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1. Introduction

- Korean object control predicates show a nominative/accusative case alternation on the persuadee DP, as in (1).

  (1) cheolsu-neun yeonghi-leul/ka kake-e ka-tolok seolteukha-eoss-ta
      cheolsu-top yeonghi-acc/nom store-to go-comp persuade-past-decl
      ‘cheolsu persuaded yeonghi to go to the store’

- I argue that the difference in case equates to a difference in structural position.
- Accusative case: constituent of the matrix clause binding a null element $\Delta$ in the embedded clause (2, ordinary control)
- Nominative case: constituent of the embedded clause binding a null element $\Delta$ in the matrix clause, (3) (backward control)

  (2) cheolsu-neun yeonghi-leul [$\Delta_e$ kake-e ka-tolok] seolteukha-eoss-ta
      cheolsu-top yeonghi-acc store-to go-comp persuade-past-decl
      ‘cheolsu persuaded yeonghi to go to the store’ (ordinary control)

  (3) cheolsu-neun $\Delta_e$ [yeonghi-ka, kake-e ka-tolok] seolteukha-eoss-ta
      cheolsu-top yeonghi-nom store-to go-comp persuade-decl
      ‘cheolsu persuaded yeonghi to go to the store’ (backward control)

2. Goals of the talk

- Provide evidence supporting the analysis of Korean persuade as a control predicate and not an ECM predicate.
- Illustrate that the case alternation found on the persuadee DP indicates a difference in syntactic position.
- Present empirical evidence in support of the novel claim that Korean object control predicates license a backward control configuration.
- Provide evidence in support of the existence of a null element in the object control structures.

3. **Korean persuade is not ECM**

- ECM predicates typically select for only one internal complement, a clause, and an external agent. ECM on the embedded subject arises because the embedded subject raises into the matrix clause to check its accusative case (JS Lee 1992; Yoon 1996; Baek 1997).
- Object control predicates, on the other hand, select for two internal arguments, a complement DP and a complement clause. The complement DP is coindexed with the null subject in the embedded clause.
- It is well known that Korean ECM predicates license a similar nominative/accusative case alternation on the embedded subject (O’Grady 1991; Yoon 1996; Baek 1997), as in (4).

  (4) john-eun mary-leul/ka yepeu-ta-ko mit-neun-ta
      john-top mar-y-acc/nom pretty-decl-comp believe-pres-decl
      ‘john believes mary to be pretty’

- I show that Korean persuade selects for three semantic arguments while Korean ECM selects for two.
- Furthermore, I also show that Korean persuade places semantic requirements on the case alternating DP, whereas Korean ECM does not.

3.1 **Non-control usage**

- Korean persuade can license an additional overt internal argument, as in (5). Like English, when there is an overt matrix object and overt embedded subject, the embedded clause cannot be non-finite.

  (5) cheolsu-neun yeonghi-leul/eke suyeong-ka ka-yaha-n-ta-ko
      cheolsu-top yeonghi-acc/dat suyeong-nom go-should-pres-decl-comp
      seolteukha-eoss-ta persuade-past-decl
      ‘cheolsu persuaded yeonghi that suyeong should go to the store’

- Korean ECM predicates cannot license an additional overt argument because ECM predicates permit only one internal argument, as indicated by (6).

  (6) *cheolsu-neun yeonghi-leul suyeong-i yepeu-ta-ko mit-eoss-ta
      cheolsu-top yeonghi-acc suyeong-nom pretty-decl-comp believe-past-decl
      (*cheolsu believed yeonghi suyeong to be pretty’)

- The ability to license an additional argument in the persuade construction supports the claim that Korean persuade selects for three semantic arguments, while Korean ECM selects for only two.
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3.2 Passive/active synonymy

- The passive form (7b) is not semantically synonymous with its active counterpart in (7a).
- The difference is in the entity being persuaded. In the active form it is the DP yeonghi, while in the passive it is the DP suyeong.

