Concealed passives and the syntax and semantics of need/philyo in English and Korean
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Abstract. Despite similar argument structure, the syntax of English need and Korean philyo contrasts, illuminating differences in lexical derivation and insertion of argument-taking elements. Verbs need, require, deserve, want, and bear take gerundive complements that are “understood passively” (Jespersen 1927/1954:112[9.23]) and called concealed passive constructions (CPCs) (Huddleston & Pullum 2002:1429). In this paper, we argue that in English, the gerund CPC object of need is a lexically passivized V that takes a nominalizing derivational -ing affix, whereas in Korean, the CPC object of philyo is a verbal noun, directly inserted as a complement of the verb without derivation.
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1. Introduction. This paper examines the syntax and semantics of need/philyo in English and Korean. While having similar semantic argument structure, their syntactic properties contrast and illuminate differences in lexical derivation and syntactic insertion of argument-taking elements. It will also take a closer look at the structure of what Huddleston and Pullum (2002) call concealed passive constructions (CPCs). These CPCs are first noted in Jespersen 1927, can be “paraphrased as regular passives” even though they are not actual passives (Wanner 2009: 75; see also Quirk et al. 1985 and Kim 2018). The paper is structured as follows. Section 2 discusses the grammatical properties of the English verb need, and section 3 discusses the grammatical properties of Korean verb philyo ‘need’. Comparing English need and Korean philyo, we find that complements of the former can be either CP, IP, or NP, while complements of the latter are always NPs. Section 4 focuses specifically on the CPC as a complement of the English need and Korean philyo ‘need’, respectively. Section 5 provides a conclusion for the paper.

2. The grammatical properties of English need. The verb need has two senses: (i) need1 (thematic ‘need’) which takes two thematic arguments and (ii) need2 (modal ‘need’), a verb of ontological necessity that takes only one thematic argument. For instance, the sentence I need to make a phone call is understood as “I have the need to make a phone call.” Here, I gets its thematic role directly from the verb need1. In the latter case, it is similar to the modal verb must. Accordingly, I need2 to make a phone call means “I must make a phone call.” In this reading, I gets its thematic role the embedded verb make, and undergoes Raising. When need1 or need2 is the main verb, the first argument will be either a thematic NP subject (need1) or a derived NP subject (need2). The complement can be clausal or nominal in the case of need1, but only clausal in the case of need2. Example (1) illustrates these two verbs, where (1a) shows need1 with an NP complement, and (1b), (1c), and (1d) illustrate need2 with a clausal complement. When used as thematic ‘need’ (e.g. I’m tired and need to sleep), in (1b) and (1c), it is an optional control predicate. In (1b) need1 has a controlled CP complement, and in (1c) need1 has a non-controlled
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CP complement. When used as modal ‘need’ (e.g. You need to/must do this), it is a raising
predicate. In (1d), need₂ has an IP complement and Raising to subject.

(1) a. He desperately needed₁ [NP sleep/money]
   b. I am tired and I, need₁ [CP PRO₁ to get some sleep]
   c. I need₁ [CP (for) you to get some work done]
   d. It’s way past your bedtime. You, need₂ [IP t₁ to be in bed in half an hour]

Both thematic and modal ‘need’ can take a nonsentient subject. In (2a) and (2b), need₁ takes either
an NP or a clausal complement, and in (2c), need₂ only takes a clausal complement.

(2) a. The house needs₁ [NP repair]
   b. This car needs₁ [CP PRO₁ to be repaired], but I am not insisting it be done.
      cf. #This car must be repaired, but I am not insisting it be done.
   c. This car, needs₂ [IP t₁ to be moved now], or it’s going to be towed.
      cf. This car must be moved now, or it’s going to be towed.

3. The grammatical properties of Korean philyo. Korean philyo ‘need’ is semantically similar
to need. It takes two arguments. However, the complements of Korean philyo are always NPs.
Because of this, philyo₁ (thematic ‘need’) and philyo₂ (modal ‘need’) are implemented differently.
Philyo₁ can have a nominal object, as in (3). With a clausal complement, it is ambiguous be-
 tween philyo₁ (thematic ‘need’) and philyo₂ (modal ‘need’), as in (4).¹

(3) Sensayng-i haksayng-i philyoha-y₁.
    teacher-NOM student-NOM need-DECL
    ‘Teachers need students.’

(4) Kim-i cip-ul chengso-ha-nun kes-i philyoha-y₁/².
    Kim-NOM house-ACC clean-do-SUBORD kes-NOM need-DECL
    ‘Kim has a need for herself or someone else to clean the house.’

