

Non-control aspects of the Korean *yaksokha*-construction*

Juwon Lee
(Jeonju University)

Lee, Juwon. 2023. Non-control aspects of the Korean *yaksokha*-construction. *Linguistic Research* 40(2): 299-316. This study presents evidence to support the claim that the Korean *yaksokha*-construction (which corresponds to the English *promise*-construction) does not meet the criteria for a subject control construction. Although it may appear similar to the English *promise*-construction when the embedded subject is omitted, a closer examination reveals significant differences between the two constructions. Moreover, this paper argues that the Anti-redundancy Hypothesis, which discourages the use of two noun phrases with nearly identical forms to refer to the same entity in close proximity, accounts for awkwardness of the *yaksokha*-construction when the matrix subject and the embedded subject are present at the same time. Finally, the non-control analysis is extended to include other *yaksokha*-constructions that contain a *keyss-ta-ko*-clause or *kes*-clause. (Jeonju University)

Keywords subject control, *yaksokha*- 'promise,' null argument, Anti-redundancy Hypothesis

1. Introduction

In this paper I argue that the Korean *yaksokha*-construction with a *ki-lo*-clause, as exemplified in (1), should not be classified as a subject control construction, unlike its English counterpart *promise*-construction, which is considered as a typical subject control construction in the literature.

- (1) *Tom_i-i Jessica_j-eykey [_____ cip-ey ilccik o-ki-lo]*
Tom-Nom Jessica-to home-to early come-Nmn-Dir
yaksokhay-ss-ta.
promise-Pst-Dec

* I would like to thank the anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments on different parts of this paper. All errors that remain are my responsibility, of course.

'Tom promised Jessica to come home early.'

The affix *-ki* attached to the verb in the embedded clause is a nominalizer (see, e.g., Barrie et al. 2022) and *-lo* indicates a direction or a goal. Control constructions are characterized by three fundamental properties (see, e.g., Williams 1980; Bresnan 1982; Farkas 1988; Horstein 1999; Landau 2013): (i) the subject of the embedded clause is unexpressed, as illustrated in the *promise*-construction (2a), (ii) the unexpressed subject in the embedded clause is caseless, and (iii) the unexpressed subject in the embedded clause is co-indexed with an argument in the matrix clause, as illustrated in (2b).

- (2) a. Tom_i promised Jessica_j [(**Tom_i/him_i/he_i*) to come home early].
 b. Tom_i promised Jessica_j [______{i/*j/*k} to come home early].

The three properties of control constructions are integral to the very notion of control, as they define the relationship between the unexpressed NP (controllee) and the expressed NP (controller) in the same sentence.¹

The *yaksokha*-construction (1) is often considered an instance of subject control construction, as it involves an unexpressed subject in the *ki-lo*-clause that is co-referenced with an argument (*Tom-i* 'Tom-Nom') in the matrix clause (see a control analysis of *yaksokha*-constructions in Yang 1984; Gamerschlag 2007; Madigan 2008; K. Y. Lee 2009; H. Lee 2011; Park 2011, 2012; Kwon 2013; Hoe 2014, Hong and Yun 2020, among others). However, I argue in this paper that the *yaksokha*-construction differs from typical subject control constructions with respect to the three properties. Note that the Korean *seltukha*-construction (*persuade*-construction) with a *tolok*-clause has previously been analyzed based on the three properties in Lee and Song (2019, 2020). This construction does not possess those three properties and is therefore considered distinct from the English *persuade*-construction, which is a standard object control construction. The primary purpose of this paper is to expand upon the non-control analysis of the *seltukha*-construction and apply it to the *yaksokha*-construction. As far as I am aware,

1 Madigan (2008) expands the definition of control to encompass constructions that feature an explicit embedded subject in Korean. As a reviewer pointed out, the following sentence exhibits an instance where an explicit expression can occur within the embedded clause (Hornstein 2001: 32).

