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-Cherichia 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]