Unlike need₂ in English, which takes an IP complement and involves Raising to Subject out of the
embedded clause, clausal complements of philyo, in both meanings, are nominalized with the affix
kes. This precludes any raising operation. However, since Korean allows null pro subjects, Kim in
(4) might be the subject of either the higher or lower clause, leading to different interpretations.

When Kim is the subject of philyo₁, it optionally controls null pro in the lower clause as in (5). When
the embedded pro is coindexed with Kim, the sentence is interpreted as in (5a), and if not, then as in (5b).
Alternatively, Kim might be the subject of the lower clause, with a null pro matrix subject. If pro is thematic, then it is interpreted as in (6a), and if non-referential, then as in (6b).

¹ As pointed out by Seulkee Park, there are philyo constructions parallel to examples (3) and (4) which can oftentimes
disambiguate the philyo₁ and philyo₂ interpretations. Example (i), with an accusative object and the light verb hata
‘do’ is parallel to (3). In example (ii), philyo is the nominative argument of the existential verb istsa, and the clause
Kim-i cip-ul chengso-ha-la modifies this nominal subject.

(i) Sensayng-i haksayng-ul philyo₁-lo-hata.
   teacher-NOM student-NOM need-CONNECTOR-do
   ‘Teachers need₁ students.’

(ii) [x] Kim-i cip-ul chengso-ha-l philyo₂]-ka istsa
    Kim-NOM house-ACC clean-do-SUBORD need-NOM exist
    ‘There is a need₂ for Kim to clean the house’
Like English, *philyo* can also take a nonsentient subject, and (7) can have two interpretations, as we saw for (4).

(7) cip-i chengso-toy-nun kes-i philyoha-y	house-NOM clean-PASSIVE-SUB kes-NOM need-DECL

‘The house is in need of being cleaned.’

‘It is necessary that the house be cleaned.’

As before, these two interpretations are dependent on whether the passivized nominal *cip* ‘house’ is overtly in the matrix or the embedded clause. We can see the contrast in (8).

(8) a. cip\(_1\)-i [NP [VP pro\(_1\) cip-ul chengso-toy-nun kes]]-i philyoha-y	house-NOM clean-PASSIVE-SUB kes-NOM need-DECL

‘The house is in need of being cleaned.’

b. pro [NP [VP cip\(_1\)-i chengso-toy-nun kes]]-i philyoha-y
it house-NOM clean-PASSIVE-SUB kes-NOM need-DECL

‘It is necessary that the house be cleaned.’

4. CPC constructions with *need* and *philyo*. Turning to the CPC complements, we noted that CPCs have a passive interpretation despite the absence of overt passive morphology. (9a) is a CPC and (9b) is a true passive paraphrase of that.

(9) a. The house needs [VP\(_2\)/NP: painting] [CPC]
b. The house needs to be painted. [Embedded passive]

In Korean, (10a) is a CPC with *philyo* taking a simple NP complement, and in (10b), the verbal noun (VN) *chengso* ‘clean’ takes a passive verbal morpheme *toy*, which has a subordinating suffix *nun* and nominalizer *kes*, to become the NP complement of *philyo*.

(10) a. cip-i [VN chengso]-ka philyo-hay [CPC]
house-NOM clean-NOM need-DECL

‘The house needs cleaning.’
b. cip-i chengso-ka toy-nun-kes-i [Embedded passive]
house-NOM clean-NOM PASS-SUBORD-NOMINAL-NOM philyo-hay.
nominalizer need-DECL.

‘The house needs to be cleaned.’
In (9a), *need* has a gerundive complement, which might be a VP or an NP. In (10a), *philyo* takes a verbal noun (VN) complement that functions variously as a V or an N.

4.1 English ‘need’ Gerundive and CPC Constructions. When *need* takes a gerundive complement, it is unclear what its category might be. In (11a), we find a gerundive object-verb complement, and in (11b) we see a bare gerundive verb complement.

(11)  
  a. Kim needs1 [VP?/NP? house-cleaning]  
  b. The house needs1 [VP?/NP? cleaning]

Given that -ing expressions can be nominal or verbal, it is not clear whether the complements of *need* in (11) are NPs or VPs, since gerunds can be both. The ambiguous status of *ing* is apparent when we consider (12) where the subjects are more NP-like as we go from (12a) to (12c).