(i) Clinton_i's campaign believes that [PRO_i/his_i keeping sex life under control] is crucial for electoral success.

there has been no previous argument made for a non-control analysis of the *yaksokha*-construction. First, an explicit subject can appear in the *ki-lo*-clause, as shown in (3) (cf. Yang 1984: 20, (3b)); an online survey was conducted using a 7-point Likert scale ranging 1 (certainly unacceptable) to 7 (certainly acceptable). The survey involved the participation of ten native Korean speakers and comprised of 4 practice items, 12 experimental items (examples below with mean and standard deviation), and 24 filler items:

- (3) *Tom_i-i Jessica_j-eykey kyelkwukun [Tom_i-i/ku_i-ka cikcep*
 Tom-Nom Jessica-to finally Tom-Nom/he-Nom in.person
o-ki-lo] yaksokhay-ss-ta.
 come-Nmn-Dir promise-Pst-Dec
 (lit.) ‘Tom_i finally promised Jessica that Tom_i/he_i would come in person.’
 [When the embedded subject is *Tom-i*, $M = 3.8$, $SD = 1.7512$]
 [When the embedded subject is *ku-ka*, $M = 4.4$, $SD = 2.0111$]

In (3), the sentence with *Tom-i* ‘Tom-Nom’ as the embedded subject may sound awkward to some native speakers of Korean (see, e.g., Yang 1984: 20, (3b)). This awkwardness can be attributed to the fact that the two NPs (*Tom-i* in the matrix clause and *Tom-i* in the embedded clause) have exactly the same form and appear in close proximity. Note that in (3), the sentence with *ku-ka* ‘he-Nom’ as the embedded subject sounds better (see an account of the awkwardness with the Anti-redundancy Hypothesis in section 3.2 below, which suggests that speakers tend to avoid repeating the same expression that has already been mentioned in the same sentence). Secondly, unlike the English control construction where the implicit embedded subject is caseless, in the *yaksokha*-construction, the embedded subject is marked with the nominative case marker *-ka*, as seen in (3) above and (4) below. Therefore, the position of the embedded subject is not caseless. Thirdly, the subject of the *ki-lo*-clause in the *yaksokha*-construction is not necessarily co-indexed with an argument in the matrix clause, as illustrated in (4).

- (4) *kamtok_i-i Jessica emeni_j-eykey kyelkwukun*
 director-Nom Jessica mother-Dat finally
[Jessica_i-ka cwuyen-ul ha-ki-lo] yaksokhay-ss-ta.
 Jessica-Nom lead.role-Acc do-Nmn-Dir] promise-Pst-Dec

‘The director finally promised Jessica’s mother that Jessica would play the lead role.’ [$M = 5.6$, $SD = 1.7127$]

In (4), the explicit subject *Jessica-ka* ‘Jessica-Nom’ appears in the *ki-lo*-clause, but it refers to *Jessica*, which is not a matrix argument. These distinct properties of the *yaksokha*-construction challenge its classification as a control construction, as is commonly assumed in the literature. I argue in this paper that the verb *yaksokha*-‘promise’ is not actually a control verb, and thus *yaksokha*-constructions are not a control construction; these constructions only resemble control constructions when the embedded subject is omitted, as is often the case in Korean due to its “*pro*-drop” nature. I believe that the findings of this paper can enhance our understanding of *yaksokha*-constructions and “control” constructions in Korean, particularly the source of *yaksokha*-constructions, the verb *yaksokha*- ‘promise.’

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 highlights the inadequacy of prior control analyses in fully explaining the *yaksokha*-construction. In Section 3, I put forth a non-control analysis of the construction, and Section 4 offers additional details on the Anti-redundancy Hypothesis. Finally, the paper concludes with Section 5.

2. Previous analyses of control

2.1 PRO

According to Chomsky (1981, 1995), PRO is conventionally situated in the subject position of the *to*-infinitive clause, as exemplified below.

- (5) a. Bill_i persuaded Mary_j [_{TP} PRO_{j/*i/*k} to leave].
 b. John_i promised Mary_j [_{TP} PRO_{i/*j/*k} to leave].

PRO is a required element in control constructions, and it must be co-referenced with a matrix argument to achieve an obligatory control interpretation. This PRO analysis doesn’t seem to apply to the *yaksokha*-construction in Korean, which diverges from English in that the nominative subject of the *ki-lo*-clause can be overtly expressed, as shown in (3) and (4) above, and it is not always co-indexed with a matrix argument,

as illustrated in (4).

2.2 Movement

According to Kwon and Polinsky (2006) as well as Kwon et al. (2010), the two *seltukha*-constructions in (6) are not derivationally related, but instead represent separate constructions. Specifically, they propose that the scrambling of (6a) does not yield (6b). They refer to the former construction as ACC1 and the latter as ACC2.

