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1. Introduction

Backward control\(^1\) is a construction where the null controllee is structurally superior to the overt controller, as in hypothetical (1b).

(1)  a. Gus Hiddink persuaded him\(\Delta_i\) to play center middle
    b. Gus Hiddink persuaded \(\Delta_i\) [he, to play center middle] (hypothetical)

In this paper, I claim that Korean licenses backward object control. Korean object control predicates permit an accusative/nominative case alternation on the persuadee DP, as in (2).\(^2\)

(2)  Chelswu-nun Yenghi-lul/ka kakey-ey ka-tolok
    Chelswu-Top Yenghi-Acc/Nom store-Loc go-Comp
    seltukha-ess-ta
    persuade-Past-Decl
    ‘Chelswu persuaded Yenghi to go to the store.’

I argue that the difference in case equates to a difference in syntactic position. Specifically, when the persuadee DP shows accusative case, it is a constituent of the matrix clause binding a null element \(\Delta\) in the embedded clause. This is exemplified in (3), which is the forward control construction.
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2. The abbreviations are as follows: Top-topic, Acc-accusative, Nom-nominative, Dat-dative, Gen-genitive, Loc-locative, Comp-complementizer, Past-past, Pres-present, Fut-future, Pass-passive, Decl-declarative, Pl-plural.

(3) Chelswu-nun Yenghi-lul [Δi kakey-ey ka-tolok]
Chelswu-Top Yenghi-Acc store-Loc go-Comp
seltukha-ess-ta
persuade-Past-Decl
‘Chelswu persuaded Yenghi to go to the store.’ (forward control)

Conversely, when the persuadee DP shows nominative case, I argue that it is a constituent of the embedded clause coindexed with a null element Δ in the matrix clause, as in (4). This is the backward control configuration.3

(4) Chelswu-nun Δi [Yenghi-ka i kakey-ey ka-tolok]
Chelswu-Top Yenghi-Nom store-Loc go-Comp
seltukha-ess-ta
persuade-Past-Decl
‘Chelswu persuaded Yenghi to go to the store.’ (backward control)

The first portion of this paper is devoted to empirically motivating the structure in (4).4 The second portion of the paper provides a theoretical explanation. First, I argue against an ECM analysis of Korean persuade. I show that Korean persuade selects for three arguments, including the persuadee DP, while Korean ECM predicates select for two. Then, I argue that a difference in case equates to a difference in syntactic constituency. Specifically, the nominative DP is a constituent of the embedded clause, while the accusative DP is a constituent of the matrix clause. Next, I present evidence supporting the existence of Δ in the backward control configuration. Finally, I provide a formal analysis of the construction. I show that a pro-based approach (Cormack and Smith 2002) faces empirical challenges, while a control-is-movement analysis (Hornstein 1999; Polinsky and Potsdam 2002) is able to account for the construction.

2. Korean persuade is object control not ECM

In this section, I present evidence from the non-control structure, passive/active synonymy and selectional restrictions suggesting that Korean persuade not be treated as an ECM predicate. The reason for making this

3. Other predicates that appear to license this configuration are kangyohata ‘force,’ chwungkohata ‘advise’ and ceyanhata ‘suggest.’
4. While empirically motivating the backward control structure in (4), I make no claims as to whether Δ is a phonologically empty lexical item, such as pro or PRO, or whether it represents an empty specifier position that is not lexically filled at Spell-Out. The nature of Δ is discussed in Section 5.
contrast is that ECM predicates license an accusative/nominative case alternation similar to (2) in Korean (Lee 1992). This is illustrated in (5).

(5) Joe-nun Mary-lul/ka yeyppu-ta-ko mit-nun-ta
    Joe-Top Mary-Acc/Nom pretty-Decl-Comp believe-Pres-Decl
    ‘Joe believes Mary to be pretty.’

I argue that Korean persuade selects for the case alternating DP and places selectional restrictions on it, while Korean ECM predicates do not.

2.1. Non-control

The non-control version of Korean persuade can license an additional overt internal argument, as in (6). This suggests that Korean persuade selects for three arguments: the matrix subject, a clausal complement and an object DP complement.

(6) Chelswu-nun Yenghi-lul/eykey Swuyeng-i kakey-ey
    Chelswu-Top Yenghi-Acc/Dat Swuyeng-Nom store-Loc
    ka-yaha-n-ta-ko seltukha-ess-ta
    go-should-Pres-Decl-Comp persuade-Past-Decl
    ‘Chelswu persuaded Yenghi that Swuyeng should go to the store.’

