The persuade-construction in Korean controls nothing
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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, tried [ ____ to leave].
   b. John promised Mary [ ____, to leave].
   c. John persuaded Mary [ ____ 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 tried [ ____ v\_r to leave].
   b. John promised Mary [ ____ v\_r to leave].
   c. John persuaded Mary [ ____ v\_r 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).
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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).

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] [TP PRO, 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_seltukhay/*Anyone to invite Jane] would be good.
   b. Robert, knows that it is important [PRO_seltukhay], 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):

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

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.

2.2 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
    persuade-Pst-Dec [ACC1]
    ‘Jane persuaded Minswu to run away.’
   b. Jane-i [____x tomangka-tolok], [Minswu-lul]
      Jane-Nom run away-Comp Minswu-Acc
      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 tayli-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 sentence in (11) should be derived from the two distinct constructions in (9).

(11) Minswu-ka Jane-eyuyhay [___ tomanga-tolok]
    Minswu-Nom Jane-by run away-Comp
    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 pepay-ey ka-
    teacher-Nom Minswu-Nom law school-to go-
    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.

    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-lul [pro, tomanka-tolok]
    Jane-Nom Minswu-Acc run away-Comp
    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:

     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) ka-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 Controlee

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:

     persuade-Pst-Dec
     (lit.) ‘John persuaded 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, adored John). If the subject in the embedded clause is a pronoun as in (19), the sentence sounds better than (18).

     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 controlee. 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-lul [(kunye) casin-i ttena-tolok]
    John-Nom Mary-Acc she self-Nom leave-Acc
    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-lul [Mary-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-lul [kunye-ka cikcep
    John-Top Mary-Acc she-Nom by herself
    ttena-tolok] seltukhay-ss-ta.
    leave-Acc persuade-Pst-Dec
    (lit.) ‘John persuaded Mary 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/un…/kulenikka
    teacher-Top Jane-Acc PAUSE/un…/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).

\[(26) \text{John-un [Mary-ka ttena-tolok] kankokhakey} \]
\[\text{John-Top Mary-Nom leave-Acc earnestly Mary-lul seltukhay-ss-ta.}\]
\[\text{Mary-Acc persuade-Pst-Dec} \]
\[\text{lit.) ‘John earnestly persuaded Mary to leave.’} \]

\[(27) \text{John-un kankokhakey Mary-lul} \]
\[\text{John-Top earnestly Mary-Nom seltukhay-ss-ta [Mary-ka ttena-tolok].} \]
\[\text{persuade-Pst-Dec Mary-Nom leave-Comp} \]
\[\text{lit.) ‘John earnestly persuaded Mary to leave.’} \]

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.

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

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.

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

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.

\[(30) \text{Sally-ka John-i anila Sally-lul} \]
\[\text{Sally-Nom John-Nom Neg Sally-Acc tayli-ess-ta.} \]
\[\text{hit-Pst-Dec} \]
\[\text{‘Sally hit Sally, not John.’} \]

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:

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

\[(32) \text{sensayngnim-i [Minswu-ka peptay-ey ka-teacher-Nom Minswu-Nom law school-to go-tolok] Minswu emeni-lul seltukhay-ss-ta.} \]
\[\text{Comp Minswu mother-Acc persuade-Pst-Dec} \]
‘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 does not want to attend school anymore. The teacher tried to persuade Minji to come to school again, but failed. So the teacher talked to Minji, in order to make Minji persuade Minji to come to school again.]


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.

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?
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_{r}:Acc) [CP [(NP_{p}: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:


task-Acc undertake-Comp persuade-Pst-Dec (lit.) ‘Chelswu, persuaded the president himself, to undertake the task.’

(41) Chelswu-ka [casin,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, persuaded the president himself, 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).


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.


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.


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).


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.
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