- (6) a. *Jane-i Minswu-lul* [_____j *tomangka-tolok*] *seltukhay-ss-ta*.
 Jane-Nom Minswu-Acc run.away-Tolok persuade-Pst-Dec
 ‘Jane persuaded Minswu to run away.’ [ACC1]
- b. *Jane-i* [_____j *tomangka-tolok*]_j
 Jane-Nom run.away-Tolok
Minswu-lul _____j *seltukhay-ss-ta*.
 Minswu-Acc persuade-Pst-Dec
 ‘Jane persuaded Minswu to run away.’ [ACC2]

Based on the movement analysis of English controls (Hornstein 1999, 2003; Boeckx and Hornstein 2003, 2004; Boeckx et al. 2010), they posit that in (6a) the subject of the *tolok*-clause moves to the object position in the matrix clause, and the tail of the A-chain is deleted, leading to ACC1, an obligatory control construction. In (6b), the *tolok*-clause moves to the left, while the subject of the clause moves to the right to occupy the object position, resulting in ACC2, a non-obligatory control construction. While the *yaksokha*-construction was not specifically addressed in their discussion, it may be possible to apply the movement analysis to it, as follows:

- (7) *Jane-i Minswu-eykey* [_____j *tomangka-ki-lo*] *yaksokhay-ss-ta*.
 Jane-Nom Minswu-Acc run.away-Nmn-Dir promise-Pst-Dec
 ‘Jane promised Minswu to run away.’

In (7) the subject of the *ki-lo*-clause moves to the matrix subject position, and the tail of the A-chain is deleted. However, the movement analysis faces certain challenges when

applied to the *yaksokha*-construction. First, as demonstrated earlier, the subject can appear inside the *ki-lo*-clause, as in (3) and (4). Second, there are cases where the matrix subject and the embedded subject refer to different individuals, as in (4). Third, if the matrix subject comes from the subject of the *ki-lo*-clause, then we should say that the matrix subjects are licensed in two different ways: base generation as in *Jane-i Minswu-lul cohaha-n-ta* ‘Jane likes Minswu’ and movement as in (7). It’s unclear why two different methods are necessary to license the subject in the matrix clause.

2.3 Semantic control

Cormack and Smith (2004) proposed that the *seltukha*-constructions like (8) involve obligatory “semantic control” (see also Jackendoff and Culicover 2003 for a semantic approach).

- (8) *Jane-i Minswu-lul [pro_j tomangka-tolok] seltukhay-ss-ta.*
 Jane-Nom Minswu-Acc run.away-Tolok persuade-Pst-Dec
 ‘Jane persuaded Minswu to run away.’

The null pronoun *pro* can function as either a bound variable or a referential pronoun, and therefore, it is not necessarily coreferential with the matrix object in the sentence. To ensure co-indexation between the null pronoun and the matrix object, Cormack and Smith (2004: 66) introduced a meaning postulate in (9) as an axiom.

- (9) 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).

While the meaning postulate in (9) is for *persuade*-construction, it may be revised to be appropriate for *promise*-construction and then applied to *yaksokha*-construction. However, this revised meaning postulate cannot explain *yaksokha*-constructions like (4) where the matrix subject and the embedded subject refer to different individuals. I argue below that a non-control analysis of the *yaksokha*-construction can provide a natural account for data

like (4).

2.4 Pro

Choe (2006) proposed that Korean does not possess obligatory object control, either in forward or backward form. Instead, she suggested the involvement of *pro*, which is a pronominal element that can be either referential *pro* or bound *pro*, in the *seltukha*-constructions (see also Park 2012):

- (10) a. *Yenghuy-nun Chelswu-lul [pro ttena-tolok] seltukhay-ss-ta.*
 Yenghuy-Top Chelswu-Acc leave-Tolok persuade-Pst-Dec
 ‘Yenghuy persuaded Chelswu to leave.’
- b. *Yenghuy-nun pro [Chelswu-ka ttena-tolok] seltukhay-ss-ta.*
 Yenghuy-Top Chelswu-Acc leave-Tolok persuade-Pst-Dec
 ‘Yenghuy persuaded Chelswu to leave.’

Choe (2006) suggested that (10a) does not exhibit obligatory control, while pragmatic coreference is involved in (10b) instead of backward object control. The non-control analysis proposed in this paper shares some similarities with the one presented by Choe (2006). However, it is important to acknowledge that Choe's work did not specifically address sentences like (3) and their perceived awkwardness. Furthermore, she did not delve into the examination of *yaksokha*-constructions. In order to enhance the existing analysis, it would be beneficial to explore the reasons behind the awkwardness of sentences like (3) and to investigate the implications of *yaksokha*-constructions within the broader context of this research. Such an exploration will contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of the phenomenon under study. I argue below that the *yaksokha*-construction cannot be considered a control construction. Instead, I argue that the omission of the embedded subject in the *yaksokha*-construction creates the impression of control, but it should not be considered a true control construction.