(7) a. chelsu-neun yeonghi-ka%leul suyeong-eul interphyu ha-tolok
    chelsu-top yeonghi-nom/acc suyeong-acc interview do-comp
    seolteukha-eoss-ta persuade-past-decl
    'chelsu persuaded yeonghi to interview suyeong'

    b. chelsu-neun suyeong-ka%leul yeonghi-ke interphyu pat-tolok
    chelsu-top suyeong-nom/acc yeonghi-dat interview pass-comp
    seolteukha-eoss-ta persuade-past-decl
    'chelsu persuaded suyeong to be interviewed by yeonghi' (not synonymous with 7a)

- This lack of passive/active synonymy suggests that Korean persuade is selecting for the case alternating DP.
- We do not see the same lack of passive/active synonymy in the ECM examples (active in (8a); passive in (8b))

    chelsu-top yeonghi-nom suyeong-acc meet-past-decl-comp believe-past-decl
    'chelsu believed (that) yeonghi to have met suyeong

    chelsu-top suyeong-nom yeonghi-by meet-past-decl-comp believed
    'chelsu believed (that) suyeong to have been met by yeonghi' (synonymous with 8a)

- This supports the claim that ECM predicates in Korean do not select for the case alternating DP, while Korean persuade does.

3.3 Selectional restrictions

- By placing a non-persuadable entity in the case alternating position, we expect an anomalous reading, as in (9), supporting the claim that Korean persuade selects for and thus places semantic requirements on the persuadee DP.

(9) #chelsu-neun tol-i-eul tteoleoji-tolok seolteukha-eoss-ta
    chelsu-top rock-nom/acc fall-comp persuade-past-decl
    '#chelsu persuaded the rocks to fall'

- The same anomalous reading does not arise in ECM constructions because the matrix predicate does not impose semantic requirements on the embedded subject.

(10) chelsu-neun tol-i tteoleoji-n-ta-ko mit-eoss-ta
    chelsu-top rock-nom fall-pres-decl-comp believe-past-decl
    'chelsu believes the rocks to be falling'

3.4 Summary of section

- Korean persuade selects for three semantic arguments while Korean ECM selects for only two.
- In selecting for the additional argument, Korean persuade places selectional restrictions on the case alternating DP.
- Coupled with the assumption that argument selection is local, these facts suggest a control analysis.

4. Constituent analysis of Korean persuade constructions

- In this section, I propose two plausible constituency structures to account for the case alternation and subsequently argue that the constituency structure showing the nominative DP as a constituent of the embedded clause is the correct one.

4.1 Proposed constituency structures

- In the Subject/Object Analysis, the nominative marked DP is a constituent of the embedded clause (11a), while the accusative marked DP is a constituent of the matrix clause (11b).

(11) Subject/Object Analysis (SOA)

    a. chelsu-neun [yeonghi-ka kake-e ka-tolok] seolteukha-eoss-ta
        chelsu-top yeonghi-nom store-to go-comp persuade-past-decl
        'chelsu persuaded yeonghi to go to the store'

    b. chelsu-neun yeonghi-leul [kake-e ka-tolok] seolteukha-eoss-ta
        chelsu-top yeonghi-acc store-to go-comp persuade-past-decl
        'chelsu persuaded yeonghi to go to the store'

- In the Object Analysis, syntactic position does not vary with case, and the case alternating DP is a constituent of the matrix clause regardless of whether it shows nominative or accusative case.
(12) Object Analysis (OA)
   cheolsu-neun yeonghi-leul/ka [kake-e ka-tolok] seolteukha-eoss-ta
   cheolsu-top yeonghi-acc/nom store-to go-comp persuade-past-decl
   'cheolsu persuaded yeonghi to go to the store'

4.2 Case in monoclusal structures
   ☐ In a monoclusal structure, nominative case is not permitted on the object DP, an incorrect
     predication made by the OA. The SOA, on the other hand, makes this prediction because
     nominative case is not licensed in matrix object position.
   (13) cheolsu-neun yeonghi-leul/ka seolteukha-eoss-ta
       cheolsu-top yeonghi-acc/nom persuade-past-decl
       'cheolsu persuaded yeonghi'

4.3 Temporal adverb distribution
   ☐ Temporal adverbs in Korean are clausebound in their scope (Yoon 1996).
   ☐ A matrix adverb is able to follow the accusative marked persuadee DP (14), while it is
     unable to follow the nominative marked persuadee DP (15).
   (14) cheolsu-neun yeonghi-leul nae-il [kake-e maeil ka-tolok seolteukha-l keo-ya
       cheolsu-top yeonghi-acc tom, store-to everyday go-comp persuade-fut-decl
       'tomorrow cheolsu will persuade yeonghi to go to the store everyday'
   (15) *cheolsu-neun yeonghi-ka nae-il [kake-e maeil ka-tolok seolteukha-l keo-ya
       cheolsu-top yeonghi-nom tom, store-to everyday go-comp persuade-fut-decl
       'tomorrow cheolsu will persuade yeonghi to go to the store everyday'

