

Control is Agree: Evidence from Korean

Hyungjung Lee & Mike Berger

University of Leipzig

hyunjung.lee@uni-leipzig.de mike.berger@uni-leipzig.de

Overview We revisit Korean control data which poses a challenge for the M(ovement) T(theory) of C(ontrol) (Hornstein 1999), and a PRO-based analysis (Chomsky 1982), respectively. **Puzzles** (A) The overtness of the controllee suspends its OC properties. (B) Rightward movement of the controller disrupts the OC relation. (C) Backward Control cannot be observed in finite complements. What is intriguing is (i) how the null subject is interpreted like PRO in one case, but like *pro* in the other, and (ii) how the subject's overtness relates to OC. It poses a problem for an MTC; given A-chain formation, there is no way for the overtness of the subject to disrupt the OC relation. Note that the OC property is retained only if the controllee alternates with an overt pronoun and is emphatic. MTC is incompatible with this point, given that the controllee and controller positions are related via movement, and that scrambling does not alter these positions *per se*. Lastly, BC itself is a problem for classical PRO theory, as PRO c-commanding NP would violate Condition C. **Analysis** We propose a derivational route to control which can accommodate the puzzling facts under the *uPro* account (McFadden & Sundaresan 2016). The matrix verb merges its own object, which then either binds the embedded null subject (OC PRO) or accidentally corefers with it (*pro*). Since null subjects in finite complements are interpreted like OC PRO under control verbs, but like *pro* under non-control verbs, Korean finite CPS under control verbs must still be reduced and dependent on the matrix verb to some extent (Landau 2004). The dependence of control complements is reflected in their default lack of the XP hosting the Aboutness operator, such that binding by the matrix object is forced and *uPro* is spelled out as silent OC PRO. The restrictive reference of subjects of control complements can be obviated by the presence of projections like FOCP, which bear an Aboutness Topic operator. Along this line, rightward movement of controller fails to value *uPro* due to the requirement of precede-and-command (Bruening 2018). Backward Control is a side product, only permitted in non-finite CPS due to the operation of structure removal (Müller 2017, Pesetsky 2016) as a last resort.

References: •McFadden, T. & S. Sundaresan. 2016. Failure to control is not a failure: It's *pro*. In C. Hammerly & B. Prickett (eds.), *Proceedings of the Forty-Sixth Annual Meeting of the North East Linguistic Society*, 1–10. GLSA, Amherst.