3. A non-control analysis of *yaksokha*-construction

As previously mentioned in the introduction, the *yaksokha*-construction differs from

control constructions in that they do not exhibit the three crucial properties of control. In this section, I further discuss the syntactic and semantic properties of the *yaksokha*-construction that distinguish it from other constructions. First, consider the *yaksokha*-construction (1), repeated below:

- (11) *Tom_i-i Jessica_j-eykey [____ cip-ey ilccik o-ki-lo]*
 Tom-Nom Jessica-to home-to early come-Nmn-Dir
yaksokhay-ss-ta.
 promise-Pst-Dec
 ‘Tom promised Jessica to come home early.’

The null argument in the *ki-lo*-clause is normally interpreted to be co-indexed with the matrix subject. However, if a specific context is given as like the following, the gap in the *ki-lo*-clause can be co-indexed with the matrix object:

- (12) [Context: Swumin expressed her desire to play the lead role in a drama, and requested the director's permission to do so. The director granted her request and assured her that she would play the lead role.]
kamtok_i-i Swumin_j-eykey kyelkwukun [_____j tulama cwuyen-ul
 director-Nom Swumin-Dat finally drama lead.role-Acc
ha-ki-lo] yaksokhay-ss-ta.
 do-Nmn-Dir promise-Pst-Dec
 ‘The director finally promised Swumin_j that she_j would play the lead role of the drama.’ [*M* = 4.6, *SD* = 1.7764]

This phenomenon is similar to control shift observed in English subject control construction. Consider the following example (Horstein 1999: 23, (59b)):

- (13) Grandpa promised the children₁ [PRO₁ to be able to stay up for the late show].

In (13) the controller of the embedded subject should be the matrix object (Goal) rather than the matrix subject (Agent). However, in English it appears that the embedded subject cannot refer to a contextually salient individual. In Korean, on the other hand, that

appears to be possible, as illustrated below:

- (14) [Context: Swumin's mother hoped that Swumin would play the lead role in a drama. So Swumin's mother appealed to the director to give the lead role to Swumin. The director granted her request and assured her that Swumin would play the lead role.]

kamtok_i-i Swumin emeni_j-eykey kyelkwukun

director-Nom Swumin mother-Dat finally

[_k *tulama cwuyen-ul ha-ki-lo*] *yaksokhay-ss-ta.*

drama lead.role-Acc do-Nmn-Dir promise-Pst-Dec

'The director finally promised Swumin's mother that Swumin would play the lead role of the drama.' [$M = 3.7$, $SD = 1.9465$]

Given the context of the utterance, it is appropriate to identify the implicit subject as Swumin, rather than as either the director or Swumin's mother, who are matrix arguments of the sentence.

Second, in the following while the subject of the matrix clause is left implicit, the subject of the embedded clause is explicitly stated:

- (15) *Swumin emeni_j-eykey kyelkwukun*

Swumin mother-Dat finally

[*Swumin-i tulama cwuyen-ul ha-ki-lo*] *yaksokhay-ss-ta.*

Swumin-Nom drama lead.role-Acc do-Nmn-Dir promise-Pst-Dec

'The director finally promised Swumin's mother that Swumin would play the lead role of the drama.' [$M = 4.7$, $SD = 1.8865$]

The matrix subject is likely to be interpreted as Swumin. However, if the sentence (15) is used in the context provided in (14), then the implicit subject of (15) should be the director, not Swumin.

Third, in a *yaksokha*-construction, it is also possible for both of the NPs to be implicit, as shown below:

- (16) *Swumin emeni_j-eykey kyelkwukun*

Swumin mother-Dat finally

[_____ *tulama cwuyen-ul ha-ki-lo*] *yaksokhay-ss-ta.*
 drama lead.role-Acc do-Nmn-Dir promise-Pst-Dec
 ‘The director finally promised Swumin’s mother that Swumin would play
 the lead role of the drama.’ [$M = 4.9$, $SD = 1.6633$]

By default, the matrix subject and embedded subject are interpreted as co-indexed with each other. However, this co-indexation is not always necessary and may vary depending on the utterance context.