Conversely, Korean ECM predicates cannot license an additional overt argument, as in (7). This suggests that Korean ECM predicates select for only two arguments: a matrix subject and a clausal complement.

(7) *Chelswu-nun Yenghi-lul Swuyeng-i yeyppu-ta-ko
    Chelswu-Top Yenghi-Acc Swuyeng-Nom pretty-Decl-Comp
    mit-ess-ta believe-Past-Decl
    (*Chelswu believed Yenghi Swuyeng to be pretty.’)

The evidence presented here indicates that Korean persuade and Korean ECM predicates have different subcategorization frames. The former selects for three arguments while the latter selects for two.

2.2. Passive/active synonymy

Additional evidence against an ECM analysis of Korean persuade arises from the fact that the passive and active forms of the embedded clause are not synonymous under Korean persuade. In the active (8a),
Yenghi is the entity being persuaded. Conversely, in the passive (8b), Swuyeng is interpreted as the object of persuade.

(8) a. Chelswu-nun Yenghi-lul/ka Swuyeng-ul
    Chelswu-Top Yenghi-Acc/Nom Swuyeng-acc
    intephyu ha-tolok seltuka-ess-ta
    interview do-Comp persuade-Past-Decl
    ‘Chelswu persuaded Yenghi to interview Swuyeng.’

    b. Chelswu-nun Swuyeng-%ul/i Yenghi-eykey
        Chelswu-Top Swuyeng-Acc/Nom Yenghi-Dat
        intephyu pat-tolok seltukha-ess-ta
        interview Pass-Comp persuade-Past-Decl
        ‘Chelswu persuaded Swuyeng to be interviewed by Yenghi.’ (≠8a)

The lack of synonymy between the active and the passive suggests that Korean persuade is selecting for the persuadee DP. If ECM predicates do not select for the case alternating DP, then we expect the passive and active forms to be synonymous, as illustrated in (9).

(9) a. Chelswu-nun Yenghi-ka Swuyeng-ul
    Chelswu-Top Yenghi-Nom Swuyeng-Acc
    manna-ass-ta-ko mit-ess-ta
    meet-Past-Decl-Comp believe-Past-Decl
    ‘Chelswu believed (that) Yenghi met Swuyeng.’

    b. Chelswu-nun Swuyeng-i Yenghi-ey wihayse
        Chelswu-Top Swuyeng-Nom Yenghi-by
        manna-ci-ess-ta-ko mit-ess-ta
        meet-Pass-Past-Decl-Comp believe-Past-Decl
        ‘Chelswu believed Swuyeng was met by Yenghi.’ (=9a)

Therefore, evidence from passive/active synonymy provides additional support for the claim that Korean ECM predicates do not select for the case alternating DP, while Korean persuade does.

2.3. Selectional restrictions

The final argument against an ECM analysis of Korean persuade arises from the fact that a non-persuadable entity in the case alternating position creates an anomalous reading, as in (10). This is expected if persuade is selecting for the case alternating DP.
(10) #Chelswu-nun tol-ul/i tteleci-tolok seltukha-ess-ta
Chelswu-Top rock-Acc/Nom fall-Comp persuade-Past-Decl
‘#Chelswu persuaded the rocks to fall.’

If ECM predicates do not select for the case alternating DP, then we do not expect an anomalous interpretation, as confirmed by (11).

(11) Chelswu-nun  tol-i tteleci-n-ta-ko mit-ess-ta
Chelswu-Top rock-Nom fall-Pres-Decl-Comp believe-Past-Decl
‘Chelswu believed the rocks to be falling.’

These facts suggest that Korean persuade selects for and places semantic restrictions on the case alternating DP, while Korean ECM predicates do not.

2.4. Summary of Section 2

In Section 2, I argued that Korean persuade selects for three semantic arguments and places selectional restrictions on the case alternating DP, unlike Korean ECM predicates. Assuming that argument selection is local, these facts suggest a control analysis. In Section 3, I address the constituency structures for (2).

3. Constituent analysis

In this section, I present two plausible constituent structure analyses to account for (2). According to the Subject/Object Analysis (SOA), the nominative persuadee DP is a constituent of the embedded clause, as in (12a). When the persuadee DP shows accusative case, however, it is a constituent of the matrix clause, as in (12b).

