

# Backward Object Control in Korean

Philip J. Monahan

*University of Florida*

## 1. Introduction

Backward control<sup>1</sup> is a construction where the null controllee is structurally superior to the overt controller, as in hypothetical (1b).

- (1) a. Gus Hiddink persuaded him<sub>i</sub> [ $\Delta_i$  to play center middle]  
b. Gus Hiddink persuaded  $\Delta_i$  [he<sub>i</sub> to play center middle] (hypothetical)

In this paper, I claim that Korean licenses backward object control. Korean object control predicates permit an accusative/nominative case alternation on the *persuadee* DP, as in (2).<sup>2</sup>

- (2) Chelswu-nun      Yenghi-lul/ka      kakey-ey      ka-tolok  
Chelswu-Top      Yenghi-Acc/Nom      store-Loc      go-Comp  
seltukha-ess-ta  
persuade-Past-Decl  
'Chelswu persuaded Yenghi to go to the store.'

I argue that the difference in case equates to a difference in syntactic position. Specifically, when the *persuadee* DP shows accusative case, it is a constituent of the matrix clause binding a null element  $\Delta$  in the embedded clause. This is exemplified in (3), which is the forward control construction.

---

\* An immeasurable amount of gratitude is owed to Eric Potsdam for his support and guidance. I would also like to thank the audiences at WCCFL 22 and LSA 77 in Atlanta for valuable comments. In particular, I thank Heejeong Ko, Nayoung Kwon, Chungmin Lee, Alec Marantz, D. Gary Miller, Andrew Ira Nevins, Maria Polinsky, Norvin Richards, Hiromu Sakai, John Whitman, James Yoon and Peter Zubkov for enlightening discussions. Finally, special thanks are afforded to my consultants: Jongbum Ha, Juhyun Jang, Eunjeong Kim, Kyongok Paik and Heenam Park. This work was funded in part by NSF grant BCS-0131993 to the University of Florida. Their support is gratefully acknowledged. All errors are my responsibility.

1. Proposed in Japanese (Kuroda 1965), Brazilian Portuguese (Farrell 1995), Tsez (Polinsky and Potsdam 2002) and Malagasy (Polinsky and Potsdam 2003).

2. The abbreviations are as follows: Top-topic, Acc-accusative, Nom-nominative, Dat-dative, Gen-genitive, Loc-locative, Comp-complementizer, Past-past, Pres-present, Fut-future, Pass-passive, Decl-declarative, Pl-plural.

- (3) Chelswu-nun    Yenghi-lul<sub>i</sub> [Δ<sub>i</sub>    kakey-ey    ka-tolok]  
 Chelswu-Top    Yenghi-Acc            store-Loc    go-Comp  
 seltukha-ess-ta  
 persuade-Past-Decl  
 ‘Chelswu persuaded Yenghi to go to the store.’ (forward control)

Conversely, when the *persuadee* DP shows nominative case, I argue that it is a constituent of the embedded clause coindexed with a null element Δ in the matrix clause, as in (4). This is the backward control configuration.<sup>3</sup>

- (4) Chelswu-nun    Δ<sub>i</sub> [Yenghi-ka<sub>i</sub>    kakey-ey    ka-tolok]  
 Chelswu-Top            Yenghi-Nom    store-Loc    go-Comp  
 seltukha-ess-ta  
 persuade-Past-Decl  
 ‘Chelswu persuaded Yenghi to go to the store.’ (backward control)

The first portion of this paper is devoted to empirically motivating the structure in (4).<sup>4</sup> The second portion of the paper provides a theoretical explanation. First, I argue against an ECM analysis of Korean *persuade*. I show that Korean *persuade* selects for three arguments, including the *persuadee* DP, while Korean ECM predicates select for two. Then, I argue that a difference in case equates to a difference in syntactic constituency. Specifically, the nominative DP is a constituent of the embedded clause, while the accusative DP is a constituent of the matrix clause. Next, I present evidence supporting the existence of Δ in the backward control configuration. Finally, I provide a formal analysis of the construction. I show that a *pro*-based approach (Cormack and Smith 2002) faces empirical challenges, while a control-is-movement analysis (Hornstein 1999; Polinsky and Potsdam 2002) is able to account for the construction.