(12)  
  a. [NP [VP him reading that book]] took a long time  
  b. [NP his [VP reading that book]] took a long time  
  c. [NP his [v reading] of that book] took a long time

We assert that the gerundive compound *house-cleaning* in (11a) and that the gerundive *cleaning* in (11b) are both NPs and not VPs of the verb *need*. This is supported by the following, they (i) co-occur with determiners and quantifiers; (ii) take adjectival but not adverbial modifiers; (iii) are accompanied by either *by* or *from* agent-like modifiers (iv) have the object preceding the verb; (v) are not used as VP-idioms; and (vi) when the gerundive complement is a phrasal verb (e.g. *look up*), do not allow the intensifier *right* to be inserted between the verbal morpheme and the particle (e.g. *look right up*).

Taking up (i), note that a true VP gerund – even one with a compounded object – cannot take a specifier or a quantifier, as in (13). In contrast, gerundive complements of *need* can be preceded by either, as in (14).

(13)  
  Kim is [VP {*a/*some} pizza-eating]

(14)  
  a. Kim needs1 [NP {*a/*some} house-cleaning]  
  b. The house needs1 [NP {*a/*some} cleaning]  
  [CPC]

Second, VP gerundives can be modified by adverbs, but not adjectives, as in (15). In contrast, gerundive complements of *need* are modified by adjectives, but not adverbs, as in (16).

(15)  
  Kim is [VP thorough{*ly}* investigating a corona virus]

(16)  
  a. Kim needs1 [NP thorough{*ly} house-cleaning]  
  b. The house needs1 [NP thorough{*ly} cleaning]  
  [CPC]

Third, VP gerundives in passives can have *by* modifiers, but not *from* modifiers, as in (17). Gerundive complements of *need*, however, can have either *by* or *from* modifiers, as in (18).

(17)  
  The house is [VP being cleaned {*by/*from} Kim]

(18)  
  a. Kim needs1 [NP some house-cleaning {*by/*from} Kim]  
  b. The house needs1 [NP some cleaning {*by/*from} Kim]  
  [CPC]

As pointed out by Frances Blanchette, example (11b) has parallels in some varieties of American English with sentences like (i).

(i)  
  The house needs cleaned.

While we suspect, based on a cursory examination of the data, that *cleaned* in (i) heads a VP, in contrast with *cleaning* in (11b). Further discussion of this contrast lies outside the bounds of this paper.
Fourth, the object of a VP gerundive usually follows the verb as in (19a) and (19b). However, gerundive complements of \textit{need}, must precedes the verb, as in (20a) and (20b) show.

(19) a. Kim disliked \([\text{VP} \text{him\, cleaning\, (the)\, house}]\)
b. *Kim disliked \([\text{VP} \text{him\, house\,-\, cleaning}]\)

(20) a. Kim really needs\(_1\) \([\text{NP\, house\,-\, cleaning}]\)
b. *Kim really needs\(_1\) \([\text{NP\, cleaning\,-\, house}]\)

Fifth, when a VP-idiom forms a lexical compound, it loses its idiomatic meaning. We see this in the contrast between (21a) and (21b), where the VP gerundive is idiomatic and the NP gerund formed through the compounding of \textit{hit} and \textit{book} is not. When we attempt to use this idiom as a complement of \textit{need}, it fails, because \textit{need} cannot take a VP gerundive complement as in (22a), and the NP gerundive complement in (22b) cannot be idiomatic.

(21) a. Jeremy dislikes \([\text{VP\, hitting\, the\, books}]\)
b. *Jeremy dislikes \([\text{NP\, book\,-\, hitting}]\)

(22) a. *Jeremy needs \([\text{VP\, hitting\, the\, books}]\)
b. *Jeremy needs \([\text{NP\, book\,-\, hitting}]\)

Finally, when a gerundive complement of \textit{need} is a phrasal verb, the intensifier \textit{right} cannot be inserted between the verbal morpheme and the particle. These facts, in particular, show the NP gerund analysis of \textit{need} complements to be correct.

Observe the contrast between gerundive and passive VP complements of \textit{need} in (23).

(23) a. The 1\textsuperscript{st} word was ignored by the students, but the 2\textsuperscript{nd} one

\[
\text{need}_1\, [\text{CP\, PRO\, to\, be\, looked}\, t_1\, [\text{PP\, right\, up}]] \quad \text{[Embedded passive]}
\]

b. The 1\textsuperscript{st} word was ignored by the students, but the 2\textsuperscript{nd} one

\[
\text{need}_1\, [\text{NP\, looking\, (*right)}\, \text{(up)}] \quad \text{[CPC]}
\]

The asymmetry between CPC and passive in (23) is explained by our proposed structure for the CPC. In (23a), the object of \textit{look up} (i.e. the 2\textsuperscript{nd} one) is a complement of \textit{look}, and the particle \textit{up} projects a PP that is modified by \textit{right}. In (23b), \textit{look up} is lexically derived as a compound phrasal verb and the -\textit{ing} affix attaches directly to the head of this compound (i.e. to \textit{look}). In this context, \textit{right} cannot be inserted immediately before \textit{up}.

