

The *persuade*-construction in Korean controls nothing

Juwon Lee

Jeonju University
Department of English Education
303, Cheonjam-ro, Wansan-gu,
Jeollabuk-do, Korea
juwonlee@khu.ac.kr

Sanghoun Song

Korea University
Department of Linguistics,
145, Anam-ro, Seongbuk-gu,
Seoul, Korea
sanghoun@korea.ac.kr

Abstract

Quite a few studies of the control constructions in Korean have assumed that *seltukha*-‘persuade’ in Korean serves as an object control verb like its corresponding translation *persuade* in English. However, this study shows that the claim is based on dubious theoretic and empirical premises. In particular, we argue that the *seltukha*-construction in Korean is not an object control providing several pieces of empirical evidence. The evidence shows that the object in the matrix clause and the subject of the embedded clause can simultaneously appear in *seltukha*-construction and they are not necessarily co-indexed with each other. Building upon the non-control analysis, we suggest the Anti-redundancy Hypothesis; two NPs referring to the same entity or having the same form tend not to appear right next to each other in order to avoid redundancy. Finally, we discuss some possible extensions of the non-control analysis to other related constructions.

1 Introduction

In many prior syntactic studies in Korean, the verb *seltukha*- ‘persuade’ has been considered as involving an object control. However, the present study argues that the verb is tangential to a syntactic control in spite of the correspondence in translation.

First, consider some canonical examples of English subject and object controls given in (1) (see e.g. Farkas 1988; Borsley 1999; Jackendoff & Culicover 2003; Sag *et al.* 2003; *inter alia*). The missing subjects of the embedded clauses are marked with the gap:

- (1) a. John_i tried [_____i to leave].
b. John_i promised Mary_j [_____i to leave].
c. John_i persuaded Mary_j [_____j to leave].

The control constructions, irrespective of subject or object control, have the two defining properties in common across languages. The first property is that the subject of the embedded clauses must be silent. As illustrated in (2), no explicit NP can appear in the subject position of the *to*-infinitive clause.

- (2) a. John tried [(*John/*he/*him/*himself) to leave].
b. John promised Mary [(*John/*he/*him/*himself) to leave].
c. John persuaded Mary [(*Mary/*she/*her/*herself) to leave].

A second property is that the silent subject of the *to*-infinitive clause must be co-indexed with an argument of the matrix clause, as illustrated in (3).

- (3) a. John_i tried [_____{i/*j} to leave].
b. John_i promised Mary_j [_____{i/*j/*k} to leave].
c. John_i persuaded Mary_j [_____{*i/j/*k} to leave].

In (3) the silent element (controllee) in the embedded clauses is necessarily co-indexed with an explicit argument (controller) in the matrix clauses. These are two fundamental features of the subject or object control constructions.

Like the English *persuade*-construction, the corresponding Korean sentence exemplified in (4) has often been assumed to be a control construction (Monahan 2004; Cormack and Smith 2004; Kwon and Polinsky 2006, among others).

(4) *John_i-i Mary_j-lul/-eykey* [_____*_{i/j}/*_k *ttena- tolok*]
 John-Nom Mary-Acc/-Dat leave-Comp
seltukhay-ss-ta.
 persuade-Pst-Dec
 ‘John persuaded Mary to leave.’

(7) *Jane-i _____* [*Minswu-ka o-tolok*]
 Jane-Nom Minswu-Nom come-Comp
seltukhay-ss-ta.
 persuade-Pst-Dec
 ‘Jane persuaded Minswu to come.’

If *seltukha-* ‘persuade’ is indeed a control verb like *persuade*, then it is predicted that the *seltukha-* construction shares the two crucial properties of control constructions presented above. However, this paper provides several counterexamples to the premises: (i) the subject of the embedded clauses can explicitly appear, and (ii) the subject of the embedded clauses is not necessarily co-indexed with the matrix object. We present several pieces of critical evidence to support the argument that the *seltukha-* construction is not a control. Instead, the present study presents a *pro*-drop analysis of the *seltukha-* construction (Choe 2006; Park 2013).