## 2. Korean *persuade* is object control not ECM

In this section, I present evidence from the non-control structure, passive/active synonymy and selectional restrictions suggesting that Korean *persuade* not be treated as an ECM predicate. The reason for making this

3. Other predicates that appear to license this configuration are *kangyohata* ‘force,’ *chwungkohata* ‘advise’ and *ceyanhata* ‘suggest.’

4. While empirically motivating the backward control structure in (4), I make no claims as to whether Δ is a phonologically empty lexical item, such as *pro* or PRO, or whether it represents an empty specifier position that is not lexically filled at Spell-Out. The nature of Δ is discussed in Section 5.

contrast is that ECM predicates license an accusative/nominative case alternation similar to (2) in Korean (Lee 1992). This is illustrated in (5).

- (5) Joe-nun Mary-lul/ka      yeppu-ta-ko      mit-nun-ta  
 Joe-Top Mary-Acc/Nom    pretty-Decl-Comp    believe-Pres-Decl  
 ‘Joe believes Mary to be pretty.’

I argue that Korean *persuade* selects for the case alternating DP and places selectional restrictions on it, while Korean ECM predicates do not.

### 2.1. Non-control

The non-control version of Korean *persuade* can license an additional overt internal argument, as in (6). This suggests that Korean *persuade* selects for three arguments: the matrix subject, a clausal complement and an object DP complement.

- (6) Chelswu-nun    Yenghi-lul/eykey    Swuyeng-i    kakey-ey  
 Chelswu-Top    Yenghi-Acc/Dat    Swuyeng-Nom    store-Loc  
 ka-yaha-n-ta-ko                    seltukha-ess-ta  
 go-should-Pres-Decl-Comp    persuade-Past-Decl  
 ‘Chelswu persuaded Yenghi that Swuyeng should go to the store.’

Conversely, Korean ECM predicates cannot license an additional overt argument, as in (7). This suggests that Korean ECM predicates select for only two arguments: a matrix subject and a clausal complement.

- (7) \*Chelswu-nun    Yenghi-lul    Swuyeng-i    yeppu-ta-ko  
 Chelswu-Top    Yenghi-Acc    Swuyeng-Nom    pretty-Decl-Comp  
 mit-ess-ta  
 believe-Past-Decl  
 (\*‘Chelswu believed Yenghi Swuyeng to be pretty.’)

The evidence presented here indicates that Korean *persuade* and Korean ECM predicates have different subcategorization frames. The former selects for three arguments while the latter selects for two.

### 2.2. Passive/active synonymy

Additional evidence against an ECM analysis of Korean *persuade* arises from the fact that the passive and active forms of the embedded clause are not synonymous under Korean *persuade*. In the active (8a),

*Yenghi* is the entity being *persuaded*. Conversely, in the passive (8b), *Swuyeng* is interpreted as the object of *persuade*.

- (8) a. Chelswu-nun    Yenghi-lul/ka    Swuyeng-ul  
 Chelswu-Top    Yenghi-Acc/Nom    Swuyeng-acc  
 intephyu    ha-tolok    seltukha-ess-ta  
 interview    do-Comp    persuade-Past-Decl  
 ‘Chelswu persuaded Yenghi to interview Swuyeng.’
- b. Chelswu-nun    Swuyeng-%ul/i    Yenghi-eykey  
 Chelswu-Top    Swuyeng-Acc/Nom    Yenghi-Dat  
 intephyu    pat-tolok    seltukha-ess-ta  
 interview    Pass-Comp    persuade-Past-Decl  
 ‘Chelswu persuaded Swuyeng to be interviewed by Yenghi.’ (≠8a)

The lack of synonymy between the active and the passive suggests that Korean *persuade* is selecting for the *persuadee* DP. If ECM predicates do not select for the case alternating DP, then we expect the passive and active forms to be synonymous, as illustrated in (9).

