

Control in Korean

Nayoung Kwon
University of California, San Diego

Korean (KOR)
a Language Isolate
also known as *Hanguohua*, *Hanguk Mal*
spoken in *South Korea (Asia)*

1 Grammar Profile

1.1 Morpho-Syntax

1.1.1 Head position

head-final. SOV word order, adjective appears before its modifying noun, relative clause appears before its head noun, postposition

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.

give: cwuta tulita (honorific)

1.1.5 Transitivity Patterns

passive, causative

1.1.6 Null Arguments

subject and object *pro*-drop. Subject or object will be more likely to be omitted with topichood but topichood is not necessary to drop them. For example, when the missing argument has arbitrary reading, topichood is not a necessary condition.

1.1.7 Non-Finite Categories

Infinitive is allowed with certain clause enders

- (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 verb comes last. 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

It is the 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 clause enders 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 tochakha-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 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.'

Connective *-ko*, *-(u)myen* 'if': tense is allowed but aspect and mood are not allowed.

- (6) Yenghuy-ka phyenci-lul ssu-ess-(*kyess-*ta)-ko Chelswu-ka kulim-ul
 Y-NOM letter-ACC write-PST-(ASP-DECL)-ko C-NOM drawing-ACC

kuli-ess-ta
 draw-PST-DECL
 ‘Yenghuy wrote a letter and Chelswu drew a painting.’

1.3.4 Non-control complements

Regular embedding: *-kes*

- (7) 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*

- (8) 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.’

Causative *-key*

- (9) Na-nun Mary-lulhakk yo-ey ka-key hay-ss-ta
 I-TOP Mary-ACC school-to go-key do-PST-DECL
 ‘I made Mary go to school’

Serial verb construction *-e/a* or *-ko*

- (10) Na-nun hakkyo-ey ka-a po-ass-ta
 I-TOP school-to go-a see-PST-DECL
 ‘I went to school.’
- (11) Chelswu-ka pap-ul mek-ko iss-ta
 C-NOM meal-ACC eat-ko exist-decl
 ‘Chelswu is eating meal.’

Before ECM

- (12) 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

- (13) 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

- (14) Tom-un Mary-ka ttena-tolok seltukha-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’

2.1.3 Evidence in support bi-clausal structure

NPI (Negative Polarity Item) should be c-commanded by a clause-mate with negation (H.-S. Choe, 1988). The example in (15) is grammatical because the clause-mate condition is satisfied. In contrast, (16) is not grammatical because *amuto* ‘anyone’ is in the complement clause, and negation is in the matrix clause.

- (15) 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’
- (16) *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?’

In Control construction, when NPI appears in the main clause and negation appears in the embedded clause, the sentence is not grammatical as in (17).

- (17) *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 of empty category

The null argument is in matrix clauses and the overt controller is in embedded clause.

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

- (18) [Mary-ka ttena-tolok] Tom-un seltukha-ss-ta
 Mary-NOM leave-tolok Tom-TOP persuade-PST-DECL
 ‘Chelwu persuaded Yenghi to leave tomorrow.’

Honorific agreement

i) honorific agreement is local, triggered by subject:

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

ii) Embedded verb shows subject honorification in NOM:

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

iii) matrix verb does not:

- (21) *Chelwu-nun [sensayng-nim-i ka-si-tolok] seltukha-si-ess-ta
 Chelwu-TOP teacher-RESP-NOM go-HON-COMP persuaded-HON-PST-DECL

Null argument is in matrix clause

1) Controller cannot appear in the second higher clause.

- (22) *Chelwu-ka [[cipey Yenghii-ka o-tolok] kyelsimha-tolok] seltukhaessta
 Chelwu-NOM home Yenghi-NOM come-COMP decide-COMP persuaded
 ‘Chelwu persuaded Yenghi [to decide [to come home]].’

2) Quantifier floating

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

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

- (24) Chelswu-ka [haksayng-i hakkyo-ey sey-myeong-i kaesta-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.’

- (25) *Chelswu-ka [haksayng-i hakkyo-ey kaesta-ko] sey-myeong-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:

- (26) *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)

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

2.1.5 Selectional restrictions

Volitional, agentive DP required.

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

DP can be a patient of lower verb

- (29) Tom-un [Mary_j-ka Bob_k-ey uyhay chwuyca-y-toy-tolok] seltukhayssta
 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*

2.2.1 Example structure

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

2.2.2 Predicates participating in the alternation

verb: manipulative: *seltukhata* ‘persuade’

2.2.3 Evidence in support bi-clausal structure

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

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

2.2.4 Evidence of empty category

The empty category is in the embedded clause and the controller is in the matrix clause.

Honorific agreement is local, triggered by subject:

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

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

- (33) 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.

- (34) Chelswu-nun sensayng-nim-ul [ka-si-tolok] seltukhaessta
 Chelswu-TOP teacher-RESP-ACC go-HON-COMP persuaded

2.2.5 Selectional restrictions

- (35) #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*

2.3.1 Example structure

- (36) 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

- (37) *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

- (38) #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

- (39) 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)
- (40) *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.’
- (41) 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’
- (42) *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 NPI appears in the main clause and when negation appears in the embedded clause, the sentence is not grammatical.

- (43) *amuto_i [Yenghi-lul tasi an manna-ki] ka twulyep-ta
 NPI Y.-ACC again NEG meet-NML NOM fear-DECL
 ‘Anyone fears to not meet Yenghi again.’
 (Gamerschlag 2005)

- (44) amuto_i [Yenghi-lul an manna-ki] lul cicakhay-ss-ta
 NPI Y.-ACC NEG meet-NML ACC begin-PST-DECL
 ‘Anyone began to not meet Yenghi’

2.4.4 Evidence of empty category

Embedded subject shows the honorific marker *-si*.

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

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

2.4.5 Selectional restrictions

Agentive NP can be a controller.

- (47) *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, Phillip. 2003. Backward Object Control in Korean. In *Proceedings of the 22nd West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics (WCCFL XXII)*, eds. G. Garding & M. Tsujimura. 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/>