Fourth, it seems possible for the matrix subject and the embedded subject to be explicitly stated at the same time:

(17) *Swumin-i kunye-uy emeni-eykey kyelkwukun*
 Swumin-Nom she-Gen mother-Dat finally
 [*Swumin-i cwuyen-ul ha-ki-lo*] *yaksokhay-ss-ta.*
 Swumin-Nom lead.role-Acc do-Nmn-Dir promise-Pst-Dec
 ‘Swumin_i finally promised her mother that she_i would play the lead role.’
 [$M = 4.0$, $SD = 1.8257$]

Although not unacceptable, the sentence (17) may sound awkward to some native speakers of Korean. This awkwardness can be accounted for by the Anti-redundancy Hypothesis, which suggests that two NPs (e.g., *Swumin-i* and *Swumin-i* in (17)) appearing in close proximity can result in redundancy (see more in section 3.2 below). As expected, this awkwardness can be reduced by using a pronominal subject in the *ki-lo*-clause:

(18) *Swumin-i kunye-uy emeni-eykey kyelkwukun*
 Swumin-Nom she-Gen mother-Dat finally
 [*kunye-ka cwuyen-ul ha-ki-lo*] *yaksokhay-ss-ta.*
 she-Nom lead.role-Acc do-Nmn-Dir promise-Pst-Dec
 ‘Swumin_i finally promised her mother that she_i would play the lead role.’
 [$M = 5.5$, $SD = 1.7795$]

The explicit subject of the *ki-lo*-clause can be distinct from any argument in the matrix clause:

- (19) [Context: Swumin's mother hoped that Swumin would play the lead role in a drama. So Swumin's mother appealed to the director to give the lead role to Swumin. The director granted her request and assured her that Swumin would play the lead role.]

kamtok_i Swumin emeni_j-eykey kyelkwukun

director-Nom Swumin mother-Dat finally

[*Swumin-i cwuyen-ul ha-ki-lo*] *yaksokhay-ss-ta.*

Swumin lead.role-Acc do-Nmn-Dir promise-Pst-Dec

'The director finally promised Swumin's mother that Swumin would play the lead role.' [$M = 6.0$, $SD = 1.3333$]

Furthermore, it is also possible for the subject of the *ki-lo*-clause to be coreferential with the matrix object, as shown in the following:

- (20) *kamtok_i Swumin_j-eykey kyelkwukun*

director-Nom Swumin-Dat finally

[*Swumin_j-i/kunye_j-ka cwuyen-ul ha-ki-lo*] *yaksokhay-ss-ta.*

Swumin-Nom/she-Nom lead.role-Acc do-Nmn-Dir promise-Pst-Dec

'The director finally promised Swumin_j that she_j would play the lead role.'

[When the embedded subject is *Swumin-i*, $M = 4.9$, $SD = 2.0248$]

[When the embedded subject is *kunye-ka*, $M = 5.5$, $SD = 2.0138$]

While the sentence (20) with *Swumin-i* 'Swumin-Nom' as the subject of the embedded clause may sound awkward, it seems to be still considered acceptable, albeit with some degree of expected redundancy. Note that the sentence would sound more natural if a pronominal subject, such as *kunye-ka* 'she-Nom', is used instead. The example (20) can be used to describe a situation where Swumin requested the director of a drama to let her play the lead role, and the director finally agreed to do so. To summarize, the *yaksokha*-construction is not a control construction, suggesting that the verb *yaksokha*- 'promise' is not a control verb. It is more plausible to assume that the subject NPs in matrix or embedded clauses are at times omitted to avoid redundancy.

4. Anti-redundancy Hypothesis

It has been noted that sentences containing clauses with similar or identical referential subjects can sound awkward due to redundancy. However, replacing the referential subject of the *ki-lo*-clause with a pronoun can make the sentences more acceptable. Moreover, introducing a pause after the matrix object or using an emphatic expression such as *cikcep* ‘herself’ can improve the sentences. In light of these observations, the Anti-redundancy Hypothesis, originally formulated in (21) in the context of the *seltukha*-construction by Lee and Song (2019), can be applied to the *yaksokha*-construction.

- (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.^{2,3}

This hypothesis is further supported by the fact that sentence (22a) sounds better than (22b), in which the embedded subject appears immediately after the matrix subject. Note that in (22b) a pause should come between the two subjects.