- (9) a. Chelswu-nun    Yenghi-ka    Swuyeng-ul  
 Chelswu-Top    Yenghi-Nom    Swuyeng-Acc  
 manna-ass-ta-ko    mit-ess-ta  
 meet-Past-Decl-Comp    believe-Past-Decl  
 ‘Chelswu believed (that) Yenghi met Swuyeng.’
- b. Chelswu-nun    Swuyeng-i    Yenghi- ey wihayse  
 Chelswu-Top    Swuyeng-Nom    Yenghi- by  
 manna-ci-ess-ta-ko    mit-ess-ta  
 meet-Pass-Past-Decl-Comp    believe-Past-Decl  
 ‘Chelswu believed Swuyeng was met by Yenghi.’ (=9a)

Therefore, evidence from passive/active synonymy provides additional support for the claim that Korean ECM predicates do not select for the case alternating DP, while Korean *persuade* does.

### 2.3. Selectional restrictions

The final argument against an ECM analysis of Korean *persuade* arises from the fact that a non-*persuadable* entity in the case alternating position creates an anomalous reading, as in (10). This is expected if *persuade* is selecting for the case alternating DP.

- (10) #Chelswu-nun tol-ul/i tteleci-tolok seltukha-ess-ta  
 Chelswu-Top rock-Acc/Nom fall-Comp persuade-Past-Decl  
 ‘#Chelswu persuaded the rocks to fall.’

If ECM predicates do not select for the case alternating DP, then we do not expect an anomalous interpretation, as confirmed by (11).

- (11) Chelswu-nun tol-i tteleci-n-ta-ko mit-ess-ta  
 Chelswu-Top rock-Nom fall-Pres-Decl-Comp believe-Past-Decl  
 ‘Chelswu believed the rocks to be falling.’

These facts suggest that Korean *persuade* selects for and places semantic restrictions on the case alternating DP, while Korean ECM predicates do not.

#### 2.4. Summary of Section 2

In Section 2, I argued that Korean *persuade* selects for three semantic arguments and places selectional restrictions on the case alternating DP, unlike Korean ECM predicates. Assuming that argument selection is local, these facts suggest a control analysis. In Section 3, I address the constituency structures for (2).

### 3. Constituent analysis

In this section, I present two plausible constituent structure analyses to account for (2). According to the Subject/Object Analysis (SOA), the nominative *persuadee* DP is a constituent of the embedded clause, as in (12a). When the *persuadee* DP shows accusative case, however, it is a constituent of the matrix clause, as in (12b).

- (12) a. Chelswu-nun [Yenghi-ka kekey-ey ka-tolok]  
 Chelswu-Top Yenghi-Nom store-Loc go-Comp  
 seltukha-ess-ta  
 persuade-Past-Decl  
 ‘Chelswu persuaded Yenghi to go to the store.’
- b. Chelswu-nun Yenghi-lul [kekey-ey ka-tolok]  
 Chelswu-Top Yenghi-Acc store-Loc go-Comp  
 seltukha-ess-ta  
 persuade-Past-Decl  
 ‘Chelswu persuaded Yenghi to go to the store.’

The alternative to the SOA that I propose is the Object Analysis (OA). The OA claims that the case alternating DP is always a constituent of the matrix clause, as in (13). Under this analysis, only a forward control configuration is licensed. The OA does, however, require that nominative case be licensed on the complement of Korean *persuade*.

- (13) Chelswu-nun    Yenghi-lul/ka    [kakey-ey    ka-tolok]  
       Chelswu-Top    Yenghi-Acc/Nom    store-Loc    go-Comp  
       seltukha-ess-ta  
       persuade-Past-Decl  
       ‘Chelswu persuaded Yenghi to go to the store.’

In the following subsections, I present evidence from the monoclausal structure, temporal adverb scope and scrambling showing that the OA is empirically inadequate. It predicts that the nominative and accusative *persuadee* should behave similarly. It is evident, by the facts discussed below, that this is false. The SOA, however, predicts these facts.

### 3.1. Monoclausal structure

Accusative but not nominative case is permitted on the *persuadee* DP in the monoclausal structure, as in (14).