(12) a. Chelswu-nun [Yenghi-ka kakey-ey ka-tolok]
Chelswu-Top Yenghi-Nom store-Loc go-Comp
seltukha-ess-ta persuade-Past-Decl
‘Chelswu persuaded Yenghi to go to the store.’

b. Chelswu-nun Yenghi-lul [kakey-ey ka-tolok]
Chelswu-Top Yenghi-Acc store-Loc go-Comp
seltukha-ess-ta persuade-Past-Decl
‘Chelswu persuaded Yenghi to go to the store.’
The alternative to the SOA that I propose is the Object Analysis (OA). The OA claims that the case alternating DP is always a constituent of the matrix clause, as in (13). Under this analysis, only a forward control configuration is licensed. The OA does, however, require that nominative case be licensed on the complement of Korean *persuade*.

(13) Chelswu-nun Yenghi-lul/ka [kakey-ey ka-tolok]
    Chelswu-Top Yenghi-Acc/Nom store-Loc go-Comp
    seltukha-ess-ta
    persuade-Past-Decl
    ‘Chelswu persuaded Yenghi to go to the store.’

In the following subsections, I present evidence from the monoclausal structure, temporal adverb scope and scrambling showing that the OA is empirically inadequate. It predicts that the nominative and accusative persuadee should behave similarly. It is evident, by the facts discussed below, that this is false. The SOA, however, predicts these facts.

### 3.1. Monoclausal structure

Accusative but not nominative case is permitted on the persuadee DP in the monoclausal structure, as in (14).

(14) Chelswu-nun Yenghi-lul/*ka seltukha-ess-ta
    Chelswu-Top Yenghi-Acc/*Nom persuade-Past-Decl
    ‘Chelswu persuaded Yenghi.’

The OA does not predict this contrast because nominative case should be licensed in this position. The SOA makes this prediction, as accusative is the only structural case permitted on the complement of Korean *persuade*.

### 3.2. Temporal adverb distribution

Temporal adverbs in Korean are clause-bound in their scope (Yoon 1996). In the construction under investigation, a matrix adverb can follow the accusative marked persuadee DP, while it cannot follow the nominative persuadee DP. This is illustrated in (15).

(15) Chelswu-nun Yenghi-lul/*ka nayil kakey-ey
    Chelswu-Top Yenghi-Acc/*Nom tomorrow store-Loc
    mayil ka-tolok seltukha-lke-ya
    every day go-Comp persuade-Fut-Decl
    ‘Chelswu will persuade Yenghi tomorrow to go to the store every day.’
The OA predicts the grammaticality of (16). The accusative DP is a constituent of the matrix clause, and therefore, the temporal adverb can still be interpreted with matrix scope.

\[(16)\] Chelswu-nun Yenghi-lul nayil [kakey-ey Chelswu-Top Yenghi-Acc tomorrow store-Loc mayil ka-tolok] seltukha-lke-ya
\[\text{every day go-Comp persuade-Fut-Decl} \]
\[\text{‘Chelswu will persuade Yenghi tomorrow to go to the store every day.’}\]

According to the OA, (17) is also expected to be grammatical for the same reasons that explained the acceptability of (16). This is because the OA predicts both the accusative and nominative persuadee DP to pattern similarly. Its ungrammaticality indicates that the OA is inadequate.

\[(17)\] *Chelswu-nun Yenghi-ka nayil [kakey-ey Chelswu-Top Yenghi-Nom tomorrow store-Loc mayil ka-tolok] seltukha-lke-ya
\[\text{every day go-Comp persuade-Fut-Decl} \]
\[\text{‘Chelswu will persuade Yenghi tomorrow to go to the store every day.’}\]

The SOA makes the same predictions as the OA when the persuadee DP is marked with accusative case. Under both analyses, it is a constituent of the matrix clause. Where the two analyses differ, however, is with respect to the nominative marked persuadee DP. According to the SOA, the nominative persuadee is a constituent of the embedded clause.

\[(18)\] *Chelswu-nun [Yenghi-ka nayil kakey-ey Chelswu-Top Yenghi-Nom tomorrow store-Loc mayil ka-tolok] seltukha-lke-ya
\[\text{every day go-Comp persuade-Fut-Decl} \]
\[\text{‘Chelswu will persuade Yenghi tomorrow to go to the store every day.’}\]

The matrix adverb is then unable to take matrix scope, and the SOA predicts the ungrammaticality of (18).

