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1 Grammar Profile

1.1 Morpho-Syntax

1.1.1 Head position
Head-final. SOV word order, prenominal adjectives, prenominal relative clauses, postpositions.

1.1.2 Morphological type
Agglutinating

1.1.3 Case system
Nominative/accusative; nominative {-i/ka}, accusative {-ul/lul}, topic {-un/nun}, dative {-eykey},
locative {-ey/-eyse}, genitive {-uy}, honorific {-si}

1.1.4 Verbal Agreement
Honorific: for some verbs, there are corresponding verbs to honorify objects.
Ex: cwuta ‘to give’ tulita ‘to give (honorific)’

1.1.5 Transitivity Patterns
Passive, causative

1.1.6 Null Arguments
Subject and object pro-drop. Subjects and objects are more likely omitted under topichood, but
Topichood is sufficient, but not necessary condition for omission. As an example, when the omitted
Argument has arbitrary reading, topichood is not a necessary condition.

1.1.7 Non-Finite Categories
Infinitives are licensed with certain complementizers.
(1) Yenghuy-nun chinkwu-lul manna-lyeko tapang-ey ka-ss-ta
Yenghuy-TOP friend-ACC meet-to cafe-to go-PST-DECL
‘Yenghuy went to a cafe to meet her friend’

1.2 Matrix Clause

1.2.1 Basic word order
SOV
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1.2.2 Alternate word orders
Scrambling is allowed as long as the clause is verb-final. Therefore, OSV is allowed.

(2) Yenghuy-ka sakwa-lul mek-ess-ta
Yenghuy-NOM apple-ACC eat-PST-DECL
‘Yenghuy ate an apple.’

Scrambled:

(3) sakwa-lul Yenghuy-ka mek-ess-ta
apple-ACC Yenghuy-NOM eat-PST-DECL
‘Yenghuy ate an apple.’

1.2.3 Ordering of nominal and pronominal arguments
Same.

1.3 Embedded Clause

1.3.1 Basic word order
SOV

1.3.2 Verbal agreement
Same.

1.3.3 Restrictions on tense, aspect, mood
Different complementizers allow marking of tense, aspect and mood differently, as shown below:
Quotative –ko: tense, aspect, mood all can appear

(4) Na-nun Mary-ka hakkyo-ey tochakhay-ss-kyess-ta-ko tul-ess-e
I-TOP Mary-NOM school-to arrived-PST-ASPECT-DECL-ko hear-PST-DECL
‘I heard that Mary would have arrived at school.’

–se ‘because’, -ca ‘as soon as, because’: tense, aspect, and mood are not allowed.

(5) Yenghuy-nun sulphe-(ess-ul-ta)-se, nwunmwul-ul hully-ess-ta
Yenghuy-TOP be_sad-(*PST-*ASPECT-*DECL)-because tear-ACC shed-PST-DECL
‘Yenhuy shed tears because she was sad.’

1.3.4 Non-control complements
Regular embedding: -kes

(6) Na-nun Mary-ka hakkyo-ey tochakha-n-kes-ul al-ess-ta
I-TOP Mary-NOM school-to arrived-REL-kes-ACC know-PST-DECL
‘I knew that Mary had arrived at school.’

Quotative –ko

(7) Na-nun Mary-ka hakkyo-ey tochakhay-ss-kyess-ta-ko tul-ess-e
I-TOP Mary-NOM school-to go-PST-ASPECT-DECL-ko hear-PST-DECL
‘I heard that Mary would have arrived at school.’

Before ECM

(8) Na-nun Mary-ka yeppu-ta-ko sayngkakha-ess-ta
I-TOP Mary-NOM be_pretty-DECL-ko think-PST-DECL
‘I thought that Mary was pretty.’
After ECM

(9) Na-nun Mary-lul yeppu-ta-ko sayngkakha-ess-ta
    I-TOP Mary-ACC be_pretty-DECL-ko think-PST-DECL
    ‘I thought Mary to be pretty.’