- (14) Chelswu-nun    Yenghi-lul/\*ka    seltukha-ess-ta  
       Chelswu-Top    Yenghi-Acc/\*Nom    persuade-Past-Decl  
       ‘Chelswu persuaded Yenghi.’

The OA does not predict this contrast because nominative case should be licensed in this position. The SOA makes this prediction, as accusative is the only structural case permitted on the complement of Korean *persuade*.

### 3.2. Temporal adverb distribution

Temporal adverbs in Korean are clause-bound in their scope (Yoon 1996). In the construction under investigation, a matrix adverb can follow the accusative marked *persuadee* DP, while it cannot follow the nominative *persuadee* DP. This is illustrated in (15).

- (15) Chelswu-nun    Yenghi-lul/\*ka    nayil    kakey-ey  
       Chelswu-Top    Yenghi-Acc/\*Nom    tomorrow    store-Loc  
       mayil    ka-tolok    seltukha-lke-ya  
       every day    go-Comp    persuade-Fut-Decl  
       ‘Chelswu will persuade Yenghi tomorrow to go to the store every day.’

The OA predicts the grammaticality of (16). The accusative DP is a constituent of the matrix clause, and therefore, the temporal adverb can still be interpreted with matrix scope.

- (16) Chelswu-nun    Yenghi-lul    nayil    [kakey-ey  
       Chelswu-Top    Yenghi-Acc    tomorrow    store-Loc  
       mayil    ka-tolok]    seltukha-lke-ya  
       every day    go-Comp    persuade-Fut-Decl  
       ‘Chelswu will persuade Yenghi tomorrow to go to the store every day.’

According to the OA, (17) is also expected to be grammatical for the same reasons that explained the acceptability of (16). This is because the OA predicts both the accusative and nominative *persuadee* DP to pattern similarly. Its ungrammaticality indicates that the OA is inadequate.

- (17) \*Chelswu-nun    Yenghi-ka    nayil    [kakey-ey  
       Chelswu-Top    Yenghi-Nom    tomorrow    store-Loc  
       mayil    ka-tolok]    seltukha-lke-ya  
       every day    go-Comp    persuade-Fut-Decl  
       ‘Chelswu will persuade Yenghi tomorrow to go to the store every day.’

The SOA makes the same predictions as the OA when the *persuadee* DP is marked with accusative case. Under both analyses, it is a constituent of the matrix clause. Where the two analyses differ, however, is with respect to the nominative marked *persuadee* DP. According to the SOA, the nominative *persuadee* is a constituent of the embedded clause.

- (18) \*Chelswu-nun    [Yenghi-ka    nayil    kakey-ey  
       Chelswu-Top    Yenghi-Nom    tomorrow    store-Loc  
       mayil    ka-tolok]    seltukha-lke-ya  
       every day    go-Comp    persuade-Fut-Decl  
       ‘Chelswu will persuade Yenghi tomorrow to go to the store every day.’

The matrix adverb is then unable to take matrix scope, and the SOA predicts the ungrammaticality of (18).

### 3.3. Scrambling

In this section, I present evidence from scrambling, showing that the OA is inadequate. The embedded clause is unable to scramble without the nominative marked DP, while the accusative *persuadee* DP is able to appear in post-embedded clause position, as in (19). The SOA, however, predicts the contrast between the nominative and accusative DP.

- (19) Chelswu-nun    kakey-ey    ka-tolok    Yenghi-lul/\*ka  
 Chelswu-Top    store-Loc    go-Comp    Yenghi-Acc/\*Nom  
 seltukha-ess-ta  
 persuade-Past-Decl  
 ‘Chelswu persuaded Yenghi to go to the store.’

The OA fails to predict the contrast between the grammatical (20), with accusative case, and the ungrammatical (21), with nominative case. This is because, according to the OA, the *persuadee* DP is always a constituent of the matrix clause. Therefore, the OA incorrectly predicts that the embedded clause should be able to scramble without either the nominative or accusative DP.

