

Null and overt subjects in control constructions in Korean

Introduction It has been reported in the literature that null subjects as well as overt subjects (e.g. pronouns and the long-distance (LD) reflexive *caki*) are allowed in obligatory control (OC) constructions in Korean (Yang 1985, Madigan 2008, Lee 2009, a.o.). Focusing on the fact that both null and overt subjects in OC constructions exhibit OC properties, this paper first examines how consistent OC properties of controlled subjects are derived. Then, this paper also presents novel observations on the interactions between controlled subjects, which must be interpreted *de se*, and another *de se* element, the LD reflexive *caki*, in Korean. We will propose that consistent *de se* interpretations of controlled subjects and their relationships with another *de se* element *caki* can be derived from features on *de se* elements and structural properties of control constructions.

Key data on controlled subjects and *caki* in Korean First, both null and overt subjects in OC constructions only allow local control by a matrix argument, *de se* interpretations, and sloppy readings under ellipsis. Second, while the LD reflexive *caki* in a controlled subject position may be distinguished from a non-controlled *caki* in that it does not allow long-distance control, it also preserves the basic properties of *caki* that it cannot be anteceded by a first or second person pronoun and that it requires a subject antecedent. Given these properties, it is hard to consider controlled *caki* merely an overt form of PRO. Third, I present novel data on clausemate controlled subjects and *caki* in comparison with clausemate multiple LD *cakis*. That is, unlike that multiple LD *cakis* in the same clause must be coreferential under multiple embeddings (as in Chinese first observed by Pan 1997), PRO/controlled pronouns and a non-subject *caki* in the same clause do not have to be coreferential. Contrary to PRO and pronouns, however, a controlled *caki* and non-controlled LD *caki* in the same clause still must be coreferential as multiple LD *cakis*.

Puzzles These data on controlled subjects and *caki* raise a number of questions: (i) How does a subject, either null or overt, in a control clause get an obligatory *de se* reading?, (ii) How can we account for the different properties of the two types of *de se* elements: OC PRO/controlled pronouns on the one hand and LD *caki* on the other?, (iii) How does controlled *caki* exhibit both OC PRO-like and non-controlled LD *caki*-like properties in OC constructions?

Proposals Based on the Lewis-Chierchia property analysis on *de se* attitude reports (Lewis 1979, Chierchia 1989), I argue that controlled subjects, as *de se* arguments, need to be bound by a closest *de se* binder with the same value of the feature [log]. Null subjects and controlled pronouns are different from controlled *caki* in that the former ones bear [-log] while the latter bears [+log]. Crucially, I further assume that the [log] feature on the binder in control constructions is unspecified due to some structural reason, and it must be specified by matching the feature on the element in the controlled subject position. In this way, we can account for the obligatory local control and *de se* readings of controlled subjects. Furthermore, under this system, we can also derive the disjoint readings of LD *caki* and PRO/controlled pronouns in the same clause well as the obligatory coreferential readings of a controlled and non-controlled LD *cakis*.

- (1) John thought [$\lambda_1^{[+log]}$ Bill promised [$\lambda_2^{[-log]}$ PRO/he $_2^{[-log]}$ to go to $caki_1^{[+log]}$'s house]]
- (2) a. John thought [$\lambda_1^{[+log]}$ Bill promised [$\lambda_2^{[+log]}$ $caki_2^{[+log]}$ to go to $caki_2^{[+log]}$'s house]]
b. *John thought [$\lambda_1^{[+log]}$ Bill promised [$\lambda_2^{[+log]}$ $caki_2^{[+log]}$ to go to $caki_1^{[+log]}$'s house]]