

matrix verb is immediately preceded by a manner adverb, or when some syntactic operations apply (relevant examples omitted due to space limitation).

3. Proposed Analysis

Although Monahan's (2003) approach, which adopts the MTC at face value, appears to be on the right track in capturing exhaustive control (EC, in Landau's (1999) sense), it has been reported in the literature that control sentences with the *tolok*-clause permit other readings than EC, as in (11) (from Kim (1995: (167), p.247) with some modification).

- (11) Coach-ka cwucangi-eykey [e_j kong-ul han saram-ey
 coach-NOM team.captain-DAT ball-ACC one person-per
 han kay-ssik kat-tolok] cisahay-ss-ta.
 one CL-each have-COMP instruct-PAST-DECL

'The coach instructed the team captain that (the players) have one ball per person.'

In order to explain various interpretive patterns like this, this paper adopts Hornstein's (2001: Ch 2) idea for interpreting referentially dependent elements. At the heart of Hornstein's idea is the following disjunctive mechanism for assigning references to anaphoric arguments:

- (12) a. Environments where OC is possible are those where A-movement of a controller can take place, and **OC PRO** can be reinterpreted as an **A-trace**.
 b. Environments where NOC is possible are those where A-movement of a potential antecedent cannot apply, and **NOC PRO** need to be reanalyzed as **pro**.

Building on this mechanism, I suggest that there is more than one *tolok*-clause in Korean, which can be a complement or an adjunct depending on the syntactic environment they appear. As comprehensively discussed in Suh (1996: Ch 22), *tolok* is normally defined as a subordinator of a clause that (i) denotes a purpose of the matrix event; (ii) expresses a result or degree of resulting state of the matrix event; or (iii) indicates the temporal end point of the matrix event, and so forth (illustration of relevant data precluded due to space reason). It is thus not surprising that the clause headed by the subordinator *-tolok* is found not only in OC and causative constructions, but also in various other contexts, such as resultatives, where the *tolok*-clauses can be diagnosed as adjuncts (cf. Shim and den Dikken (2009) for an analysis of the *tolok*-clauses as adjuncts in subject-oriented resultatives in Korean).

These facts also lead me to argue that the *tolok*-clauses with OC readings accompanied are complements, while those without are unselected adjuncts. Pieces of evidence in favor of this argument can be easily found. For instance, sentence (11) can be paraphrased as (13), and given that the maximum valency of control predicates is 'three,' it follows that the *tolok*-clause in this context should be an adjunct (cf. Kim (1995: 249-250) for a similar argument).

- (13) Coach-ka cwucangi-eykey [e_j kong-ul han saram-ey
 coach-NOM team.captain-DAT ball-ACC one person-per
 han kay-ssik kat-tolok] kulen cisi-lul hay-ss-ta.
 one CL-each have-COMP such instruction-ACC do-PAST-DECL

'The coach gave an instruction to the team captain so that (the players) have one ball per person.'

Now we are left with a question about the categorial status of null subjects in the *tolok*-clauses that are analyzed as adjuncts here, thereby lacking the obligatory referential dependency. Given that A-movement (except scrambling) out of the adjunct is not allowed, it immediately follows that they are not **A-traces** but **pro**. One piece of evidence comes from the fact that (i) overt pronouns can be substituted for null subjects and (ii) NOMINATIVE Case is assigned, as in (14).

- (14) Cokyo-ka [haksayng-tul-i te umak swuep-ul tut-tolok]
 teacher's aid-NOM student-PL-NOM more music class-ACC take-COMP
 hakpwumo-lul seltukhayssta.
 parent-ACC persuaded
 'The teacher's aid persuaded the parents that their children should take more music lessons.'
Polinsky et al. (2007: (27))

Second, the sentences with the *tolok*-clause triggering OC do not allow the multiple occurrences of floating quantifiers, while those with the *tolok*-clause with NOC permit them ((15) adapted from Hornstein (2001)).

- (15) a. ??John-un pwumotul_i **motwu**-lul [t_i **kakak** ttena-tolok] seltukhayssta.
 John-TOP parents all-ACC each leave-COMP persuaded
 Intended: 'John persuaded the parents all to each leave.'
(OC)
- b. John-un pwumotul_i **motwu**-lul [pro_j **kakak** ttena-tolok] seltukhayssta.
 John-TOP parents all-ACC each leave-COMP persuaded
 Lit. 'John persuaded the parents all to make their children each leave.'
(NOC)
- c. ??John-un pwumotul_i **motwu**-lul [t_i **motwu** ttena-tolok] seltukhayssta.
 John-TOP parents all-ACC all leave-COMP persuaded
 Intended: 'John persuaded the parents all to all leave.'
(OC)
- d. John-un pwumotul_i **motwu**-lul [pro_j **motwu** ttena-tolok] seltukhayssta.
 John-TOP parents all-ACC all leave-COMP persuaded
 Lit. 'John persuaded the parents all to make their children all leave.'
(NOC)

4. Conclusion

This paper has shown that the ambiguity found in control sentences with *tolok*-clauses in Korean can be attributed to the various usages of the subordinator *-tolok*. In particular, I have argued that we need to distinguish between the *tolok*-clauses triggering OC and those yielding NOC in terms of their categorial status—the former being complements, while the latter being adjuncts. This being said, since there is nothing that prevents the controller from undergoing A-movement in (1) and (2), these sentences can be characterized as OC, the former being defined as forward control while the latter as backward control. This in turn leads us to conclude that no approaches insisting that null subjects in the *tolok*-clauses embedded under control predicates be invariably an **A-trace**, **PRO** or **pro**, can be entirely correct.

Selected References

- Choe, Hyon-Sook. 2006. On (Backward) Object Control in Korean. In S. Kuno et al. (eds.), *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics XI*, 373-86. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.
- Hornstein, Norbert. 2001. *Move! A Minimalist Theory of Construal*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Kim, Kyungan. 1995. Casuativity in Korean: Syntactic Causative, Control and Purpose. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Southern California.
- Landau, Idan. 1999. *Elements of Control*. Doctoral Dissertation, MIT.
- Madigan, Sean. 2008. *Control Constructions in Korean*. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Delaware.
- Monahan, Philip. 2003. Backward Object Control in Korean. In G. Garding and M. Tsujimura (eds.), *WCCFL 22 Proceedings*, 356-369. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
- Polinsky, Maria, Philip Monahan and Nayoung Kwon. 2007. Object Control in Korean: How Many Constructions?" *Language Research* 43.1, 1-33.
- Shim, Ji Young and Marcel den Dikken. 2009. The Tense of Resultatives: The Case of Korean. To appear in the *Proceedings of NELS 38*. Amherst, MA: GLSA.
- Suh, Jeong Soo. 1996. *The Korean Grammar*. [written in Korean] Seoul: Hanyang University Press.