### 3.3. Scrambling

In this section, I present evidence from scrambling, showing that the OA is inadequate. The embedded clause is unable to scramble without the nominative marked DP, while the accusative persuadee DP is able to appear in post-embedded clause position, as in (19). The SOA, however, predicts the contrast between the nominative and accusative DP.
(19) Chelswu-nun kakey-ey ka-tolok Yenghi-lul/*ka
    Chelswu-Top store-Loc go-Comp Yenghi-Acc/*Nom
    seltukha-ess-ta
    persuade-Past-Decl
    ‘Chelswu persuaded Yenghi to go to the store.’

    The OA fails to predict the contrast between the grammatical (20), with
    accusative case, and the ungrammatical (21), with nominative case. This is
    because, according to the OA, the persuadee DP is always a constituent of
    the matrix clause. Therefore, the OA incorrectly predicts that the embedded
    clause should be able to scramble without either the nominative or
    accusative DP.

    (20) Chelswu-nun [kakey-ey ka-tolok], Yenghi-lul ti
        Chelswu-Top store-Loc go-Comp Yenghi-Acc
        seltukha-ess-ta
        persuade-Past-Decl
        ‘Chelswu persuaded Yenghi to go to the store.’

    (21) *Chelswu-nun [kakey-ey ka-tolok], Yenghi-ka ti
        Chelswu-Top store-Loc go-Comp Yenghi-Nom
        seltukha-ess-ta
        persuade-Past-Decl
        ‘Chelswu persuaded Yenghi to go to the store.’

    According to the SOA, the nominative persuadee DP is a constituent of
    the embedded clause. Therefore, the embedded clause is unable to scramble
    without the nominative persuadee, as in (23).

    (22) Chelswu-nun [kakey-ey ka-tolok], Yenghi-lul ti
        Chelswu-Top store-Loc go-Comp Yenghi-Acc
        seltukha-ess-ta
        persuade-Past-Decl
        ‘Chelswu persuaded Yenghi to go to the store.’

    (23) *Chelswu-nun kakey-ey ka-tolok, [Yenghi-ka ti]
        Chelswu-top store-Loc go-Comp Yenghi-Nom
        seltukha-ess-ta
        persuade-Past-Decl
        ‘Chelswu persuaded Yenghi to go to the store.’

    The SOA predicts the contrast between the grammatical (22), with
    accusative case, and the ungrammatical (23), with nominative case.
3.4. Summary of Section 3

In Section 3, I argued that a difference in case equates to a difference in syntactic position, as predicted by the SOA. When the persuadee DP is accusative, it is a constituent of the matrix clause. When the persuadee DP is nominative, however, it is a constituent of the embedded clause, as in (4).

4. Evidence for \( \Delta \)

In this section, I present evidence from quantifier agreement and reflexive binding supporting the existence of a silent element \( \Delta \) in the matrix clause under backward control.

4.1. Quantifier agreement

Postnominal quantifiers in Korean must agree in case with the head noun (Cho 2000). Nominative case is illicit on the quantifier in (24), because the modified nominal shows accusative case.

(24) Mary-ka haksayng-tul-ul motwu-lul/*ka sohwanha-ess-ta
Mary-Nom student-Pl-Acc all-Acc/*Nom call-Past-Decl
‘Mary called all the students.’ (Cho 2000:194)

In the construction under investigation, an accusative quantified DP can appear in post-embedded clause position. Notice that both the DP and post-nominal quantifier show accusative case.

Chelswu-Top store-Loc go-Comp child-Pl-Acc all-Acc
seltukha-ess-ta persuade-Past-Decl
‘Chelswu persuaded all the children to go to the store.’

The persuadee DP in (26) shows nominative and is, therefore, a constituent of the embedded clause. The quantifier shows accusative and is a constituent of the matrix clause. In the absence of a silent element licensing the quantifier in the matrix clause, this should be illicit.