2 It is a common phenomenon that once a referent is introduced in a sentence through an NP, it can be referred to later in the same sentence using a pronoun or omitted altogether. This tendency to avoid redundancy is a widely recognized concept (see, e.g., Zipf 1949; Jaeger 2010; Meister et al. 2021), and the Anti-redundancy Hypothesis can be viewed as a specific application of this principle. However, in the context of *seltukha*- and *yaksokha*-constructions, the three specific factors related to the Anti-redundancy Hypothesis require further elucidation. These factors include: (i) the extent to which the referents of the two NPs overlap, (ii) the degree to which their forms are similar to each other, and (iii) how closely they are positioned in a sentence. Further research is needed to clarify these factors.

3 The Anti-redundancy Hypothesis has the potential to replace Condition C in the context of Korean language. Consider the following example:

- (i) *Chelswu-nun Chelswu-lul salangha-ko, Minse-nun Minse-lul salangha-n-ta.*
 Chelswu-Top Chelswu-Acc love-and Minse-Top Minse-lul love-Pre-Dec
 (lit.) ‘Chelswu loves Chelswu and Minse loves Minse.’

Although the sentence (i) may sound somewhat awkward, it still appears acceptable, which can be explained by the Anti-redundancy Hypothesis.

- (22) a. *Minho_i-ka Swumin-eykey kyelkwuk [Minho_i-ka cikcep*
 Minho-Nom Swumin-Dat finally Minho-Nom himself
ttena-ki-lo] yaksokhay-ss-ta.
 leave-Nmn-Dir promise-Pst-Dec
 ‘Minho_i finally promised Swumin that he_i himself would leave.’
- b. *Minho_i-ka [Minho_i-ka cikcep ttena-ki-lo] Swumin-eykey*
 Minho-Nom Minho-Nom himself leave-Nmn-Dir] Swumin-Dat
kyelkwuk yaksokhay-ss-ta.
 finally promise-Pst-Dec
 ‘Minho_i finally promised Swumin that he_i himself would leave.’

The degradation of the sentence (22b) is expected by the Anti-redundancy Hypothesis; the distance between the same two NPs is closer than that in (22a).

To test this hypothesis further, consider the following sentences in which the *ki-lo*-clause is fronted. By moving the embedded subject to the beginning of the sentence, the distance between the embedded subject and the matrix subject increases:

- (23) a. [*Minho-ka cikcep ttena-ki-lo] Swumin-eykey kyelkwuk*
 Minho-Nom himself leave-Nmn-Comp Swumin-Dat finally
 (*Minho-ka*) *yaksokhay-ss-ta.*
 Minho-Nom promise-Pst-Dec
 ‘Minho_i finally promised Swumin that he_i himself would leave.’
- b. [*Minho-ka cikcep ttena-ki-lo] Swumin-eykey kyelkwuk*
 Minho-Nom himself leave-Nmn-Comp Swumin-Dat finally
sensayngnim-i yaksokhay-ss-ta.
 teacher-Nom promise-Pst-Dec
 ‘The teacher finally promised Swumin that Minho himself would leave.’

In (23a), the sentence without the matrix subject sounds better than the sentence with the matrix subject. Furthermore, in (23b) the matrix subject differs from the embedded subject, and this sentence sounds better than the sentence (23a) with the explicit matrix subject. These differences can be explained by the Anti-redundancy Hypothesis.

The non-control analysis of *yaksokha*-construction can be called into question by some examples. For instance, consider the following example in which the verb of the

ko-clause is attached with the future tense morpheme *-keyss* (see a similar example in Yang 1984: 20, (3b); Madigan 2008):

- (24) *Minho*_r-*ka* *Swumin*_j-*eykey* *kyelkwuk* [_____ _{i/j/*k} *ttena-keyss-ta-ko*]
 Minho-Nom Swumin-Dat finally leave-Fut-Dec-Comp
yaksokhay-ss-ta.
 promise-Pst-Dec
 'Minho finally promised Swumin to leave.'

In (24) the implicit subject of the *ko*-clause must be co-indexed with the matrix subject. This means that the sentence cannot be used to describe a situation where someone other than Minho leaves. Likewise, in the following sentence, the embedded clause must have *Minho-ka* 'Minho-Nom' as its explicit subject:

- (25) *Minho*_r-*ka* *Swumin*_j-*eykey* *kyelkwuk* [*Minho*-/**Swumin*-/**Tom-i*
 Minho-Nom Swumin-Dat finally Minho-/Swumin-/Tom-Nom
ttena-keyss-ta-ko] *yaksokhay-ss-ta*.
 leave-Fut-Dec-Comp promise-Pst-Dec
 'Minho finally promised Swumin to leave.'