4.3.1 OA analysis of adverb facts
   ☐ The OA correctly predicts the grammaticality of (14), because the matrix adverb can still be
     construed in the matrix clause, as in (16).
   (16) cheolsu-neun yeonghi-leul nae-il [kake-e maeil ka-tolok seolteukha-l keo-ya
       cheolsu-top yeonghi-acc tom, store-to everyday go-comp persuade-fut-decl
       'tomorrow cheolsu will persuade yeonghi to go to the store everyday'
   ☐ The OA, however, fails to predict the ungrammaticality of (15), because if the nominative
     marked DP is a constituent of the matrix clause, the matrix adverb should be able to follow it.
   (17) *cheolsu-neun yeonghi-ka nae-il [kake-e maeil ka-tolok seolteukha-l keo-ya
       cheolsu-top yeonghi-nom tom, store-to everyday go-comp persuade-fut-decl
       'tomorrow cheolsu will persuade yeonghi to go to the store everyday'

4.3.2 SOA analysis of adverb facts
   ☐ The SOA correctly predicts the grammaticality of (15), as the accusative marked DP is a
     constituent of the matrix clause, and thus, the matrix adverb is able to follow it.
   (18) cheolsu-neun yeonghi-leul nae-il [kake-e maeil ka-tolok seolteukha-l keo-ya
       cheolsu-top yeonghi-acc tom, store-to everyday go-comp persuade-fut-decl
       'tomorrow, cheolsu will persuade yeonghi to go to the store everyday'
   ☐ The SOA, however, also correctly predicts the ungrammaticality of (19), as the nominative
     marked DP is a constituent of the embedded clause, and thus the matrix adverb is forced to
     be construed inside the embedded clause. There, it is unable to take matrix scope and is
     ungrammatical.
   (19) *cheolsu-neun [yeonghi-ka nae-il kake-e maeil ka-tolok seolteukha-l keo-ya
       cheolsu-top yeonghi-nom tom, store-to everyday go-comp persuade-fut-decl
       'tomorrow, cheolsu will persuade yeonghi to go to the store everyday'

4.4 Scrambling
   ☐ The embedded clause is unable to precede the nominative marked DP, while it is able to
     precede the accusative marked DP, as in (20).
   (20) cheolsu-neun kake-e ka-tolok yeonghi-leul/ka seolteukha-eoss-ta
       cheolsu-top store-to go-comp yeonghi-acc/nom persuade-past-decl
       'cheolsu persuaded yeonghi to go to the store'

4.4.1 OA analysis of scrambling facts
   ☐ Because the persuadee DP is in the same syntactic position regardless of case, the OA fails to
     predict a contrast between the grammatical (21) and the ungrammatical (22).
   (21) cheolsu-neun [kake-e ka-tolok], yeonghi-leul ti, seolteukha-eoss-ta
       cheolsu-top store-to go-comp yeonghi-acc persuade-past-decl
       'cheolsu persuaded yeonghi to go to the store'
   (22) *cheolsu-neun [kake-e ka-tolok], yeonghi-ka ti, seolteukha-eoss-ta
       cheolsu-top store-to go-comp yeonghi-nom persuade-past-decl
       'cheolsu persuaded yeonghi to go to the store'
4.4.2 SOA analysis of scrambling facts

- Because there is a difference in structural position dependent upon case, the SOA predicts the contrast between the grammatical (23) and the ungrammatical (24). Because the accusative DP is a constituent of the matrix clause the embedded clause can scramble without it.

(23) cheolsu-neun [kake-e ka-tokol] yeonghi-leul t1 seolteukha-eoss-ta
    cheolsu-top store-to go-comp yeonghi-acc persuade-past-decl
    ‘cheolsu persuaded yeonghi to go to the store’

- However, because according the SOA, the nominative marked DP is a constituent of the embedded clause, the embedded clause is unable to scramble without it.1

(24) * cheolsu-neun kake-e ka-tokol [yeonghi-ka t1] seolteukha-eoss-ta
    cheolsu-top store-to go-comp yeonghi-nom persuade-past-decl
    ‘cheolsu persuaded yeonghi to go to the store’

4.5 Summary of section 4

- In this section, I presented evidence in support of the claim that a difference in case equates to a difference in syntactic position.
- When the persuadee DP is accusative, it is a constituent of the embedded clause, as in (2).
- When the persuadee DP is nominative, it is a constituent of the matrix clause, as in (3).

