

Control in Korean

Nayoung Kwon
University of California, San Diego

Philip J. Monahan
University of Maryland, College Park

Korean (KOR)

Family: Language Isolate

Also known as *Hanguohua*, *Hanguk Mal*

Spoken: *South Korea* and *North Korea (Asia)*

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

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 arrive-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 sulpho-(ess-ul-ta)-se, nwunmwul-ul hully-ess-ta
 Yenghuy-TOP be_sad-(*PST-*ASPECT-*DECL)-because tear-ACC shed-PST-DECL
 'Yenghuy 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-ass-ta
 I-TOP Mary-NOM school-to arrive-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 sayngkacha-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', myenglyenghata '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
 Chelwu-nom anyone come-neg-pst-decl-comp-Acc speak-pst-decl
 'Chelwu said that no one came'
- (12) *Chelwu-ka amuto owa-ss-ta-nun-ket-ul malhaci anh-ss-ta
 Chelwu-Nom anyone come-Pst-decl-Comp-Acc speak not-Pst-Decl
 'Chelwu 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:

- (17) *Chelswu-nun [sensayng-nim-i ka-si-tolok] seltukha-si-ess-ta
 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 (Gerdt 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-myeung-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-myeung-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) Cangkwun-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) *Cangkwun-un kkoma-ka setwulle chwulpalha-tolok kwonyuhay tuli-essta
secretary-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_j-ka Bob_k-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.

- (29) Chelswu-nun [Mary-ka cenmallo ttokttokhata-ko] sayngkakhanta
 Chelswu-TOP Mary-NOM really smart-COMP thought
 ‘Chelswu thought that Mary is really smart.’
- (30) [Mary-ka cenmallo ttokttokhata-ko] Chelswu-nun sayngkakhanta
 Mary-NOM really smart-COMP Chelswu-TOP thought
 ‘Chelswu thought that Mary is really smart.’
- (31) *cenmallo ttokttokhata-ko Chelswu-nun Mary-ka sayngkakhanta
 really smart-COMP Chelswu-TOP Mary-NOM thought
 ‘Chelswu thought that Mary is really smart.’

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.

- (32) Chelswu-nun sensayng-nim-ul [ka-si-tolok] seltukhaessta
 Chelswu-TOP teacher-RESP-ACC go-HON-COMP persuaded
 ‘Chelswu persuaded the teacher to go.’
- (33) [ka-si-tolok] Chelswu-nun sensayng-nim-ul seltukhaessta
 go-HON-COMP Chelswu-TOP teacher-RESP-ACC persuaded
 ‘Chelswu persuaded the teacher to go.’

The silent controllee is in the embedded clause.
 Honorific agreement is local, triggered by subject:

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

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

- (35) Mary-nun sensayng-nim-kkey [ku ai-ka tochakha-*si-ess-ta-ko]
 Mary-TOP teacher-RESP-DAT [the child-NOM arrive-*HON-PST-DECL-ko]
 malhay-ess-ta
 say-PST-DECL
 ‘Mary told the teacher that the child arrived.’

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

- (36) Chelswu-nun sensayng-nim-ul [ka-si-tolok] seltukhaessta
 Chelswu-TOP teacher-RESP-ACC go-HON-COMP persuaded
 ‘Chelswu persuaded the teacher to go.’

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 [ttena-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_i [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_i [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_i [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', *caymiissta* 'to find it interesting'

aspectual verb: *kepwuhata* 'refuse', *soholhihata* 'neglect', *sicakhata* 'begin', *kyesokhata* 'continue', *kkuthmachita* 'finish', *memchwuta* 'stop', and *samkata* 'refrain'.

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_i 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 not meet Yenghi again.'
(Gamerschlag 2005)

(46) *amuto_i 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_i 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_i tanhohi [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_i [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.'

References

- Baek, Judy Yoo-Kyung. 1997. *Verb Raising and the A/A-bar Distinction: Evidence from Exceptional Case marking*, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, MA.
- Cho, Jai-Hyoung. 1993. Three Types of Scrambling. In L.S. Stvan (ed.), *FLSM III: Papers from the Third Annual Meeting of the Linguistics Society of Midamerica*, Indiana University Linguistics Club, Bloomington, IN, pp.
- Cho, Sungeun. 2000. *Three Forms of Case Agreement in Korean*, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, State University of New York, Stony Brook.
- Choe, Hyon Sook. 1988. Restructuring Parameters and Complex Predicates: A Transformational Approach. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, MIT.
- Choe, Hyon Sook. 2006. On (Backward) Object Control in Korean. *Harvard Studies on Korean Linguistics XI*: 373-386. Kyunggi: Hanshin Pub.
- Choi, Youngseok. 1988. S'-Deletion vs. Raising: Evidence from Korean, *Language Research* 24, 169-193.
- Gamerschlag Thomas. 2005. Semantic and Structural Aspects of Complement Control in Korean.
- Gerds, Donna. 1987. Surface Case and Acceptable Relations in Korean: Evidence from Quantifier Float, *Studies in Language* 11.
- Kim, K.-R. 1999. *Agreement and Tense in Korean*. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison.
- Monahan, Philip J. 2003. Backward Object Control in Korean. In *Proceedings of the 22nd West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, eds. G. Garding & M. Tsujimura, pp. 356-369. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.

- Sohn, Ho-min. 1999. *The Korean language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Son, Minjeong. 2004. A Unified Syntactic Account of Morphological Causatives in Korean, *Proceedings of the 13th Japanese/Korean Linguistics, CSLI*.
- Whitman, J. and S. Hahn. 1988. Korean Morphological Passives/Causatives. *The Papers from the Sixth International Conference on Korean Linguistics*. Seoul: Hanshin Publishing Company
- Um, H. 1995. Argument Structure of Korean Causatives. In *Harvard Studies of Korean Linguistics* 6.

Nayoung Kwon
Department of Linguistics
University of California, San Diego
9500 Gilman Drive #0108
La Jolla, CA 92093-0108
nayoung-ling.ucsd.edu
<http://ling.ucsd.edu/~nayoung>

Philip J. Monahan
Cognitive Neuroscience of Language Laboratory
Department of Linguistics
University of Maryland, College Park
1401 Marie Mount Hall
College Park, MD 20742-7505
pmonahan-wam.umd.edu
<http://ling.umd.edu/~phil>