This co-indexation restriction satisfies one of the conditions for control construction, but the other two conditions are not met in the *yaksokha*-construction when used with a *keyss-ta-ko*-clause. Therefore, it is still reasonable to conclude that the verb *yaksokha*- 'promise' used in (25) is not a control verb. Furthermore, it appears that the co-indexation restriction is due to the interaction between the verb and *-keyss* (Yang 1982: 269, 1984: 22-23; Madigan 2008). The future tense morpheme *-keyss* can convey the subject's intention if the subject is sentient, as shown in the following:

- (26) a. *nayil* *pi-ka* *o-keyss-ta*.
 tomorrow rain-Nom come-Fut-Dec
 'It will rain tomorrow.'
- b. *nay-ka* *nayil* *ttena-keyss-ta*.
 I-Nom tomorrow leave-Fut-Dec
 'I will leave tomorrow.'

In (26a), the sentence simply expresses a future event, while (26b) conveys the intention of the subject. The future tense morpheme *-keyss* in (25) also expresses the intention of the subject of the *ko*-clause. Since we cannot promise someone else's intention, the subject of the *ko*-clause should be the person who makes the promise in the sentence (i.e., the person who promises can promise their own intention). In short, the co-indexation restriction can be attributed to the interaction of the non-control verb *yaksokha*- 'promise' with the future tense morpheme *-keyss*.

Note that when the embedded clause is a *kes*-clause, which lacks the *-keyss* future morpheme, the co-indexation restriction no longer applies, and different explicit subjects can appear in the *kes*-clause:

- (27) a. *Minho_i-ka Swumin_j-eykey kyelkwuk* [*Minho_i-ku_i-ka cikcep*
 Minho-Nom Swumin-Dat finally Minho/he-Nom himself
ttena-l kes-ul] *yaksokhay-ss-ta.*
 leave-Rel thing-Acc promise-Pst-Dec
 'Minho_i finally promised Swumin that Minho/he_i himself would leave.'
- b. *Minho_i-ka Swumin_j-eykey kyelkwuk* [*Swumin_j-/Tom_k-i kot*
 Minho-Nom Swumin-Dat finally Swumin-/Tom-Nom soon
pwullyena-l kes-ul] *yaksokhay-ss-ta.*
 be.released-Rel thing-Acc promise-Pst-Dec
 'Minho finally promised Swumin_j that she_j/Tom would be released soon.'

In summary, the Korean verb *yaksokha*- 'promise' does not function as a control verb, and therefore, the *yaksokha*-constructions cannot be considered as control constructions. The omission of the subject in the embedded clause of *yaksokha*-constructions can create the impression of a subject control construction, as the implicit subject is often interpreted as being co-referential with the subject of the main clause.

6. Conclusion

This paper presents several pieces of evidence to support the argument that the Korean *yaksokha*-construction, which involves a *ki-lo*-clause, does not conform to the

characteristics of typical control construction. Although the *yaksokha*-construction may resemble the English *promise*-construction in certain instances when the embedded subject is omitted, a closer analysis reveals that the two constructions differ significantly. According to the Anti-redundancy Hypothesis, it is unlikely for two NPs that have (almost) identical forms and refer to the same entity to appear in close proximity, which results in redundancy in the *yaksokha*-construction when the matrix subject and the embedded subject are present at the same time. This non-control analysis can be applied to other *yaksokha*-constructions with a *keyss-ta-ko*-clause or *kes*-clause. The present research raises several related questions that can be explored in future investigations: (i) are there other verbs in Korean, aside from *yaksokha*- 'promise', that cannot be classified as control verbs? (ii) which verbs in Korean can be classified as genuine control verbs? (iii) can we support the Anti-redundancy Hypothesis with empirical data obtained through experiments or a corpus analysis? and (iv) can we strengthen our arguments by formalizing the analysis? Addressing these questions can enhance our understanding of *yaksokha*-constructions and control verbs in Korean.