(2.2) cheolsu-neun yeonghi-leul [Δi kake-e ka-tokol] seolteukha-eoss-ta
    cheolsu-top yeonghi-acc store-to go-comp persuade-past-decl
    ‘cheolsu persuaded yeonghi to go to the store’ (ordinary control)

(3.2) cheolsu-neun Δi [yeonghi-ka, kake-e ka-tokol] seolteukha-eoss-ta
    cheolsu-top yeonghi-nom store-to go-comp persuade-decl
    ‘cheolsu persuaded yeonghi to go to the store’ (backward control)

5. Evidence for the null element

- In this section, I present evidence for the existence of the null element in both the forward control construction ([5.1]) and the backward control construction ([5.2] and [5.3]).

5.1 Honorific licensing

- In Korean, only honorific subjects, not objects, can license honorific marking on the verb, as illustrated in the contrast between (25) and (26).

(25) seonsaeng-nim-i suhak-eul kakechi-si-n-ta
    teacher-hon-nom mathematics-acc teacher-hon-pres-decl
    ‘the teacher teaches mathematics’
    (Hong 1994: 100)

(26) *minsu-ka seonsaeng-nim-eul mana-si-eoss-ta
    minsu-nom teacher-hon-acc meet-hon-past-decl
    ‘minsu met the teacher’
    (Hong 1994: 102)

- This fact is again illustrated in (27), where the embedded subject licenses honorific marking on the embedded verb.

(27) cheolsu-neun seonsaeng-nim-i kake-e ka-ni-toolk seolteukha-eoss-ta
    cheolsu-top teacher-hon-nom store-to go-hon-comp persuade-past-decl
    ‘cheolsu persuaded the teacher to go to the store’

- In (28), however, it appears that the matrix object is licensing honorific marking on the embedded predicate, which should be illicit.

(28) cheolsu-neun seonsaeng-nim-eul kake-e ka-ni-toolk seolteukha-eoss-ta
    cheolsu-top teacher-hon-acc store-to go-hon-inf persuade-past-decl
    ‘cheolsu persuaded the teacher to go to the store’

- I argue that this is acceptable because of the null element in the subject position of the embedded clause that is coindexed with the matrix predicate. It is this null element that licenses the honorific marking on the embedded verb.

(29) cheolsu-neun seonsaeng-nim-eul, Δi kake-e ka-ni-toolk seolteukha-eoss-ta
    cheolsu-top teacher-hon-acc store-to go-hon-inf persuade-past-decl
    ‘cheolsu persuaded the teacher to go to the store’

5.2 Quantifier agreement

- Postnominal quantifiers in Korean must agree in case with the head noun (Cho 2000), as illustrated in (30) and (31).

(30) haksae-leul-i motto-ka/*teul us-eoss-ta
    student-pl-nom all-nom/*acc laugh-past-decl
    ‘all the students laughed’ (Cho 2000:193)
Like the scrambling examples, an accusative marked quantified DP can appear in post-embedded clause position, as in (32).

(32) cheolsu-neun [kake-eكا-tolok] ai-teul-eul motu-leul seolteukha-eoss-ta
cheolsu-top store-to go-comp child-pl-acc all-acc persuade-past-decl
‘cheolsu persuaded all the children to go to the store’

I argue that the grammaticality of (33) is due to the embedded subject being coindexed with a null element in the matrix clause. This null element licenses the accusative case on the quantifier, which is in the matrix clause.

(33) cheolsu-neun [ai-teul-i كا-te] motu-leul seolteukha-eoss-ta
cheolsu-top child-pl-nom store-to go-comp all-acc persuade-past-decl
‘cheolsu persuaded all the children to go to the store’

5.3 Reflexive binding

In Korean, the reflexive anaphor lasin ‘self’ is governed by Condition A of the Binding Theory (JM Yoon 1989). Condition A states that a reflexive must be bound in its governing category. In (35), however, the reflexive is a constituent of the matrix VP adjunct and is bound by the embedded subject. Because its antecedent is not a classmate and furthermore, it does not c-command the reflexive, (35) should be impossible.

(35) % cheolsu-neun [yeonghi-ka ka-l keos-eul] [re keunyeojasin-eul, yeuk-eul]
cheolsu-top yeonghi-nom go-comp herself-gen benefit-acc
uihaje] seolteukha-eoss-ta
 for persuade-past-decl
‘cheolsu for herself’s, benefit persuaded yeonghi, to go’

However, its acceptability by most of my consultants is due, I argue, to the null element in the matrix clause that can satisfy the clausemate condition required by Condition A.