We know that this is the case whenever a phrasal verb’s particle is not separated from its head. In (24b), \textit{up} is attached directly to \textit{look} and cannot project a PP that would accommodate \textit{right}.

(24) a. They \([\text{VP\, looked\, the\, word\, [PP\, (right)}\, \text{up}]]\) in the dictionary
b. *They \([\text{VP\, [v\, looked]\, [P\, (*right)}\, \text{up}]]\) the word in the dictionary

The structure of the CPC complement in (23a) is similar and shown here in (25).

(25) \([\text{NP\, -ing}\, [v\, [v\, look]\, [p\, up]]] \rightarrow [\text{NP\, look}_1\, \text{-ing}\, [v\, [v\, t_1]\, [p\, up]]]\)

In (25), the V head \textit{look} undergoes head movement to the N head -\textit{ing} of the gerundive NP. The P in the compound \textit{up} cannot project a phrase and cannot thereby host \textit{right}.

4.2 KOREAN ‘PHILYO’ VERBAL NP AND CPC CONSTRUCTIONS. Like English, Korean also has CPC constructions with the verb \textit{philyo}, but their syntax is different from what we have found with the English verb \textit{need}. In (26a), the complement of \textit{philyo} is a VN object-verb compound, and in (26b) it is a CPC with a bare VN complement.
As with English, constructions like (26b) are CPCs, since they can be “paraphrased as regular passives” – (26b) and (8a) have essentially the same meaning. These CPC complements differ from English ones in needing no special morphology to turn them into NPs. They simply are NPs, for reasons spelled out below. As with English, verbal NP object constructions with *philyo* only have a *philyo* interpretation, since there is no thematic position in the complement NP for a thematic subject. The subjects of (26a) and (26b) both matrix subjects of *philyo*. In other words, (26b) can never have the meaning of (8b).

We assume complements of *philyo* in (26) to be VNs – that is, that nouns which have the semantics and argument structure attributes of verbs. So, where English verbs require additional morphology to be used as nouns, e.g. [v clean] → [N [v clean] ing], Korean VNs require additional morphology to be used as verbs, e.g. [N *chensso* in (26) → [v [N *chensso* ha] in (4). That Korean VN complements are nouns is confirmed by the following: (i) nominative case *i/ka* is obligatory; (ii) a VN’s object cannot take accusative case *ul/lul*; (iii) the VN cannot take the nominalizer *kes*; and (iv) the VN can be modified by adjectivals, but not by adverbials.

First, Korean nominative case can sometimes mark objects in addition to subjects. Like case markers generally, it is attached to a noun, and not to a verb, as (27) shows. In (28), we observe that the VN complement of *philyo* must have nominative case.

(26) a. Kim-i [vn cip-chengso]-ka philyoha-y
   Kim-NOM house-clean-NOM need-DECL
   ‘Kim needs1 house-cleaning.’

b. *cip-i [vn chengso]-ka philyoha-y
   house-NOM clean-NOM need-DECL
   ‘The house needs1 cleaning.’
   [CPC]

As with English, constructions like (26b) are CPCs, since they can be “paraphrased as regular passives” – (26b) and (8a) have essentially the same meaning. These CPC complements differ from English ones in needing no special morphology to turn them into NPs. They simply are NPs, for reasons spelled out below. As with English, verbal NP object constructions with *philyo* only have a *philyo* interpretation, since there is no thematic position in the complement NP for a thematic subject. The subjects of (26a) and (26b) both matrix subjects of *philyo*. In other words, (26b) can never have the meaning of (8b).

We assume complements of *philyo* in (26) to be VNs – that is, that nouns which have the semantics and argument structure attributes of verbs. So, where English verbs require additional morphology to be used as nouns, e.g. [v clean] → [N [v clean] ing], Korean VNs require additional morphology to be used as verbs, e.g. [N *chensso* in (26) → [v [N *chensso* ha] in (4). That Korean VN complements are nouns is confirmed by the following: (i) nominative case *i/ka* is obligatory; (ii) a VN’s object cannot take accusative case *ul/lul*; (iii) the VN cannot take the nominalizer *kes*; and (iv) the VN can be modified by adjectivals, but not by adverbials.