2 Control Profile

2.1 backward object control into nonfinite complement

2.1.1 Example structure

(10) Tom-un Mary-ka ttena-tolok seltukhay-ss-ta
    Tom-TOP Mary-NOM leave-tolok persuade-PST-DECL
    ‘Tom persuaded Mary to leave.’

2.1.2 Predicates participating in the alternation
Verb: manipulative: seltukhata ‘persuade’, myenglye nghata ‘order’, kwonhata ‘suggest’

2.1.3 Evidence in support of bi-clausal structure
NPIs (Negative Polarity Items) should be c-commanded by clausemate negation (H.-S. Choe, 1988). The example in (11) is acceptable because the clause-mate condition is satisfied. In contrast, (12) is unacceptable because *amuto* ‘anyone’ is in the complement clause, and negation is in the matrix clause.

(11) Chelwu-ka amuto o-ci-anh-ss-ta-nun-ket-ul malha-yess-ta
    Chelswu-nom anyone come-neg-pst-decl-comp-Acc speak-pst-decl
    ‘Chelswu said that no one came’

(12) *Chelwu-ka amuto owa-ss-ta-nun-ket-ul malhaci anh-ss-ta
    Chelswu-Nom anyone come-Pst-decl-Comp-Acc speak not-Pst-Decl
    ‘Chelswu did not say anyone came?’

The NPI clausemate condition also holds in control structures. In (13), the NPI is a constituent of the matrix clause, while it is the embedded clause that is negated. This renders the example unacceptable.

(13) *Amutwo Mary-ka an ttena-tolok seltukha-ss-ta
    NPI Mary-NOM NEG leave-tolok persuade-PST-DECL
    ‘Anyone persuaded Mary not to leave.’

2.1.4 Evidence for empty category
The overt controller is a constituent of the embedded clause.

Scrambling
Overt controller is in the embedded clause. The entire complement clause scrambles as a constituent.

(14) [Mary-ka nayil ttena-tolok] Tom-i seltukhay-ss-ta
    Mary-NOM tomorrow leave-tolok Tom-NOM persuade-PST-DECL
    ‘Tom persuaded Mary to leave tomorrow.’

Honorific agreement
Overt controller is a constituent of the embedded clause. It triggers honorific agreement only within the embedded clause.
i) Honorific agreement, triggered by subject:

(15) sensayng-nim-i    ka-si-ess-ta
    teacher-RESP-NOM go-HON-PAST-DEC
    ‘The teacher went.’

ii) Embedded verb shows subject honorification on the NOM subject:

(16) Chelswu-nun [sensayng-nim-i    ka-si-tolok]   seltukhay-ss-ta
    Chelswu-TOP teacher-RESP-NOM go-HON-COMP persuade-PST-DECL
    ‘Chelswu persuaded the teacher to go.’

iii) Matrix verb does not:

    Chelswu-TOP teacher-RESP-NOM go-HON-COMP persuaded-HON-PST-DECL
    ‘Chelswu persuaded the teacher to go.’

Null argument is in matrix clause

Quantifier float
i) If a quantifier follows the DP it modifies, the two must agree in case (Gerdts 1987, Choi 1988, Cho 2000)

(18) haksayng-tul-i  twul-i/*ul/*Ø    ka-ess-ta
    student-PL-NOM   two-NOM/*ACC/*no case went-PST-DECL
    ‘Two students went.’

ii) Postnominal quantifiers can be separated from the host DP (quantifier float), but quantifier float is strictly local (Kang 2002, Miyagawa 2005)

(19) Chelswu-ka [haksayng-i hakkyo-ey    sey-myueung-i kaessta-ko]
    Chelswu-NOM student-NOM school-to three-CL-NOM went-COMP
    malha-ess-ta
    say-PST-DECL
    ‘Chelswu said that three students went to school.’