- (20) Chelswu-nun    [kakey-ey    ka-tolok]<sub>i</sub>    Yenghi-lul     $t_i$   
 Chelswu-Top    store-Loc    go-Comp    Yenghi-Acc  
 seltukha-ess-ta  
 persuade-Past-Decl  
 ‘Chelswu persuaded Yenghi to go to the store.’
- (21) \*Chelswu-nun    [kakey-ey    ka-tolok]<sub>i</sub>    Yenghi-ka     $t_i$   
 Chelswu-Top    store-Loc    go-Comp    Yenghi-Nom  
 seltukha-ess-ta  
 persuade-Past-Decl  
 ‘Chelswu persuaded Yenghi to go to the store.’

According to the SOA, the nominative *persuadee* DP is a constituent of the embedded clause. Therefore, the embedded clause is unable to scramble without the nominative *persuadee*, as in (23).

- (22) Chelswu-nun    [kakey-ey    ka-tolok]<sub>i</sub>    Yenghi-lul     $t_i$   
 Chelswu-Top    store-Loc    go-Comp    Yenghi-Acc  
 seltukha-ess-ta  
 persuade-Past-Decl  
 ‘Chelswu persuaded Yenghi to go to the store.’
- (23) \*Chelswu-nun    kakey-ey    ka-tolok<sub>i</sub>    [Yenghi-ka     $t_i$ ]  
 Chelswu-top    store-Loc    go-Comp    Yenghi-Nom  
 seltukha-ess-ta  
 persuade-Past-Decl  
 ‘Chelswu persuaded Yenghi to go to the store.’

The SOA predicts the contrast between the grammatical (22), with accusative case, and the ungrammatical (23), with nominative case.



### 3.4. Summary of Section 3

In Section 3, I argued that a difference in case equates to a difference in syntactic position, as predicted by the SOA. When the *persuadee* DP is accusative, it is a constituent of the matrix clause. When the *persuadee* DP is nominative, however, it is a constituent of the embedded clause, as in (4).

### 4. Evidence for $\Delta$

In this section, I present evidence from quantifier agreement and reflexive binding supporting the existence of a silent element  $\Delta$  in the matrix clause under backward control.

#### 4.1. Quantifier agreement

Postnominal quantifiers in Korean must agree in case with the head noun (Cho 2000). Nominative case is illicit on the quantifier in (24), because the modified nominal shows accusative case.

- (24) Mary-ka haksayng-tul-ul motwu-lul/\*ka sohwanha-ess-ta  
 Mary-Nom student-Pl-Acc all-Acc/\*Nom call-Past-Decl  
 ‘Mary called all the students.’ (Cho 2000:194)

In the construction under investigation, an accusative quantified DP can appear in post-embedded clause position. Notice that both the DP and post-nominal quantifier show accusative case.

- (25) Chelswu-nun [akey-ey ka-tolok] ai-tul-ul motwu-lul  
 Chelswu-Top store-Loc go-Comp child-Pl-Acc all-Acc  
 seltukha-ess-ta  
 persuade-Past-Decl  
 ‘Chelswu persuaded all the children to go to the store.’

The *persuadee* DP in (26) shows nominative and is, therefore, a constituent of the embedded clause. The quantifier shows accusative and is a constituent of the matrix clause. In the absence of a silent element licensing the quantifier in the matrix clause, this should be illicit.

- (26) Chelswu-nun [ai-tul-i akey-ey ka-tolok]  
 Chelswu-Top child-Pl-Nom store-Loc go-Comp  
 motwu-lul seltukha-ess-ta  
 all-Acc persuade-Past-Decl  
 ‘Chelswu persuaded all the children to go to the store.’

I argue that the acceptability of (26) can be attributed to the embedded subject being coindexed with  $\Delta$  in the matrix clause. This licenses the accusative case on the quantifier.

- (27) Chelswu-nun [ai-tul-i kakey-ey ka-tolok]  $\Delta_i$   
 Chelswu-Top child-Pl-Nom store-Loc go-Comp  
 motwu-lul seltukha-ess-ta  
 all-Acc persuade-Past-Decl  
 ‘Chelswu persuaded all the children to go to the store.’

#### 4.2. Reflexive binding

The reflexive anaphor *kunyecasin* ‘herself’ is governed by Condition A of the Binding Theory (Yoon 1989). In (28), the reflexive is in a matrix VP adjunct and is coindexed with the embedded subject.<sup>5</sup> This should be illicit.