First, Korean nominative case can sometimes mark objects in addition to subjects. Like case markers generally, it is attached to a noun, and not to a verb, as (27) shows. In (28), we observe that the VN complement of *philyo* must have nominative case.

(27) a. Kim-i [vn cheongso]-ka coh-ta
   Kim-NOM clean-NOM fond-DECL
   ‘Kim is fond of cleaning.’

b. *Kim-i [v [vn cheongso] ha]-ka coh-ta
   Kim-NOM clean do-NOM fond-DECL
   ‘Kim is fond of do-cleaning.’

(28) a. Kim-i [vn cip-chengso]-*ka philyoha-y
   Kim-NOM house-clean-NOM need-DECL
   ‘Kim needs1 house-cleaning.’

b. *cip-i [vn chengso]-*ka philyoha-y
   house-NOM clean -NOM need-DECL
   ‘The house needs1 cleaning.’
   [CPC]

Second, the Korean VN is different from other transitive verbs. A transitive Korean VN can only assign accusative case to its object when augmented by the transitive light verb (LV) *ha* ‘do’. In other words, its transitive argument structure alone does not allow it to assign case to its object, it not being a verb. In (29a), *cip* ‘house’ can only get accusative case when the LV *ha* is present. In (29b), the transitive verb *sass* ‘buy’ assigns accusative case on its own. In contrast, when the same transitive VN doesn’t have a LV affix, as in (30), its object cannot take accusative case –*ul/lul*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b. *cip-i philyoha-y</td>
<td>house-NOM</td>
<td>clean-NOM</td>
<td>need-DECL</td>
<td>‘The house needs1 cleaning.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. *cip-i philyoha-y</td>
<td>house-NOM</td>
<td>clean-NOM</td>
<td>need-DECL</td>
<td>‘The house needs1 cleaning.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Third, the nominalizer -kes, together with the VP-subordinator –nun, can only be attached to VP clausal complements, but not to NP complements. In (31a), the verb sa ‘buy’ forms a transitive VP with its object kapang ‘bag’. This VP has the subordinator nun attached to it, and is then nominalized with kes, forming a NP complement of cohaha ‘like’ and getting marked with accusative case ul. In (31b), the transitive VN kapang-kwumay ‘bag-purchase’ takes accusative case directly, indicating that it is already an NP. In (32), the transitive VN cip-cheongso ‘house-clean’ and the bare VN cheongso ‘clean’ both take the nominative case assigned by philyo, and neither can be suffixed with nun-kes. Accordingly, we assume that these VNs are NPs.

Finally, a Korean nominal expression can be modified by adjectives but not adverbs, as in (33a) where cip ‘house’ is modified by the adjective kkalkkumhan ‘neat’. In contrast, verbal expressions take adverbal modifiers, as in (33b), where the VP cip-up cheongso-ha ‘clean the house’ is modified by the adverb kkalkkumhakey ‘neatly’. In (34), the transitive VN cip-cheongso ‘house-clean’ and the bare VN cheongso ‘clean’ both take adjectival but not adverbial modifiers.
5. Conclusion. In examining the ‘need’ verbs of English and Korean, we have seen how the morphosyntax of each language provides for an identical range of interpretations, but in obviously distinct grammatical ways. In English, only \textit{need}$_1$ (thematic ‘need’) can take NP complements. Thematic ‘need’ can also take clausal CP complements. In contrast, \textit{need}$_2$ (modal ‘need’) only allows IP complements and is a raising verb. In Korean, both \textit{philyo}$_1$ and \textit{philyo}$_2$ only take NP complements, but these complements can be nominalized tensed clauses. Accordingly, the distinction between \textit{philyo}$_1$ and \textit{philyo}$_2$ rests on the distribution and coindexing of null \textit{pro} in matrix and complement clauses. Turning to CPC complements of \textit{need}$_1$ and \textit{philyo}$_1$, we found and demonstrated that both are NPs. The path to an NP CPC complement, though, is different in each language. This is shown in (35).

(35)  
  a. This room needs \([\text{NP} [N \text{ clean } [P \text{ up}]] \text{-ing}]]\) [Detransitivized nominalized V]  
  b. Cip-i \([\text{NP} [N \text{ chengso}]]\)-ka philyo-hay \([\text{Detransitivized VN}]\)  

In English, the gerund CPC object of \textit{need} is a lexically passivized V that takes a nominalizing derivational -\textit{ing} affix, as in (35a). In Korean, the CPC object of \textit{philyo} is a verbal noun, directly inserted as a complement of the verb, as in (35b).
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