(20) *Chelswu-ka [haksayng-i hakkyo-ey kaessta-ko] sey-myueung-i
    Chelswu-NOM student-NOM school-to went-COMP three-CL-NOM
    malha-ess-ta
    say-PST-DECL
    ‘Chelswu said that three students went to school.’

iii) Case-matching quantifier must follow its host DP:

(21) *twul-i   haksayng-tul-i   ka-ess-ta
    two-NOM student-PL-NOM go-PST-DECL
    ‘Two students went.’

iv) The silent element licenses a case-marked quantifier (floated quantifier): the case of the quantifier is determined by the matrix verb (not the embedded verb)

(22) kunye-ka [ai-tul-i  ka-tolok] motwu-lul/*motwu-ka seltukhay-ess-ta
    she-NOM child-PL-NOM go-COMP all-ACC/*all-NOM persuade-PST-DECL
    ‘She persuaded all the children to go.’
Object agreement

The main verb can be honorified when the embedded subject is someone who can be honorified, such as ‘the president’ in (23). The honorific form of *seltukhata* ‘to persuade’ is *kwonyuhay tulita*. When the embedded subject cannot be honorified, like ‘the kid’ in (24), the sentence is not acceptable.

(23) Cangkwan-un taythonglyeng-i setwulle chwulpalha-si-tolok kwonyuhay tuli-essta secretary-TOP president-NOM in a hurry leave-HON-COMP persuaded gave.HON
‘The secretary advised the president to leave in a hurry.’

(24) *Cangkwan-un kkoma-ka setwulle chwulpalha-tolok kwonyuhay tuli-essta
top kid-NOM in a hurry leave-COMP persuaded gave.HON
‘The secretary advised kid to leave in a hurry.’

2.1.5 Selectional restrictions

Volitional, agentive DP required.

(25) #Chelswu-nun tol-i tteleci-tolok seltukha-ess-ta
Chelswu-TOP rock-NOM fall-COMP persuade-PAST-DECL
‘Chelswu persuaded the rocks to fall.’

‘Persuadee’ object DP can be a patient of lower verb

(26) Tom-un [Mary-ka Bob-ey uyhay chwuycay-toy-tolok] seltukha-ess-ta
  Tom-TOP Mary-NOM Bob-by interview-PASS-COMP persuaded
  ‘Tom persuaded Mary to be interviewed by Bob.’
  * ‘Tom persuaded Bob to interview Mary.’

2.2 forward object control into nonfinite complement I

2.2.1 Example structure

(27) Tom-un Mary-lul [cip-ul ttena-tolok] seltukha-ess-ta
  Tom-TOP Mary-ACC home-acc leave-tolok persuade-PST-DECL
  ‘Tom persuaded Mary to leave.’

Predicates participating in the alternation; verb: manipulative: *seltukhata* ‘persuade’

2.2.2 Evidence in support bi-clausal structure

As in Control pattern 1, when an NPI appears in the main clause and when the negation appears in the embedded clause, the sentence is not as in (29).

(28) *Amutwo Mary-lul an ttena-tolok seltukha-ss-ta
  NPI Mary-ACC NEG leave-tolok persuade-PST-DECL
  ‘Anyone persuaded Mary not to leave.’

2.2.3 Evidence of empty category

The overt controller is a constituent of the main clause.
Scrambling is allowed in Korean as long as the clause is predicate-final.
In control construction, when the overt controller is a constituent of the matrix clause and consequently marked with accusative case, embedded clauses can be scrambled to the front of the sentence without including the overt controller.

The silent controllee is in the embedded clause.

Honorific agreement is local, triggered by subject:

The matrix object does not trigger subject honorification in the embedded clause:

The silent controllee in the embedded clauses triggers subject honorification in the embedded clause.

2.2.4 Selectional restrictions

(37) #Chelswu-nun tol-ul tteleci-tolok seltukha-ess-ta
Chelswu-TOP rock-ACC fall-COMP persuade-PAST-DECL
(‘Chelswu persuaded the rocks to fall.’)
2.3 forward object control into nonfinite complement II

2.3.1 Example structure

(38) Tom-un [tena-tolok] Mary-lul seltukha-ss-ta
      Tom-TOP leave-tolok Mary-ACC persuade-PST-DECL
      ‘Tom persuaded Mary to leave.’