(8) *sensayngnim-i Minswu emeni-lul* [*Minswu-ka*
 teacher-Nom Minswu mother-Acc Minswu-Nom
peptay-ey ka-tolok] *seultukhay-ss-ta*.
 law school-to go-Comp persuade-Pst-Dec
 ‘The teacher persuaded Minswu’s mother that
 Minswu should go to law school.’

Second, the subject of the *tolok*-clause is nominative, not caseless as shown in (7) and (8). Third, the subject of the *tolok*-clause in (8) is not co-indexed with the matrix object. Thus, there is no *a posteriori* proof for believing that the null element in the *seltukha-* construction involves the essential properties of PROs.

2 Previous Analyses

Some prior studies on control construction in Korean are discussed in this section.

2.1 PRO Analysis

Traditionally, PRO is on the subject position of the *to*-infinitive clause as in the following (see Chomsky 1981, Chomsky 1995):

(5) John persuaded [Mary_i] [_{TP} PRO_i to leave].

The PRO in (5) is obligatory, which means that the null element should be co-indexed with a matrix argument as indicated by the subscript. Note that the constraint on the co-indexation does not go for the arbitrary PRO and the optional PRO exemplified in (6a-b) respectively.

(6) a. [PRO_{arb}/*Anyone to invite Jane] would be good.
 b. Robert_i knows that it is important [PRO_{i/j} to read the book].

Despite the different behaviors, all types of PROs commonly are caseless and take place in non-finite clauses.

This PRO analysis is not appropriate for the *seltukha-* construction due to several distributional facts. First, the subject of the *tolok*-clause can appear explicitly as in the following (see examples like (7) in Monahan 2003 and a sentence similar to (8) in Cormack & Smith 2004):

2.2 Movement Analysis

Kwon & Polinsky (2006) and Kwon *et al.* (2010) argue that the two sentences in (9) are not derivationally related, but they are distinct constructions. This implies that scrambling of (9a) does not result in (9b). They call (9a) ACC1 and (9b) ACC2 respectively.

(9) a. *Jane-i Minswu-lul* [_____ *tomangka-tolok*]
 Jane-Nom Minswu-Acc run away-Comp
seltukhay-ss-ta.
 persuade-Pst-Dec [ACC1]
 ‘Jane persuaded Minswu to run away.’
 b. *Jane-i* [______k *tomangka-tolok*]_j [*Minswu_k-lul*
 Jane-Nom run away-Comp Minswu-Acc
 ______j *seltukhay-ss-ta*].
 seltukhay-ss-ta. [ACC2]
 ‘Jane persuaded Minswu to run away.’

Following the movement analysis of English controls (Hornstein 1999), they argue that in (9a) the subject of the *tolok*-clause moves to the object position in the matrix clause, and the tail of this A-chain is deleted. This construction is called ACC1; i.e., the forward obligatory control (OC). On the other hand, the *tolok*-clause in (9b) moves leftward while the subject of this clause moves to the right. This construction is called ACC2; i.e., the non-obligatory control (NOC).

However, this movement analysis is less tenable for multiple reasons. First of all, there seems to be no syntactic mechanism about case assignment and

case alternation. As shown in (7) and (8) above, the subject of the embedded clause must be nominative. It is not clear how exactly the nominative subject in the embedded clause is switched to the accusative or dative object in the matrix clause. Second, if the matrix object in (9a) really comes from the subject of the *tolok*-clause, then we should say that accusative objects are generally licensed at least in two different ways, base generation as in (10) and movement as in (9a).

- (10) *Jane-i Minswu-lul ttayli-ess-ta.*
 Jane-Nom Minswu-Acc hit-Pst-Dec
 ‘Jane hit Minswu.’

A naturally occurring question is why we must use the two different ways to license accusative objects in the matrix clauses (cf. Occam’s Razor). Third, the active sentences in (9) should have their passive counterparts. Given that the object associated with the accusative case in active sentences is promoted to the subject position in the passive counterpart, the passive sentence in (11) should be derived from the two distinct constructions in (9).

- (11) *Minswu-ka Jane-eyuyhay [___ tomangka-tolok]*
 Minswu-Nom Jane-by run away-Comp
seltuktoy-ess-ta.
 persuade.Pass-Pst-Dec
 ‘Minswu was persuaded to run away by Jane.’

