-eot-da.

president-Top Hira-Nom letter-Acc write-H-Past-Cp-Acc inform-Past-Em

The syntactic structure of (21a) and (22a) can be considered as (21b) and (22b), respectively. The eligibility of (21c) and (22c) can be explained because the object of respect "Tani sensei / Sajangnim" and the honorific form "o-tutae-ninat / jeonha-si" appear in the same clause. On the other hand, the disqualification of (21d) and (22d) is because it does not follow the clause-mate constraint. The clause-mate constraint appearing in the "koto" and "geot" sentences is

maintained as in (23)-(24) and (25)-(26) in the cleft sentence phenomenon [7][8][9].

(23) a. [s Tsujisang-wa [cp yume-ga kanau koto]-o kanggae-ta]

Tsuji-Top dream-Nom come true Cp-Acc thought-Past

“Tsuji thought that his dream would come true”

b. [s [cp Yume-ga kanau koto]-o kanggaeta-no-wa Tsujisang-da]

Dream-Nom dream come Cp-Acc thought-thing-Top Tsuji-Em

c. \*[s Tsujisang-ga [cp kanau koto]-o kanggaeta-no-wa yume-da]

Tsuji-Nom come true Cp-Acc thought-thing-Top dream-Em

d. \*[s Yume-ga Tsujisang-ga [cp kanau koto]-o kanggaeta-koto-da]

dream-Nom Tsuji-Nom come true Cp-Acc thought-thing-Em

(24) a. [s Kimu-wa [cp Hanako-ga ryokouni iku koto]-o hanasi-ta]

Kimu-Top Hanako-Nom trip go Cp-Acc talk-Past

“Kimu talked about Hanako going on a trip”

b. [s [cp Hanako-ga ryokouni iku koto]-o hanasita-no-wa Kimu-da]

Hanako-Nom trip go Cp-Acc talked-thing-Top Kimu-Em

c. \*[s Kimu-ga [cp ryokouni iku koto]-o hanasita hito-wa Hanako-da]

Kimu-Nom trip go Cp-Acc talked who-Top Hanako-Em

d. \*[s Hanako-ga Kimu-ga [cp ryokouni iku koto]-o hanasita-hito-da]

Hanako-Nom Kimu-Nom trip go Cp-Acc talked-who-Em

The sentence (23c) and (24c), which appear in the main clause by focusing on the implied subject “yume(dream) / Hanako,” are inappropriate. However, (23b) and (24b), which focus on the main clause subject “Tsuji / Kimu” in the main clause, appear as eligible sentences. As a result, the elements that can be focused on in the sentence that takes the complementizer “koto” are not the elements of the embedded clause.

As can be seen from (25) and (26), in the case of Korean, the same phenomenon as (23) and (24) appears [10][11].

(25) a. [s Tsuji-neun [cp kkum-i irueojineun geot]-uel sengakha-eot-da]

Tsuji-Top dream-Nom come true Cp-Acc think-Past-Em

“Tsui thought that his dream would come true”

b. [s [cp Kkum-i irueojineun geot]-uel sengakhan-geot-eun Tsui-da]

dream-Nom come true Cp-Acc thought-thing-Top Tsui-Em

c. \*[s Tsui-ga [cp irueojineun geot]-uel sengakhan-geot-eun kkum-ida]

Tsui-Nom come true Cp-Acc thought-thing-Top dream-Em

d. \*[s Kkum-i Tsui-ga [cp irueojineun geot]-uel sengakhan-geot-ida]

dream-Nom Tsui-Nom come true Cp-Acc thought-thing-Em

(26) a. [s Kimssi-neun [cp Hanako-ga yeoheng ganeun geot] uel iyagiha-eot-da]

Kim-Top Hanako-Nom trip go Cp-Acc talk-Past-Em

“Kim talked about Hanako going on a trip”

b. [s [cp Hanakoi-ga yeoheng ganeun geot]-uel iyagihan-geot-eun Kimssi-da]