2.3.2 Predicates participating in the alternation

verb: manipulative: seltukhata ‘persuade’

2.3.3 Evidence in support bi-clausal structure

(39) *Amutwo [an ttena-tolok] Mary-lul seltukha-ss-ta
      NPI NEG leave-tolok Mary-ACC persuade-PST-DECL
      ‘Anyone persuaded Mary not to leave.’

2.3.4 Evidence of empty category

Same reasoning from the control pattern 2 can be applied here.

2.3.5 Selectional restrictions

(40) #Chelswu-nun tteleci-tolok tol-ul seltukha-ess-ta
      Chelswu-TOP fall-COMP rock-ACC persuade-PAST-DECL
      ‘Chelswu persuaded the rocks to fall.’

2.4 forward subject control into nominalized clause

2.4.1 Example structure

(41) Chelswu-nun, [Yenghi-lul tasi manna-ki]-ka twulyep-ta
      C-TOP Y.-ACC again meet-NML-NOM fear-DECL
      ‘Chelswu fears to meet Yenghi again.’
      (Gamerschlag 2005)

(42) *Chelswu-nun [Mary-ka Yenghi-lul tasi manna-ki]-ka twulyep-ta
      C-TOP M-NOM Y.-ACC again meet-NML-NOM fear-DECL
      ‘Chelswu fear that Mary meets Yenghi again.’

(43) Chelswu-nun, [Yenghi-lul manna-ki]-lul kepwuhay-ss-ta
      C-TOP Y.-ACC meet-NML-ACC refuse-PST-DECL
      ‘Chelswu refused to meet Yenghi’

(44) *Chelswu-nun, [Tom-i Yenghi-lul manna-ki]-lul kepwuhay-ss-ta
      C-TOP Tom-nom Y.-ACC meet-NML-ACC refuse-PST-DECL
      ‘Chelswu refused to meet Yenghi’

2.4.2 Predicates participating in the alternation

psych verb: twulyepta ‘to be afraid of’, silhta ‘to dislike’, cohta ‘to like’, kkelyecinta ‘to hesitate’, caymissta ‘to find it interesting’
2.4.3 Evidence in support bi-clausal structure

When an NPI appears in the main clause and when negation appears in the embedded clause, the sentence is not grammatical.

(45) *amuto, cengmalo [Yenghi-lul tasi an manna-ki]-ka twulyep-ta
NPI really Y.-ACC again NEG meet-NML-NOM fear-DECL
‘Anyone really fears to meet Yenghi again.’

(Gamerschlag 2005)

(46) *amuto, ecey [Yenghi-lul an manna-ki]-lul cicakhay-ss-ta
NPI yesterday Y.-ACC NEG meet-NML-ACC begin-PST-DECL
‘Yesterday anyone began to not meet Yenghi’

2.4.4 Evidence of empty category

Embedded subject shows the honorific marker -si.

(47) Sensayngnim-un, cengmalo [Yenghi-lul tasi manna-si-ki]-ka twulyewu-si-ess-ta
teacher-TOP really Y.-ACC again meet-hon-NML-NOM fear-hon-DECL
‘The teacher really feared to meet Yenghi again.’

(48) Sensayngnim-un, tanhoi [Yenghi-lul manna-si-ki]-lul kepwuha-si-ess-ta
teacher-TOP firmly Y.-ACC meet-hon-NML-ACC refuse-hon-PST-DECL
‘Teacher firmly refused to meet Yenghi’

2.4.5 Selectional restrictions

Agentive NP can be a controller.

(49) *tol-un, [Yenghi-lul tasi manna-si-ki]-ka twulyewu-si-ess-ta
stone-TOP Y.-ACC again meet-hon-NML-NOM fear-hon-DECL
‘The stone feared to meet Yenghi again.’
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