Then, the sentence in (11) should be ambiguous between obligatory and non-obligatory control readings since a passive sentence shares the truth-condition with its active counterpart unless a specific operator such as quantifiers and subject-oriented adverbs intervenes. Because they leave how the logical form is made across the active-passive forms out of discussion, there is no clue for such an ambiguity as of yet. Fourth, the silent subject in (9a) is not necessarily co-indexed with the matrix object if a specific context is plausibly given (see §4.3). Fifth, the matrix object and the subject in the embedded clause can refer to different individuals as shown in (8) and (12). The movement analysis cannot derive these sentences.

- (12) *sensayngnim-i [Minswu-ka peptay-ey ka-*
 teacher-Nom Minswu-Nom law school-to go-
tolok] Minswu emeni-lul seultukhay-ss-ta.
 Comp Minswu mother-Acc persuade-Pst-Dec

‘The teacher persuaded Minswu’s mother that Minswu should go to law school.’

Sixth, the following sentence devoid of both the object and the subject can be allowed if the omitted NPs are recoverable within the discourse context. It is not clear how the movement analysis can account for sentences like this.

- (13) *John-i ___ [___ ttena-tolok] seltukhay-ss-ta.*
 John-Nom leave-Acc persuade-Pst-Dec
 ‘John persuaded someone to leave.’

In sum, the movement analysis causes the latent problems that cannot be fully accounted for.

2.3 Semantic Control

Cormack and Smith (2004) suggest that obligatory semantic control pertains to the control constructions as illustrated in (14).

- (14) *Jane-i Minswu-j-lul [pro; tomangka-tolok]*
 Jane-Nom Minswu-Acc run away-Comp
seltukhay-ss-ta.
 persuade-Pst-Dec
 ‘Jane persuaded Minswu to run away.’

As is well known, *pro* can be either a bound variable or a referential pronoun. This means that *pro* in (14) does not have to be co-indexed with the object in the matrix clause. In order to ensure the co-indexation between the matrix object and *pro* in the *tolok*-clause, Cormack & Smith (2004: 66) posited Meaning Postulate as follows:

- (15) Meaning Postulate 1:
 For all s, x, y, if ‘PERSUADE s y x’ holds then y is Agent in Event s (s is the Event argument of PERSUADE, y the persuadee, x the persuader, where x and y are individuals).

Due to this Meaning Postulate, the agent of embedded clause in (14) must be identical to the persuadee in the matrix clause. A fundamental assumption in Cormack & Smith (2004: 68) is such that the lexical meaning of *seltukha-* ‘persuade’ is identical to that of the English *persuade* and the Meaning Postulate is straightforwardly applied to the meaning of the two verbs. However, this does not account for the sentences such as (8) and (12). Cormack & Smith (2004: 68, footnote 23) assume that the sentences like (8) are acceptable due to a

causative coercion of some kind, but they do not dwell on how exactly such a coercion saves the sentence. In addition, according to Monahan (2004), Cormack & Smith's (2004) analysis predicts that the sentence in (16) should allow the second interpretation that is not available for the sentence:

- (16) *Minswu-nun [ku yepaywu-ka kica-eykey Minswu-Top the actress-Nom reporter-to intheyyupat-tolok] seltukhay-ss-ta.*
interview.Pass-Tolok persuade-Pst-Dec
'Minswu persuaded the actress to get interviewed by the reporter.'
'Minswu persuaded the reporter to interview the actress.'

Following that Cormack & Smith's (2004: 72) claim that the subject of the embedded clause is agent, the sentence has the correct meaning such as *Minswu persuaded the actress to get interviewed by the reporter*. Indeed, the subject of a passive can be an agent, as shown in the following.

- (17) *ku-ka ilpwule saca-eykey mek-hi-ess-ta.*
he-Nom intentionally lion-to eat-Pass-Pst-Dec
'He was intentionally eaten by the lion.'

In (17) the adverb *ilpwule* 'intentionally' requires an agent and the subject is the agent. However, this does not mean that the lion is not an agent in the event of eating the person. Likewise, the reporter in (16) is also an agent in the event of interviewing the actress. Then Cormack & Smith's (2004) analysis should license the unwanted interpretation such as *Minswu persuaded the reporter to interview the actress*. We present in the following section some data to support the argument that *seltukha-* 'persuade' is not a control verb even though the *seltukha-* construction may or may not have a control meaning (OC or NOC) depending upon the given contexts. The complement of *seltukha-* 'persuade' is omissible just as with the complement(s) of other transitive verbs in Korean (a *pro*-drop language).