Hanako-Nom trip go Cp-Acc talked-thing-Top Kimssi-Em

c. \*[s Kimssi-ga [cp yeoheng ganeun geot]-uel iyagihan saram-eun Hanako-da]

Kim-Nom trip go Cp-Acc talked who-Top Hanako-Em

d. \*[s Hanakko-ga Kimssi-ga [cp yeoheng ganeun geot]-uel iyagihan saram-ida]

Hanako-Nom Kim-Nom trip go Cp-Acc talked who-Em

However, in the phenomenon of Japanese and Korean cleft sentences, we can observe that the elements of embedded clauses can be focused on the main clause in the “-negau” and “-himanghada” sentence constructions.

(27) a. [s Tsujisang-wa [cp yume-ga kanau koto]-o negat-ta]

Tsui-Top dream-Nom come true Cp-Acc hope-Past

“Tsui hoped that his dream would come true”

b. [s [cp Yume-ga kanau koto] o negatta-no-wa Tsujisang-da]

dream-Nom dream come Cp Acc hoped-thing-Top Tsui-Em

c. [s Tsujisang-ga [cp kanau koto] o negatta-no-wa yume-da]

Tsui-Nom come true Cp-Acc hoped-thing-Top dream-Em

- d. [s Yume-ga Tsujisang-ga [cp kanau koto]-o negatta koto-da]  
dream-Nom Tsuji-Nom come true Cp-Acc hoped thing-Em
- (28) a. [s Kimu-wa [cp Hanako-ga ryokouni iku koto]-o negat-ta]  
Kimu-Top Hanako-Nom trip go Cp-Acc hope-Past  
“Kimu hoped that Hanako would go on a trip”
- b. [s [cp Hanako-ga ryokouni iku koto]-o negatta-no-wa Kimu-da]  
Hanako-Nom trip go Cp-Acc hoped-thing-Top Kimu-Em
- c. [s Kimu-ga [cp ryokouni iku koto]-o negatta hito-wa Hanako-da]  
Kimu-Nom trip go Cp-Acc hoped who-Top Hanako-Em
- d. [s Hanako-ga Kimu-ga [cp ryokouni iku koto]-o negatta-hito-da]  
Hanako-Nom Kimu-Nom trip go Cp-Acc hoped-who-Em
- (29) a. [s Tsuji-neun [cp kkum-i irueojineun geot] uel himangha-eot-da]  
Tsuji-Top dream-Nom come true-Cp Acc hope-Past-Em  
“Tsuji hoped that his dream would come true”
- b. [s [cp Kkum-i irueojineun geot] uel himanhan-geot-eun Tsuji-da]  
dream-Nom dream come Cp Acc hoped-thing-Top Tsuji-Em
- c. [s Tsuji-ga [cp irueojineun geot] uel himanghan-geot-eun kkum-ida]  
Tsuji-Nom come true-Cp Acc hoped-thing-Top dream-Em
- d. [s Kkum-i Tsuji-ga [cp irueojineun geot] uel himanghan-geot-ida]  
dream-Nom Tsuji-Nom come true-Cp Acc hoped-thing-Em
- (30) a. [s Kimssi-neun [cp Hanako-ga yeoheng ganeun geot] uel himangha-eot-da]  
Kim-Top Hanako-Nom trip go Cp-Acc hope-Past-Em  
“Kim hoped that Hanako would go on a trip”
- b. [s [cp Hanakoi-ga yeoheng ganeun geot]-uel himanghan-geot-eun Kimssi-da]  
Hanako-Nom trip go Cp-Acc talked-thing-Top Kimssi-Em
- c. [s Kimssi-ga [cp yeoheng ganeun geot]-uel himanghan saram-eun Hanako-da]

Kim-Nom trip go Cp-Acc hoped who-Top Hanako-Em

d. [s Hanakko-ga Kimssi-ga [cp yeoheng ganeun geot]-uel himanghan saram-ida]