(26) Chelswu-nun [ai-tul-i kakey-ey ka-tolok]
Chelswu-Top child-Pl-Nom store-Loc go-Comp
motwu-lul seltukha-ess-ta persuade-Past-Decl
‘Chelswu persuaded all the children to go to the store.’
I argue that the acceptability of (26) can be attributed to the embedded subject being coindexed with \(\Delta\) in the matrix clause. This licenses the accusative case on the quantifier.

\[
(27) \text{Chelswu-nun } \langle \text{ai-tul-i kakey-ey ka-tolok} \rangle \Delta_i \\
\text{Chelswu-Top child-Pl-Nom store-Loc go-Comp} \\
motwu-lul seltukha-ess-ta \\
\text{all-Acc persuade-Past-Decl} \\
\text{‘Chelswu persuaded all the children to go to the store.’}
\]

4.2. Reflexive binding

The reflexive anaphor \textit{kunyecasin} ‘herself’ is governed by Condition A of the Binding Theory (Yoon 1989). In (28), the reflexive is in a matrix VP adjunct and is coindexed with the embedded subject.\(^5\) This should be illicit.

\[
(28) \text{Chelswu-nun } \langle \text{Yenghi-ka i ka-tolok} \rangle \langle \text{PP kunyecasin-uyi} \rangle \\
\text{Chelswu-Top Yenghi-Nom go-Comp herself-Gen} \\
yuik-ul wihay] seltukha-ess-ta \\
\text{benefit-Acc for persuade-Past-Decl} \\
\text{‘Chelswu, for herself’s benefit, persuaded Yenghii to go.’}
\]

I claim, however, that its acceptability is due to \(\Delta\) in the matrix clause, which licenses the reflexive by satisfying Condition A.

\[
(29) \text{Chelswu-nun } \langle \text{Yenghi-ka i ka-tolok} \rangle \Delta_i \langle \text{PP kunyecasin-ul} \rangle \\
\text{Chelswu-Top Yenghi-Nom go-Comp herself.Acc} \\
yuik-ul wihay] seltukha-ess-ta \\
\text{benefit-Acc for persuade-Past-Decl} \\
\text{‘Chelswu, for herself’s benefit, persuaded Yenghii to go.’}
\]

5. Formal analysis

In this section, my goal is to address the identity of \(\Delta\). PRO is inadequate for reasons discussed in Polinsky and Potsdam (2002). I do, however, present empirical problems in extending to Korean the \textit{pro}-based alternative offered by Cormack and Smith (2002) for Tsez backward control. Consequently, I argue that a control-is-movement analysis accounts for the Korean backward control data.

\(^5\) The PP adjunct with the reflexive is also permitted in pre-embedded clause position. The reason for presenting (28) instead of this example was so that it would be clear that the PP adjunct is a constituent of the matrix clause and not the embedded clause.
5.1. Pro-based account

According to the pro-based account, the null element in (3) and (4) is pro. Initially, this analysis seems promising, as Korean is a null object language (Cole 1987). Polinsky and Potsdam (2002: fn. 17) provide three arguments against a pro-based account. First, pro c-commands its antecedent. This is a Condition C violation. Second, pro cannot account for the obligatory control relationship. Third, the null element does not alternate with an overt pronoun. Cormack and Smith (2002) provide solutions to two of these problems in order to salvage a pro-based approach to backward control in Tsez. First, under their analysis, pro would be generated in a position where it does not c-command Yenghi. This structure is lexically determined. Extended to Korean, it is presented in (30).

(30) [TP Chelswu [VP [CP Yenghi store go] [V′ [DP pro] persuaded]]]

Second, they present a Meaning Postulate that coindexes the embedded agent with pro. This creates the obligatory control interpretation.6

(31) ∀s∀x∀y[PERSUADE.s,x,y → x is an agent in the event given by s]
Where type x, y = ‹e›, type s = ‹t›

5.2. Problems with the pro-based account

As Cormack and Smith (2002) note, a distributively quantified DP should be illicit in embedded subject position.7 This is because a variable/binding configuration would not exist, as pro is generated out of the c-command domain of the quantified DP. Korean, however, permits a distributively quantified DP in subject position, as in (32). This suggests that Δ is not pro, because if pro is generated in either pre- or post-embedded clause position, there is no variable/binding configuration.

‘Chelswu persuaded each child to do the homework.’

6. The Meaning Postulate presented by Cormack and Smith (2002) was formulated for subject control. In (31), I revise it for object control predicates.
7. This is the case in Tsez where distributively quantified DPs are not permitted in the backward control configuration (Cormack and Smith 2002).
Furthermore, because the Meaning Postulate makes reference only to semantic function, it incorrectly predicts that *pro* be interpreted with the agent of the passivized embedded clause.