3 Two NPs: Controller and Controllee

In this section we argue that the two NPs (the matrix object and the subject of the *tolok*-clause) can appear simultaneously in *seltukha-* construction, but they tend not to. Along the line of the tendency,

the present study suggests the Anti-redundancy Hypothesis as a tendency.

3.1 Co-occurrence of the Two NPs

As shown above, one of the fundamental properties of control constructions is that the controllee must be silent. If *seltukha-* construction is really a control construction, we expect that it behaves like the *persuade-* construction in English; it should never allow the two NPs to appear at the same time. This appears to be verified as follows:

- (18) ??*John-i Mary_j-lul [Mary_j-ka ttena-tolok]*
John-Nom Mary-Acc Mary-Nom leave-Acc
seltukhay-ss-ta.
persuade-Pst-Dec
(lit.) 'John persuaded Mary Mary to leave.'

The sentence in (18) sounds odd. This oddness of the sentence can be accounted for if it is an object control like its English counterpart. In other words, as object control generally requires the subject of the embedded clause to be silent, (18) sounds rather awkward.

Alternatively, we can say that the awkwardness arises because the referential subject *Mary-ka* in the *tolok*-clause violates the Condition C (i.e., an *r*-expression is free; *John_i adored John_j/_{si}*). If the subject in the embedded clause is a pronoun as in (19), the sentence sounds better than (18).

- (19) ?*John-i Mary_j-lul [kunya_j-ka ttena-tolok]*
John-Nom Mary-Acc she-Nom leave-Acc
seltukhay-ss-ta.
persuade-Pst-Dec
(lit.) 'John persuaded Mary she to leave.'

This improvement is an unexpected result if the *seltukha-* construction is an object control in a genuine sense because (object) control does not allow an explicit controllee. Note that the sentence in (19) is not constrained by Condition C in that the subject in the bracketed clause is pronominal. If Condition C (or more broadly, constraints of binding theory) is really responsible for the awkwardness of the sentence in (18), then the sentence in (19) should be fine. Nonetheless, (19) still sounds a bit awkward though it is better than (18). In short, (19) can be a problem for both the control analysis and the binding analysis of the appearance of the two explicit NPs in *seltukha-*

construction. Moreover, if an anaphor comes as the subject in the embedded clause as in (20), the sentence is fine:

- (20) *John-i Mary_j-lul [(kunye) casin_j-i ttena-tolok]*
 John-Nom Mary-Acc she self-Nom leave-Acc
seltukhay-ss-ta.
 persuade-Pst-Dec
 ‘John persuaded Mary herself to leave.’

The sentence in (20) is a strong counterexample to the object control analysis of *seltukha*-construction. Since Korean allows a long-distance binding of anaphor, the sentence in (20) does not violate Condition A (or other conditions) of the binding theory for Korean. Note, however, that the sentences like (18) seem not to be totally unacceptable, and this fact is not likely to be accounted for by Condition C. In the next subsection, we propose an alternative hypothesis to account for the appearance of the two explicit NPs in *seltukha*-construction.

3.2 Anti-redundancy Hypothesis

The present analysis is such that (18) sounds rather awkward for the reason that the two referential NPs referring to the same individual tend not to appear right next to each other in order to avoid redundancy. Based on this observation, we propose the Anti-redundancy Hypothesis formulated in (21).

(21) Anti-redundancy Hypothesis:

Two NPs referring to the same entity or having the same form *tend* not to appear right next to each other, since the iteration sounds redundant.