Hanako-Nom Kim-Nom trip go Cp-Acc hoped who-Em

The sentences (27a)-(28a) and (29a)-(30a) change the main clause verb “kanggaeru / sengakhada” to “negau / himanghada” in the complementizer sentence of “koto / geot” in (23a)-(24a) and (25a)-(26a). In this case, as in (27c)-(30c) and (27d)-(30d), in (27a)-(30a), “yume(dream), Hanako / kkum(dream), Hanako” is the subject of an embedded clause, and can be focused in the main clause, therefore it appears in the subject position of the main clause through leftward movement. These phenomena demonstrate that embedded clauses elements can be focused on main clauses. As a result, the qualifications of (27c, d)-(30c, d) are all phenomena that appear in the syntactic structure of the mono-clause sentence structure where the boundary of “Cp” has vanished.

The phenomenon of the mono-clause sentence structure is shown in (31a) and (31b).

(31) a. [s Subject [cp ...NP...] negau / himanghada]

↓

[s Subject ... negau / himanghada ... NP-da / -ida]

b. [s Subject [cp ...NP...] negau / himanghada]

↓

[s NP... Subject ... negau / himanghada ... -da / -ida]

The same cleft sentence phenomenon also appears in the Japanese “-negau” sentence that uses the “no” complementizer.

(32) a. [s Goro-wa [cp neko-ga umareru no]-o negat-ta]

Goro-Top cat-Nom born Cp-Acc hope-Past

“Goro hoped for a cat to be born”

b. [s [cp Neko-ga umareru no]-o negat-ta no-wa Goro-da]

cat-Nom born Cp-Acc hope-Past thing-Top Goro-Em

c. [s Goro-ga [cp umareru no]-o negat-ta no-wa neko-da]

Goro-Nom born Cp-Acc hope-Past Cp-Top cat-Em

d. [s neko-ga Goro-ga [cp umareru no]-o negat-ta mono-da]

cat-Nom Goro-Nom born Cp-Acc hope-Past thing-Em

- (33) a. [s Isya-wa [cp wakutin-ga hirogaru no]-o negat-ta]  
 doctor-Top vaccine-Nom spread Cp-Acc hope-Past  
 “Doctors hoped the vaccine would spread”  
 b. [s [cp wakutin-ga hirogaru no]-o negat-ta no-wa isya-da]  
 vaccine-Nom spread Cp-Acc hope-Past Cp-Top doctor-  
 Em  
 c. [s Isya-ga [cp hirogaru no]-o negat-ta no-wa wakutin-da]  
 doctor-Nom spread Cp-Acc hope-Past Cp-Top vaccine-Em  
 d. [s wakutin-ga isya-ga [cp hirogaru no]-o negat-ta mono-da]  
 vaccine-Nom doctor-Nom spread Cp-Acc hope-Past thing-  
 Em  
 (34) a. [s Taro-wa [cp Hanako-ga gakkouni kuru no]-o negat-ta]  
 Taro-Top Hanako-Nom school come Cp-Acc hope-Past  
 “Taro hoped for Hanako to come to school”  
 b. [s [cp Hanako-ga gakkouni kuru no]-o negat-ta no-wa Taro-da]  
 Hanako-Nom school come Cp-Acc hope-Past thing-Top  
 Taro-Em  
 c. [s Taro-ga [cp gakkouni kuru no]-o negat-ta hito-wa Hanako-  
 da]  
 Taro-Nom school come Cp-Acc hope-Past who-Top  
 Hanako-Em  
 d. [s Hanako-ga Taro-ga [cp gakkouni kuru no]-o negat-ta hito-  
 da]  
 Hanako-Nom Taro-Nom school come Cp-Acc hope-Past  
 who-Em

The same cleft sentence phenomenon as in (32)-(34) can also be observed in the Korean “-himanghada” sentence construction, which uses the “gi” complementizer.