- (28) Chelswu-nun [Yenghi-ka<sub>i</sub> ka-tolok] [<sub>PP</sub> kunyecasin-uy<sub>i</sub>  
 Chelswu-Top Yenghi-Nom go-Comp herself-Gen  
 yuik-ul wihay] seltukha-ess-ta  
 benefit-Acc for persuade-Past-Decl  
 ‘Chelswu, for herself’s<sub>i</sub> benefit, persuaded Yenghi<sub>i</sub> to go.’

I claim, however, that its acceptability is due to  $\Delta$  in the matrix clause, which licenses the reflexive by satisfying Condition A.

- (29) Chelswu-nun [Yenghi-ka<sub>i</sub> ka-tolok]  $\Delta_i$  [<sub>PP</sub> kunyecasin-ul<sub>i</sub>  
 Chelswu-Top Yenghi-Nom go-Comp herself-Acc  
 yuik-ul wihay] seltukha-ess-ta  
 benefit-Acc for persuade-Past-Decl  
 ‘Chelswu, for herself’s<sub>i</sub> benefit, persuaded Yenghi<sub>i</sub> to go.’

#### 5. Formal analysis

In this section, my goal is to address the identity of  $\Delta$ . PRO is inadequate for reasons discussed in Polinsky and Potsdam (2002). I do, however, present empirical problems in extending to Korean the *pro*-based alternative offered by Cormack and Smith (2002) for Tsez backward control. Consequently, I argue that a control-is-movement analysis accounts for the Korean backward control data.

5. The PP adjunct with the reflexive is also permitted in pre-embedded clause position. The reason for presenting (28) instead of this example was so that it would be clear that the PP adjunct is a constituent of the matrix clause and not the embedded clause.

### 5.1. *Pro*-based account

According to the *pro*-based account, the null element in (3) and (4) is *pro*. Initially, this analysis seems promising, as Korean is a null object language (Cole 1987). Polinsky and Potsdam (2002: fn. 17) provide three arguments against a *pro*-based account. First, *pro* c-commands its antecedent. This is a Condition C violation. Second, *pro* cannot account for the obligatory control relationship. Third, the null element does not alternate with an overt pronoun. Cormack and Smith (2002) provide solutions to two of these problems in order to salvage a *pro*-based approach to backward control in Tsez. First, under their analysis, *pro* would be generated in a position where it does not c-command *Yenghi*. This structure is lexically determined. Extended to Korean, it is presented in (30).

(30) [<sub>TP</sub> Chelswu [<sub>VP</sub> [<sub>CP</sub> *Yenghi*<sub>i</sub> store go] [<sub>V'</sub> [<sub>DP</sub> *pro*<sub>i</sub>] persuaded]]]

Second, they present a Meaning Postulate that coindexes the embedded agent with *pro*. This creates the obligatory control interpretation.<sup>6</sup>

(31)  $\forall s \forall x \forall y$  [PERSUADE.*s.x.y*  $\rightarrow$  *x* is an agent in the event given by *s*]  
Where type *x*, *y* =  $\langle e \rangle$ , type *s* =  $\langle t \rangle$

### 5.2. Problems with the *pro*-based account

As Cormack and Smith (2002) note, a distributively quantified DP should be illicit in embedded subject position.<sup>7</sup> This is because a variable/binding configuration would not exist, as *pro* is generated out of the c-command domain of the quantified DP. Korean, however, permits a distributively quantified DP in subject position, as in (32). This suggests that  $\Delta$  is not *pro*, because if *pro* is generated in either pre- or post-embedded clause position, there is no variable/binding configuration.

(32) Chelswu-nun      [kakkak-uy      ai-ka      swukcey-lul  
Chelswu-Top      each-Gen      child-Nom      homework-Acc  
ha-tolok]      seltukha-ess-ta  
do-Comp      persuade-Past-Decl  
'Chelswu persuaded each child to do the homework.'

6. The Meaning Postulate presented by Cormack and Smith (2002) was formulated for subject control. In (31), I revise it for object control predicates.