This hypothesis can account for the improvement of the acceptability in (19) compared to (18). The referential matrix object and the pronominal subject in the *tolok*-clause are co-indexed, and they appear right next to each other, so the sentence sounds somewhat redundant. However, (19) is better than (18) since the latter sounds more redundant than the former. In (18) the NPs have almost the same form (*Mary-lul* and *Mary-ka*), but in (19) one is a referential NP (*Mary-lul*) and the other a pronominal NP (*kunye-ka*). The iteration of the same form serves to increase the redundancy. In (20) the anaphor *kunye casin-i* ‘herself-Nom’ is co-indexed with the matrix referential object, and they appear right next to each other. If the

contrastive focus is assigned to the anaphor, the redundancy effect seems to be dramatically alleviated. Likewise, the addition of the adverb *cikcep* ‘by herself’ reduces the redundancy in the following sentences:

- (22) *John-un Mary_j-lul [Mary_j-ka cikcep]*
 John-Top Mary-Acc Mary-Nom by herself
ttena-tolok] seltukhay-ss-ta.
 leave-Acc persuade-Pst-Dec
 (lit.) ‘John persuaded Mary Mary to leave
 by herself.’
- (23) *John-un Mary_j-lul [kunye_j-ka cikcep]*
 John-Top Mary-Acc she-Nom by herself
ttena-tolok] seltukhay-ss-ta.
 leave-Acc persuade-Pst-Dec
 (lit.) ‘John persuaded Mary she to leave by
 herself.’

The adverb *cikcep* ‘by herself’ imposes the contrastive focus on the subject of the *tolok*-clause. This reduction of redundancy renders the sentences more acceptable. Note that (23) sounds better than (22), as is expected.

Another way to reduce the redundancy is putting an adverbial expression between the matrix object and the *tolok*-clause, as underlined in (24).

- (24) *sensayngnim-un Jane-ul achim-pwuthe*
 teacher-Top Jane-Acc morning-from
kankokhakey [*Jane-i/kunye-ka hakkyo-ey*
earnestly Jane-Nom/she-Nom school-to
o-tolok] seltukhay-ss-ta.
 come-Comp persuade-Pst-Dec
 ‘From the morning the teacher has earnestly
 persuaded Jane to come to school.’

The sentence in (24) sounds much better than the sentences without the adverbial expressions. Similarly, if something like a pause or parenthesis is inserted between the two NPs to lengthen the linear distance between them, the sentence sounds more acceptable.

- (25) *sensayngnim-un Jane-ul pause/um.../kulenikka*
 teacher-Top Jane-Acc PAUSE/um.../I mean
 [*Jane-i/kunye-ka hakkyo-ey o-tolok]*
 Jane-Nom/ she-Nom school-to come-Comp
seltukhay-ss-ta.
 persuade-Pst-Dec
 (lit.) ‘The teacher persuaded Jane pause/un.../I
 mean Jane to come to school.’

Neither the control analysis nor Condition C can account for this phenomenon.

Moreover, if we scramble the matrix object as to increase the linear distance between the two NPs as presented in (26) and (27), the sentences sound much better than (18).

- (26) *John-un [Maryj-ka ttena-tolok] kankokhakey*
 John-Top Mary-Nom leave-Acc earnestly
Maryj-lul seltukhay-ss-ta.
 Mary-Acc persuade-Pst-Dec
 (lit.) ‘John earnestly persuaded Mary Mary to leave.’
- (27) *John-un kankokhakey Maryj-lul*
 John-Top earnestly Mary-Nom
seltukhay-ss-ta [Maryj-ka ttena-tolok].
 persuade-Pst-Dec Mary-Nom leave-Comp
 (lit.) ‘John earnestly persuaded Mary Mary to leave.’

The acceptability of these sentences can be accounted for by the Anti-redundancy Hypothesis; reducing the redundancy makes the sentences sound more acceptable.

In order to remove the redundancy completely, one of the two NPs should be omitted. As expected, such sentences are clearly acceptable.

- (28) a. *Jane-un Minswu-lul [___ tomangka-tolok]*
 Jane-Top Minswu-Acc run way-Comp
seltukhay-ss-ta.
 persuade-Pst-Dec
 ‘Jane persuaded Minswu to run away.’
- b. *Jane-un [___ tomangka-tolok] Minswu-lul*
 Jane-Top run way-Comp Minswu-Acc
seltukhay-ss-ta.
 persuade-Pst-Dec
 ‘Jane persuaded Minswu to run away.’
- c. *Jane-un [Minswu-ka tomangka-tolok]*
 Jane-Top Minswu-Nom run way-Comp
seltukhay-ss-ta.
 persuade-Pst-Dec
 ‘Jane persuaded Minswu to run away.’