(8b’)

Chelswu-nun [Swuyeng-i Yenghi-eykey intephyu
Chelswu-Top Swuyeng-Nom Yenghi-Dat interview
pat-tolok] seltukha-ess-ta
pass-Comp persuade-Past-Decl
‘Chelswu persuaded Swuyeng to be interviewed by Yenghi.’
‘*Chelswu persuaded Yenghi i
    that Swuyeng interview heri.’

In (8b’), *Yenghi* is the agent of the embedded clause. *Swuyeng* is the subject of the embedded clause and is interpreted as the persuadee. The Meaning Postulate in (31) predicts that *Yenghi* and not *Swuyeng* be interpreted as the persuadee. This, however, is the incorrect interpretation.

Finally, as it has been argued, Korean licenses both forward and backward control. We are therefore required to posit a lexically marked structure for backward control and a different lexically determined structure for forward control. Intuitively, this seems less than ideal.

### 5.3. Control-is-movement account

Following previous research, nominative case is licensed on the subject of [-tense] clauses in Korean because of a default nominative case (DNC) mechanism. The DNC inserts nominative case at PF on DPs that do not receive structural case by Spell-Out (Kim 1990; Kang 1998).

In my analysis of backward control in Korean, I assume the version of feature driven-movement proposed in Chomsky (2000). First, however, the forward control derivation of (3) is presented in (33).

(33) Chelswu-Top [,p Yenghi-Acc [vp Yenghi [cp [tp Yenghi [p Yenghi store go]] Comp] persuaded]]

The DP *Yenghi* is first Merged into embedded spec,\(v^o\). There, it absorbs the 0-role of the embedded verb. Then, it raises into embedded spec,\(T^o\) to delete the uninterpretable \(\phi\)-features of \(T^o\). Spell-Out does not apply and the DNC is not activated. Therefore, *Yenghi* must move into the matrix clause

---

8. See Schütze (2001) for arguments that all languages invoke some default case mechanism, and that default case is inherent to UG.

9. Hornstein (1999) does not develop the mechanics of how 0-roles are assigned or checked. For present purposes, I assume that 0-roles are absorbed by an XP from V\(^o\), and the information of that 0-role is stored on that XP.
in the overt syntax for case purposes. It moves into spec, Vº and absorbs the internal θ-role of persuade. Still in the overt syntax, it moves into the outer matrix spec, vº to be assigned accusative case and to delete the uninterpretable φ-features of vº.

The backward control phrase marker at Spell-Out is presented in (34) for the derivation of (4).

(34) Chelswu-Top [íp [VP [CP [TP Yenghi-Nom [íp Yenghi store go]] Comp] persuaded]]

First, Yenghi is Merged into embedded spec, vº and absorbs the θ-role of go. Then, it moves into embedded spec, Tº and deletes the uninterpretable φ-features of Tº. Spell-Out applies and the DNC is activated. Yenghi is marked with default nominative case at PF. Yenghi, however, is still not assigned case in the phrase marker sent to LF, and the direct object θ-role of persuade is still unabsorbed. Furthermore, the uninterpretable φ-features of vº are still not deleted.

(35) Chelswu-Top [íp Yenghi-Acc [íp Yenghi [CP [TP Yenghi [íp Yenghi store go]] Comp]] persuaded]]

In order to amend these problems, Yenghi moves covertly into the matrix clause.10 First, it moves into spec, Vº to absorb the direct object θ-role of persuade. Then, it moves into spec, vº to be assigned accusative case and to delete the uninterpretable φ-features of matrix vº. The derivation is now complete.

6. Conclusion

This paper adds to the growing number of backward control cases documented cross-linguistically. I have presented novel empirical evidence supporting the existence of the backward object control configuration in Korean. Furthermore, I showed that a pro-based approach was empirically inadequate. I extended the backward subject control analysis (Polinsky and Potsdam 2002) to backward object control. Under backward object control in Korean, both an unabsorbed θ-role and a case unassigned nominal motivate the covert movement. Covert movement in Polinsky and Potsdam (2002) was motivated solely by θ-requirements. Next, I proposed that the default nominative case strategy is responsible for the case alternation. Tsez does not license the forward/backward control alternation, nor does it show

a case alternation. I leave the interpretative consequences of these alternations for future research.
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