7. This is the case in Tsez where distributively quantified DPs are not permitted in the backward control configuration (Cormack and Smith 2002).

Furthermore, because the Meaning Postulate makes reference only to semantic function, it incorrectly predicts that *pro* be interpreted with the agent of the passivized embedded clause.

- (8b') Chelswu-nun [Swuyeng-i Yenghi-eykey intephyu  
 Chelswu-Top Swuyeng-Nom Yenghi-Dat interview  
 pat-tolok] seltukha-ess-ta  
 pass-Comp persuade-Past-Decl  
 'Chelswu persuaded Swuyeng to be interviewed by Yenghi.'  
 '\*Chelswu persuaded Yenghi<sub>i</sub> that Swuyeng interview her<sub>i</sub>.'

In (8b'), *Yenghi* is the agent of the embedded clause. *Swuyeng* is the subject of the embedded clause and is interpreted as the *persuadee*. The Meaning Postulate in (31) predicts that *Yenghi* and not *Swuyeng* be interpreted as the *persuadee*. This, however, is the incorrect interpretation.

Finally, as it has been argued, Korean licenses both forward and backward control. We are therefore required to posit a lexically marked structure for backward control and a different lexically determined structure for forward control. Intuitively, this seems less than ideal.

### 5.3. Control-is-movement account

Following previous research, nominative case is licensed on the subject of [-tense] clauses in Korean because of a default nominative case (DNC) mechanism.<sup>8</sup> The DNC inserts nominative case at PF on DPs that do not receive structural case by Spell-Out (Kim 1990; Kang 1998).

In my analysis of backward control in Korean, I assume the version of feature driven-movement proposed in Chomsky (2000). First, however, the forward control derivation of (3) is presented in (33).

- (33) Chelswu-Top [<sub>VP</sub> Yenghi-Acc [<sub>VP</sub> ~~Yenghi~~ [<sub>CP</sub> [<sub>TP</sub> ~~Yenghi~~ [<sub>VP</sub> ~~Yenghi~~  
 store go]] Comp] persuaded]]

The DP *Yenghi* is first Merged into embedded spec,<sub>v</sub><sup>o</sup>. There, it absorbs the  $\theta$ -role of the embedded verb.<sup>9</sup> Then, it raises into embedded spec,<sub>T</sub><sup>o</sup> to delete the uninterpretable  $\phi$ -features of <sub>T</sub><sup>o</sup>. Spell-Out does not apply and the DNC is not activated. Therefore, *Yenghi* must move into the matrix clause

8. See Schütze (2001) for arguments that all languages invoke some default case mechanism, and that default case is inherent to UG.

9. Hornstein (1999) does not develop the mechanics of how  $\theta$ -roles are assigned or checked. For present purposes, I assume that  $\theta$ -roles are *absorbed* by an XP from <sub>D</sub><sup>o</sup>, and the information of that  $\theta$ -role is stored on that XP.

in the overt syntax for case purposes. It moves into spec,V<sup>o</sup> and absorbs the internal  $\theta$ -role of *persuade*. Still in the overt syntax, it moves into the outer matrix spec,v<sup>o</sup> to be assigned accusative case and to delete the uninterpretable  $\phi$ -features of v<sup>o</sup>.

The backward control phrase marker at Spell-Out is presented in (34) for the derivation of (4).

(34) Chelswu-Top [<sub>VP</sub> [<sub>VP</sub> [<sub>CP</sub> [<sub>TP</sub> Yenghi-Nom [<sub>VP</sub> ~~Yenghi~~ store go]] Comp] persuaded]]

First, *Yenghi* is Merged into embedded spec,v<sup>o</sup> and absorbs the  $\theta$ -role of *go*. Then, it moves into embedded spec,T<sup>o</sup> and deletes the uninterpretable  $\phi$ -features of T<sup>o</sup>. Spell-Out applies and the DNC is activated. *Yenghi* is marked with default nominative case at PF. *Yenghi*, however, is still not assigned case in the phrase marker sent to LF, and the direct object  $\theta$ -role of *persuade* is still unabsorbed. Furthermore, the uninterpretable  $\phi$ -features of v<sup>o</sup> are still not deleted.