The three examples in (28) are ACC1, ACC2, and NOM, respectively, under the taxonomy of Kwon & Polinsky (2006) and Kwon *et al.* (2010).

If the missing NPs are sufficiently recoverable with reference to the context, the sentence in (13), repeated in (29), sounds fairly acceptable.

- (29) *John-i [___ ttena-tolok] seltukhay-ss-ta.*
 John-Nom leave-Comp persuade-Pst-Dec
 ‘John persuaded someone to leave.’

The acceptability of (29) can be explained by the resolution of the redundancy.

Note finally that some exceptions of Condition C are allowed if a contrastive focus takes place, as shown in the following.

- (30) *Sallyj-ka John-i anila Sallyj-lul*
 Sally-Nom John-Nom Neg Sally-Acc
ttayli-ess-ta.
 hit-Pst-Dec
 ‘Sally hit Sally, not John.’

If this exception is allowed, then the sentence in (22) may be accounted for by Condition C. However, sentences like (24) and (25) are still acceptable even though the subject of the embedded clause does not receive a contrastive focus. Then Condition C is not sufficient to account for the data. In addition, exceptions of this kind (converting ungrammatical sentences to grammatical sentences) seem not to be theoretically in the right direction and cast a serious doubt on the existence of Condition C itself. Thus we believe that it is better to stick with the Anti-redundancy Hypothesis to account for co-occurrence of the two NPs in *seltukha*-construction.

4 Co-indexation

Co-indexation between the matrix object and the subject of the embedded clause (OC) is required for *persuade*-construction in English. However, it is shown in this section that such co-indexation is not necessary for *seltukha*-construction in Korean.

4.1 Two Explicit NPs

When the matrix object and the subject of the *tolok*-clause appear simultaneously, they are not required to refer to the same individual, as already shown in (8) and (12). They are repeated below:

- (31) *sensayngnim-i Minswu emeni-lul [Minswu-ka*
 teacher-Nom Minswu mother-Acc Minswu-Nom
peptay-ey ka-tolok] seultukhay-ss-ta.
 law school-to go-Comp persuade-Pst-Dec
 ‘The teacher persuaded Minswu’s mother that Minswu should go to law school.’
- (32) *sensayngnim-i [Minswu-ka peptay-ey ka-*
 teacher-Nom Minswu-Nom law school-to go-
tolok] Minswu emeni-lul seultukhay-ss-ta.
 Comp Minswu mother-Acc persuade-Pst-Dec

‘The teacher persuaded Minswu’s mother that Minswu should go to law school.’

The acceptability of these sentences indicates that they are not a control construction at all.

Similarly, in the following the matrix object and the subject of the *tolok*-clause refer to different individuals who have the same name.

- (33) [Context: There are two people whose name is Minji in the same class. They are close friends. Minji_k does not want to attend school anymore. The teacher tried to persuade Minji_k to come to school again, but failed. So the teacher talked to Minji_j in order to make Minji_j persuade Minji_k to come to school again.]
- a. *sensayngnim-un Minji_j-lul [Minji_k-ka teacher-Top Minji-Acc Minji-Nom tasi hakkyo-ey o-tolok] seltukhay-ss-ta.*
again school-to come-Comp persuade-Pst-Dec (lit.) ‘The teacher persuaded Minji_j Minji_k to come to school.’
- b. *sensayngnim-un [Minji_k-ka tasi hakkyo-ey teacher-Top Minji-Nom again school-to o-tolok] Minji_j-lul seltukhay-ss-ta.*
come-Comp Minji-Acc persuade-Pst-Dec (lit.) ‘The teacher persuaded Minji_j Minji_k to come to school.’

In short, it is not necessary for the two explicit NPs in the *seltukha*-construction to refer to the same individual. This runs counter to the assumption that *seltukha*- ‘persuade’ in Korean is a control verb.

4.2 One Explicit NP: Subject of *Tolok*-clause

The default reading of the sentence in (34) is that the teacher persuaded Mary to go to law school.

- (34) *sensayngnim-un _____ [Mary-ka peptay-ey teacher-Top Mary-Nom law school-to ka-tolok] seltukhay-ss-ta.*
go-Comp persuade-Pst-Dec
‘The teacher persuaded Mary to go to law school.’