- (35) a. [s Goro-neun [cp goyangi-ga teeona gi]-reul himangha-eot-da]  
 Goro-Top cat-Nom born Cp-Acc hope-Past-Em  
 “Goro hoped for a cat to be born”  
 b. [s [cp goyangi-ga teeona gi]-reul himanghan saram-eun Goro-  
 da]

cat-Nom born Cp-Acc hoped who-Top Goro-  
Em

c. [s Goro-ga [cp teeona gi]-reul himanghan geot-eun goyangi-  
da]

Goro-Nom bornt Cp-Acc hoped thing-Top cat-Emt  
d. [s goyangi-ga Goro-ga [cp teeona gi]-reul himanghan geot-  
ida]

cat-Nom Goro-Nom born Cp-Acc hoped thing-Em  
(36) a. [s Euisa-neun [cp beksin-i peozi gi]-reul himangha-eot-da]

doctor-Top vaccine-Nom spread Cp-Acc hope-Past-Em  
“Doctors hoped the vaccine would spread ”

b. [s [cp beksin-i peozi gi]- reul himanghan geot-eun euisa-da]  
vaccinet-Nom spread Cp-Acc hope Cp-Top doctor-Em

c. [s Euisa-ga [cp peozi gi]-reul himanghan geot-eun becsin-ida]  
doctor-Nom spread Cp-Acc hope Cp-Top vaccine-Em

d. [s Beksin-i euisa-ga [cp peozi gi]-reul himanghan geot-ida]  
vaccine-Nom doctor-Nom spread Cp-Acc hope thing-Em

(37) a. [s Taro-neun [cp Hanako-ga hakgyoe o gi]-reul himangha-eot-  
da]

Taro-Top Hanako-Nom school come Cp-Acc hope-Past-Em  
“Taro hoped for Hanako to come to school”

b. [s [cp Hanako-ga hakgyoe o gi]-reul himanghan saram-eun Taro-  
ida]

Hanako-Nom school come Cp-Acc hoped who-Top Taro-Em

c. [s Taro-ga [cp haktyoue o gi]-reul himanghan saram-eun  
Hanako-ida]

Taro-Nom school come Cp-Acc hoped who-Top  
Hanako-Em

d. [s Hanako-ga Taro-ga [cp hakgyoe o gi]-reul himanghan  
saram-ida]

Hanako-Nom Taro-Nom school come Cp-Acc hoped who-  
Em

From (32)-(37), the “-negau / -himanghada” sentence constructions  
taking the “no / gi” complementizer show the same phenomenon as

that of the “-negau / -himanghada” sentence constructions in (27)-(30) taking the “koto / geot” complementizer. It can be seen that the elements of the embedded clause can be focused on the main clause. In other words, the Japanese “-negau” sentence and Korean “-himanghada” sentence using the typical Japanese complementizer “koto/no” and the typical Korean complementizer “geot/gi,” show the mono-clause phenomenon as shown in the (31).

### 3. Conclusions

This study examined the syntactic structure and characteristics of the Japanese “-negau” sentence construction and examined the corresponding Korean “-himanghada” sentence construction. First, the syntactic structure and features of these sentences were examined in the deep structure system in which they were created. The syntactic structure that emerged as a result of the function of these sentences was examined. Furthermore, they are presented based on the syntactic characteristics of these sentences in the surface structure because these sentences exhibit the features of the mono-clause structure in the surface structure. The findings of these studies are summarized below.

First, the “-negau” and “-himanhada” sentences constructions in Japanese have a bi-clause structure in the deep structure.

Second, the “koto-negau” and “geot-himanhada” represent the control structure, based on the functional difference between the “-negau” and “-himanghada” sentence constructions. The sentences “no-negau” and “gi-himanghada,” on the other hand, refer to both the control structure and the raising structure. The phenomenon of semantic interpretation of idiom expressions was used to reach this conclusion.