(35) Chelswu-Top [<sub>VP</sub> Yenghi-Acc [<sub>VP</sub> ~~Yenghi~~ [<sub>CP</sub> [<sub>TP</sub> ~~Yenghi~~ [<sub>VP</sub> ~~Yenghi~~ store go]] Comp] persuaded]]

In order to amend these problems, *Yenghi* moves covertly into the matrix clause.<sup>10</sup> First, it moves into spec,V<sup>o</sup> to absorb the direct object  $\theta$ -role of *persuade*. Then, it moves into spec,v<sup>o</sup> to be assigned accusative case and to delete the uninterpretable  $\phi$ -features of matrix v<sup>o</sup>. The derivation is now complete.

## 6. Conclusion

This paper adds to the growing number of backward control cases documented cross-linguistically. I have presented novel empirical evidence supporting the existence of the backward object control configuration in Korean. Furthermore, I showed that a *pro*-based approach was empirically inadequate. I extended the backward subject control analysis (Polinsky and Potsdam 2002) to backward object control. Under backward object control in Korean, both an unabsorbed  $\theta$ -role and a case unassigned nominal motivate the covert movement. Covert movement in Polinsky and Potsdam (2002) was motivated solely by  $\theta$ -requirements. Next, I proposed that the default nominative case strategy is responsible for the case alternation. Tsez does not license the forward/backward control alternation, nor does it show

---

10. Under this analysis, I am forced to allow movement out of spelled-out constituents (cf. Chomsky 2001).

a case alternation. I leave the interpretative consequences of these alternations for future research.

### References

- Cho, Sungeun. 2000. Three forms of case agreement in Korean. Doctoral dissertation: SUNY Stony Brook.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2000. Minimalist inquiries: The framework. In *Step by step: Essays on minimalist syntax in honor of Howard Lasnik*. ed., R. Martin and J. Uriagereka, 89-155. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2001. Derivation by phase. In *Ken Hale: A life in language*. ed., M. Kenstowicz, 1-52. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Cole, Peter. 1987. Null objects in universal grammar. *Linguistic Inquiry* 18:597-612.
- Cormack, Annabel and Neil Smith. 2002. Compositionality, copy theory, and control. In *University College of London Working Papers in Linguistics 14*. ed., A. Neeleman and R. Vermeulen, 355-373. London: UCLWPL.
- Farrell, Patrick. 1995. Backward control in Brazilian Portuguese. In *Proceedings of the Eleventh Eastern States Conference on Linguistics*. ed., J. Fuller, H. Han and D. Parkinson, 116-127. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University.
- Hornstein, Norbert. 1999. Movement and control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30:69-96.
- Kang, Seung-Man. 1998. The morphology and syntax of default case. Doctoral dissertation: University of Florida.
- Kim, Young-Joo. 1990. The syntax and semantics of Korean case: The interaction between lexical and syntactic levels of representation. Doctoral dissertation: Harvard University.
- Kuroda, Sige-Yuki. 1965. Generative grammatical studies in the Japanese language. Doctoral dissertation: MIT.
- Lee, Jeong-Shik. 1992. Case alternation in Korean: Case minimality. Doctoral dissertation: University of Connecticut.
- Polinsky, Maria and Eric Potsdam. 2002. Backward control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 33:245-282.
- Polinsky, Maria and Eric Potsdam. 2003. Backward control: Evidence from Malagasy. In *Proceedings of the Eighth Meeting of the Austronesian Formal Linguistics Association*. ed., A. Rakowski and N. Richards, 257-272. Cambridge, MA: MITWPL.
- Schütze, Carson T. 2001. On the nature of default case. *Syntax* 4:205-238.
- Yoon, James. 1996. Ambiguity of government and the chain condition. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 14:105-162.
- Yoon, Jeong-Me. 1989. Long-distance anaphors in Korean and their cross-linguistic implications. In *Papers from the Twenty Fifth Annual Meeting of the Chicago Linguistics Society*, 479-495. Chicago: The Society.