However, if a certain context is given as in (35), the silent matrix object is not necessarily co-indexed with the subject of the *tolok*-clause.

- (35) [Context: The teacher talked to Mary’s mother about Mary’s career. Mary’s mother wanted Mary to go to medical school, but...]
sensayngnim-un _____ [Mary-ka peptay-ey teacher-Top Mary-Nom law school-to ka-tolok] seltukhay-ss-ta.

go-Comp persuade-Pst-Dec
(lit.) ‘The teacher persuaded Mary’s mother Mary to go to law school.’

In sum, the co-indexation is not required for *seltukha*-constructions when the matrix object is silent, although the co-indexation reading is the most natural reading without a specific context.

4.3 One Explicit NP: Matrix Object

The default reading of the sentence in (36) is that the teacher persuaded Mary’s mother to go to law school.

- (36) *sensayngnim-i Mary emeni-lul teacher-Nom Mary mother-Acc
[_____ peptay-ey ka-tolok] seltukhay-ss-ta.*
law school-to go-Tolok persuade-Pst-Dec
‘The teacher persuaded Mary’s mother to go to law school.’

However, if a context is given as in the following, the matrix object and the understood subject of the *tolok*-clause can refer to different individuals (see the same point in Park 2013: 3, footnote 3).

- (37) A: Why did Mary go to law school?
B: *sensayngnim-i Mary emeni-lul teacher-Nom Mary mother-Acc
[_____ peptay-ey ka-tolok] seltukhay-ss-ketun.*
law school-to go-Comp persuade-Pst-since
(lit.) ‘Because the teacher persuaded Mary’s mother Mary to go to law school.’

Summarizing, if either the object or the subject is missing, the default reading is the co-indexation reading, but it is not a requirement.

4.4 No explicit NP

In (38) both the matrix object and the subject of the *tolok*-clause are missing.

- (38) A: What did the teacher say to Mary’s mother?
Why did Mary go to law school?
B: *sensayngnim-i _____ [_____ peptay-ey teacher-Top law school-to ka-tolok] seltukhay-ss-ketun.*
go-Tolok persuade-Pst-Dec
(lit.) ‘Because the teacher persuaded Mary’s mother Mary to go to law school.’

The referents of the missing NPs are recoverable from the context: the persuadee is Mary’s mother

and the person who went to law school is Mary. The non-control reading is possible for the *seltukha*-construction.

5 A Preliminary Analysis

The data discussed so far lead us to conclude that *seltukha*- ‘persuade’ is not a control verb although *seltukha*-constructions can be interpreted as OC or NOC in certain contexts. The matrix object is licensed by *seltukha*-, and the subject of the *tolok*-clause is licensed by the lexical verb in the clause. They do not necessarily refer to the same individual whether they appear or not in *seltukha*-constructions. These syntactic and semantic properties of *seltukha*-construction can be roughly represented like the following:

- (39) NP-Nom (NP_i-Acc) [_{CP} [(NP_{ij}-Nom) ... V]-*tolok*] *seltukha*-.

The matrix subject can be also omitted, but here we focus on the two NPs under discussion. When they are omitted since Korean is a *pro*-drop language, their referents are identified according to the linguistic or utterance context.

If the subject of the *tolok*-clause is not necessarily co-indexed with the matrix object, the prediction is that it can be also co-indexed with the matrix subject in a certain context. This seems to be borne out in the following:

- (40) *Chelswu_i-ka sacang-lul [casin_i-i ku Chelswu-Nom president-Acc self-Nom the il-ul math-tolok] seltukhay-ss-ta.*
task-Acc undertake-Comp persuade-Pst-Dec
(lit.) ‘Chelswu_i persuaded the president himself_i to undertake the task.’
- (41) *Chelswu_i-ka [casin_i-i ku il-ul Chelswu-Nom self-Nom the task-Acc math-tolok] sacang-lul seltukhay-ss-ta*
undertake-Comp president-Acc persuade-Pst-Dec
(lit.) ‘Chelswu_i persuaded the president himself_i to undertake the task.’

While admitting that (41) sounds better than (40), we judge both acceptable. The difference in the degree of acceptability seems to be largely due to either the tendency of the accusative object to be closer to the head verb than other complement or the distance between the anaphor and its antecedent (or probably both).