References

- Barrie, Michael, Heeryun Chung, and Duk-Ho An. 2022. Numeral classifiers in Korean *-ki* nominalizations. *Linguistic Research* 39(3): 499-518.
- Boeckx, Cedric and Norbert Hornstein. 2003. Reply to 'Control is not movement'. *Linguistic Inquiry* 34(2): 269-280.
- Boeckx, Cedric and Norbert Hornstein. 2004. Movement under control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 35(3): 431-452.
- Boeckx, Cedric, Norbert Hornstein, and Jairo Nunes. 2010. *Control as Movement*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Bresnan, Joan. 1982. Control and complementation. *Linguistic Inquiry* 13(3): 343-434.
- 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: The MIT Press.
- Cormack, Annabel and Neil 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.
- Gamerschlag, Thomas. 2007. Semantic and structural aspects of complement control in Korean. *ZAS*

- Papers in Linguistics* 47: 81-123.
- Hoe, Semoon. 2014. *A study on obligatory control constructions in Korean based on exhaustive and partial controls* [In Korean]. PhD Dissertation. Seoul National University.
- Hong, EunMi and Hongoak Yun. 2020. The argument realization and word-order preference in Korean control construction: A corpus study. *Korean Journal of Linguistics* 45(2): 421-449.
- Hornstein, Norbert. 1999. Movement and control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30(1): 69-96.
- Hornstein, Norbert. 2001. *Move! A minimalist theory of construal*. MA, Malden: Blackwell Publishers.
- Hornstein, Norbert. 2003. On control. In Randall Hendrick (ed.), *Minimalist syntax*, 6-81. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Jackendoff, Ray and Peter W. Culicover. 2003. The semantic basis of control in English. *Language* 79(3): 517-556.
- Jaeger, T. Florian. 2010. Redundancy and reduction: Speakers manage syntactic information density. *Cognitive Psychology* 61: 23-62.
- Kwon, Nayoung and Maria Polinsky. 2006. Object control in Korean: Structure and processing. *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 15: 249-262.
- Kwon, Nayoung, Philip J. Monahan, and Maria Polinsky. 2010. Object control in Korean: A backward control impostor. In Norbert Hornstein and Maria Polinsky (eds.), *Movement theory of control*, 299-328. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kwon, Young-Joong. 2013. A-movement analysis of the finite obligatory control constructions in Korean. *Studies in Linguistics* 30: 19-43.
- Landau, Idan. 2013. *Control in generative grammar: A research companion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lee, Hyeran. 2011. A movement analysis of control constructions in Korean. *Studies in Generative Grammar* 21(4): 639-669.
- Lee, Juwon and Sanghoun Song. 2019. The persuade-construction in Korean controls nothing. *Proceedings of the 33rd Pacific Asia Conference on Language, Information and Computation (PACLIC)*, 95-103.
- Lee, Juwon and Sanghoun Song. 2020. Revisiting the persuade-constructions in Korean with empirical evidence. *Linguistic Research* 37(1): 29-70.
- Lee, Kum Young. 2009. *Finite control in Korean*. PhD Dissertation. University of Iowa.
- Madigan, S. William. 2008. *Control constructions in Korean*. PhD Dissertation. University of Delaware.
- Meister, Clara, Tiago Pimentel, Patrick Haller, Lean Jäger, Ryan Cotterell, and Roger Levy. 2021. Revisiting the uniform information density hypothesis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.11635*.
- Park, Hong-Keun. 2012. Control constructions in Korean revisited. *Studies in Generative Grammar* 22(1): 1-22.
- Park, Jong Un. 2011. *Clause structure and null subjects: Referential dependencies in Korean*. PhD Dissertation. Georgetown University
- Park, Jong Un. 2012. Remarks on the unified approach to obligatory control and apparently similar

- constructions. *Studies in Generative Grammar* 22(2): 497-528.
- Williams, Edwin. 1980. Predication. *Linguistic Inquiry* 11(1): 203-238.
- Yang, Dong-Whee. 1982. Control and binding in Korean. *Linguistic Journal of Korea* 7(2): 257-283.
- Yang, Dong-Whee. 1984. The extended control theory [In Korean]. *Language Research* 20(1): 19-30.
- Zipf, G. Kingsley. 1949. *Human behavior and the principle of least effort*. Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley Press.

Juwon Lee

Assistant Professor
Department of English Education
Jeonju University
303, Cheonjam-ro, Wansan-gu,
Jeonju-si, Jeollabuk-do 55069, Korea
E-mail: juwonlee@jj.ac.kr

Received: 2023. 05. 01.

Revised: 2023. 06. 19.

Accepted: 2023. 06. 19.