Third, the “no-negau” and “gi-himanhada” sentences in the surface structure exhibit the syntactic characteristics of the mono-clause structure. This conclusion was considered through the cleft sentence phenomenon.

The findings of this study, as described above, can be applied to all hope-verb (main verb) sentences in Japanese and Korean. Other than “-negau” and “-himanghada” sentences, however, presenting empirical data for other hope-verb sentences that were not addressed in this study remains a future research task. Regarding the mono-clause phenomenon, it is a future research task to investigate the relationship between the complementizer and main verbs in Japanese and Korean [12].

## 4. Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the research fund of Hanyang University (HY-2022-G).

## Bibliography

- [1] Miyagawa, S. Issues in Japanese Linguistics: Restructuring in Japanese, In T. Imai and M. Saito(eds.), Foris, pp.273-300, (1986)
- [2] Choe, H. S. Restructuring in Korean, Eoneo Yeongu, Seoul Unive. Eoneo Yeonguso, (1988), 24-2, pp.505-538, <https://s-space.snu.ac.kr/simple-search?query=Restructuring+in+Korean>
- [3] Park, Y. I. Tongsagujowa Sangjeokeuimireul tonghan Ilboneo “V-tuzukeru” Mungwa Daeunghaneun Hangukeomuneui Bigyogochal, (2017), 41, pp.225-240, <http://gcjs.hanyang.ac.kr/html/sub0401.html>
- [4] I. Hong, Y. J. & Park, Y. I. A Comparative Study on the Relationship of the Syntactic Structure and Semantics of the Japanese and Korean Auxiliary Verb Sentence; Through the “-te-simau” Sentence, “-eo-beorida” Sentence, and “-go-malda” Sentence, Information, (2017), 20, pp.63-70, <https://www.proquest.com/docview/1901706403>
- [5] Kuno, S. Sinnihong Bunpou Kenkyu; Keigono Bunpou, Taisyokan, pp.5-92, (1983)
- [6] Park, Y. I. The Linking Relationship between the Syntactic Structures and Aspectual Meaning of the Japanese “V-hajimeru” Sentence and Korean “V-gi-sijakhada,” “V-gi-reul-sijakhada” Sentence, Asia-Pacific Journal of Advanced Research in Musin, Arts and Literature, (2018), 3, pp.7-12, <http://dx.doi.org/10.21742/ajmacl.2018.3.1.02>
- [7] Morikawa, M. On the Categorial Status of the Copula in Japanese, Journal of School of Foreign Languages, Nagoya University of Foreign Studies, (2003), 25, pp.65-100, <https://ndlonline.ndl.go.jp/#!/search?keyword=On%20the%20Categorial%20Status%20of%20the%20Copula%20in%20Japanese&searchCode=SIMPLE>
- [8] Sunakawa, Y. Hukubunno Kenkyu(Ge); Nihongoniokeru Bunretubunno Kinouto Gozyunno Genri, Kurosio, pp.353-388, (1995)
- [9] Kizu, M. Cleft Construction in Japanese Syntax, Palgrave Macillan, pp.1-245. (2005)
- [10] Kim, Y. H. Jjogaenmunuei Gineungwa Tongsa, Eomunhak, (2000), 69, pp.65-90, <https://dbpia.co.kr/author/authorDetail?ancl=1317733>
- [11] Park, C. U. Gukeo Bunyeolmuneui Tongsagujjo, Hanmal Yeongu, (2008), 22, pp.77-96, <http://www.hanmal.or.kr>
- [12] Kim, S. S. A Study on the Teacher Efficacy of Korean Language Teachers, Asia-pacific Journal of Convergent Research Interchange, (2019), 5-1, pp.11-19, <http://dx.doi.org/10.21742/apjcri.2019.03.02>
- [13] <https://shonagon.ninjal.ac.jp/>, December 2 (2021)