6 Extension

In this paper we have focused on the data with accusative matrix object. However, the persuadee can be realized as a dative NP as in (42).

- (42) *John-i Mary-eykey [___ ttena-tolok]*
John-Nom Mary-Dat leave-Comp
seltukhay-ss-ta.
persuade-Pst-Dec
‘John persuaded Mary to leave.’

The default reading of (42) is the co-indexation reading, but we believe that this co-indexation is not necessary. In (43) the two NPs appear simultaneously, and the sentence sounds quite odd.

- (43) ??*John-i Mary-eykey [Mary-ka ttena-tolok]*
John-Nom Mary-Dat Mary-Nom leave-Comp
seltukhay-ss-ta.
persuade-Pst-Dec
‘John persuaded Mary to leave.’

(43) is not impossible though it sounds redundant. If this redundancy decreases as in (44), the sentence becomes better.

- (44) *John-i Mary-eykey cengmal kankokhakey*
John-Nom Mary-Dat really earnestly
[Mary-ka ttena-tolok] seltukhay-ss-ta.
Mary-Nom leave-Comp persuade-Pst-Dec
‘John really earnestly persuaded Mary to leave.’

In addition, the two NPs in the *seltukha*-construction can refer to different individuals, as illustrated in (45).

- (45) *sensayngnim-i Minswu emeni-eykey [Minswu-ka teacher-Nom Minswu mother-Dat Minswu-Nom peptay-ey ka-tolok] seultukhay-ss-ta.*
law school-to go-Comp persuade-Pst-Dec
‘The teacher persuaded Minswu’s mother that Minswu should go to law school.’

Taken together, we can say that the *seltukha*-constructions with dative object are not a control construction either.

7 Conclusion

We argued in this paper that *seltukha*- ‘persuade’ in Korean is not a control verb. This opposes quite a few prior syntactic studies in which syntactic

derivation and similarity in meanings are invalidly mixed up. In particular, the two properties of *seltukha*-construction were presented as evidence for non-control analysis of *seltukha*- ‘persuade’: (i) the matrix object and the subject of the embedded clause can simultaneously appear in *seltukha*-constructions, and (ii) they are not necessarily co-indexed with each other. In addition, we proposed the Anti-redundancy Hypothesis that two NPs referring to the same entity or having the same form tend not to appear right next to each other, since the iteration renders the entire expressions redundant. This accounts for the oddness of some *seltukha*-constructions with the two NPs. Finally, the non-control analysis can be applied to other related constructions in Korean while a more detailed examination awaits further research.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank the audiences of the Spring Meeting of Korean Association for Corpus Linguistics held in Kyung Hee University in 2019 for their comments, questions, and discussions.

References

- Borsley, Robert. 1999. *Syntactic Theory: A Unified Approach*.
- Choe, Hyon Sook. 2006. On (backward) object control in Korean. *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics XI*, 373–386. Kyunggi: Hanshin.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1981. *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1995. *The minimalist program*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Cormack, A., and N. Smith. 2004. Backward control in Korean and Japanese. *University College London Working Papers in Linguistics* 16: 57–83.
- Farkas, Donca F. 1988. On Obligatory Control. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 11.1: 27-58.
- Hornstein, Norbert. 1999. Movement and control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30: 69–96.
- Kwon Nayoung, Monahan Philip J. and Maria Polinsky. Object Control in Korean: A Backward Control Impostor. In *Movement Theory of Control*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kwon, Nayoung and Maria Polinsky. 2006. Object control in Korean: Structure and processing. *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 15: 249–262.
- Monahan, Philip J. 2003. Backward object control in Korean. In *Proceedings of the 22nd West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, Gina Garding & Mimu Tsujimura (eds), 356–369. Somerville MA: Cascadilla Press.
- Park, Hong-Keun. 2012. Control Constructions in Korean Revisited. *Studies in Generative Grammar* 22.1: 1-22.
- Ray Jackendoff and Peter W. Culicover. 2003. The Semantic Basis of Control in English. *Language* 79.3: 517-556.
- Sag, Ivan A., Wasow, Thomas and Bender, Emily M. 2003. *Syntactic Theory: A Formal Introduction*, (2nd edition). Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.