1. Preliminaries

Much ink has been spilt over Korean auxiliary verbs since Choe (1937/1961). The main issues include the meanings of auxiliary verbs, the list of auxiliary verbs, and auxiliary verb constructions as both syntactic and morphological constructions. On the other hand, a few researchers have regarded auxiliary verbs as linguistic...
forms which express the grammatical categories of aspect and modality.

I myself argued in Yi (1995) that auxiliary verbs are dependent verbs [DVs] which require an embedded complement clause syntactically. And Heo (1991), Yi (1992), Im · Jang (1995), Bag (1998) and others persist in the same opinion, too. Therefore, I premise that auxiliary verb constructions like (1a) have structures like (1b) without additional argumentation. And I will use ‘DV’ instead of ‘auxiliary verbs’ for object in question in order to show its exact syntactic characters.

(1) a. Cheolsu-ga bbang-eul meog-eo beoli-eoss-da.²
   (Cheolsu has eaten the bread.)
   
   b. [[[Cheolsu-ga [e₁ bbang-eul meog-eo]cp beoli]-eoss]-da].

(2) [[[Cheolsu-ga [bbang-eul [meog-eo beoli]]]-eoss]-da].

Interestingly, Gim (1993), Yi (1995), and a number of others point out that auxiliary verb constructions have characteristics of both the complex sentence like (1b) and the simple sentence like (2). Originally ‘e₁ bbang-eul meog-eo’ is realized as the complement clause of the DV ‘beoli-’, but ‘meog-eo beoli-’ acts like one verb constituent and the full sentence is understood as a simple sentence as seen in the structure of (2).³

Choe (1988) explains that the original structure of (1b) changes into that of (2) by a restructuring rule [RR], and Yi (1995) accepts

---

2. Yi (1995: 64) argues that ending ‘-eo’ has no meaning or a very weak and unseizable meaning. For allomorphs of ‘-eo’, there are ‘-a’, ‘-yeo’.

3. Gim (1993) describes obviously about this, and I quote his description here. Gim (1993) points both the characteristics of simple sentence and those of complex sentence in DVCs. The impossibility of the separation DVs from the preceding verbs, the impossibility of scrambling (inversion of word order), the impossibility of paraphrasing by cleft-sentence and the impossibility of gapping show the former. On the contrary, the generality and productivity of DVCs, the reiteration of the same DVs, the aspects of realization of ‘-(eu)si-’ (honorific morpheme in Korean) and anaphora phenomena show the latter.
it. It is as follows.

(3) a. Superscript every intermediate X-head between a target and a trigger including the target and trigger (= make all the categorial dependency links between a trigger of RR and its target the categorial dependency relation of trigger).
   b. Index (superscript) percolation within RRed projections (because of X-bar conventions/feature percolation conventions).

She defined the categorial dependency [CD] link as follows.

(4) a. X and Y form a categorial dependency link iff (= if and only if) X governs the projection of Y.
   b. If X governs the projection of Y, X and Y are [+CD], and [-CD], respectively, where 0 < j < n+1.

To make a long story short, she claimed that if there are CD links you should superscript X-heads between the target and the trigger. She asserts that RR is adapted not to lexemes itself but to lexical categories for both head-first languages like Chichewa and head-final languages like Korean. Accordingly, her RR gets cross-linguistic basis. It can be said that every DV inscribes a script of itself on a preceding verb which it governs and forms a complex predicate by RR.

Restructuring is similar to traditional reanalysis. About this, Choe (1988: 522) said that while reanalysis offends the projection principle, restructuring does not because restructuring is obtained not by a reanalysis but by a process that affects categorial projections so that those affected projections are not visible with respect to syntactic processes. The RR cannot change the categories, and restructuring is covert, not overt.

RR is very effective to explain the aspect of the combination of

---
4. She distinguishes the lexeme itself ‘head’ from the lexical category ‘X-head’.
‘-(eu)si-’ in cases that DVs come out not less than two. See (5).  

(5) Seonsaengnim-kkeseo Cheolsu-leul manna-a bo-a ju-si-eoss-da.

\[ \begin{array}{ccc}
\text{HON} & \text{NOM} & \text{ACC} \\
\text{HON PAST DCL} & \\
\end{array} \]

(My teacher met Cheolsu for him/me/another person.)

There is a CD link in (5), that is, the DVs govern the preceding verbs and are very weak semantically, so index (= script) transfers from the verb ‘ju-’ of the matrix sentence to that (bo-) of the embedded sentence and from the verb ‘bo-’ of the matrix sentence to that (manna-) of the embedded sentence successively, then the three predicates become to bear the same index consequently. Therefore, a complex predicate which has a common index is formed. The phenomenon that ‘-(eu)si-’ is combined only with the last DV is easily understandable with respect to this process of restructuring.

I will describe the aspects of the realization of arguments in DVCs of Korean on the basis of the above explanations. As DVCs are those which have two predicates, those include two subjects (one is that of the matrix clause; the other is that of the embedded clause). In general, however, only one of the two is realized, so I will explain the syntactic phenomenon and then how the arguments of DV ‘ju-’, ‘ji-’ are realized because how the arguments of these two DVs are realized is highly complicated.

---

6. RR also seems to be useful for explaining dependent noun constructions because they and DVCs have the same character with respect to the distribution of negative polarity items. About this, you can refer to Im (1991: 76-90).
2. The Subjects of Embedded Clauses of DVCs

Generally, there is one overt subject in DVCs. As I presuppose that DVCs embed complement clauses, they are necessarily the constructions which have two subjects. Then it necessarily causes the question which subject does not appear of the two subjects of the matrix clause and the embedded clause.

The subject of the matrix clause cannot be an empty category [EC], the reason being as follows. First, there is no case in which the subject of a matrix clause except pro is an EC cross-linguistically. As pro is licensed by an agreement morpheme, then a pro subject of matrix clauses cannot be licensed in Korean which has no agreement morphemes. Secondly, as it is natural that the following NP co-referential with the antecedent NP be realized as an EC from the viewpoint for linguistic universals. Thirdly, the subject of the embedded clause cannot c-commands that of the matrix clause structurally, so if we regard the subject of the matrix clause as an EC, then we cannot make sure syntactically that it is co-referential with that of the embedded clause.

There are two possibilities when we regard the subject of the embedded sentence as an EC. The one possibility is that the subject of the embedded clause is an EC and is controlled by the subject of the matrix clause according to the Control Theory. The other is that the subject of the embedded clause is raised to the position of the subject of the matrix clause and only a trace remains at the former position.

---

7. Originally auxiliary verbs were main verbs in Early English according to Bag (1991: 614). He reported that the former forms of the present auxiliary verbs had each subject of themselves in Early English and that those also had a complement clause which had a co-referential PRO with the subject of matrix clause.
But the EC is not by movement regardless of the direction of the movement, in other words, it is not a trace. The reason is as follows. Firstly, as both the subjects of the matrix clause and the embedded clause are in the position of argument (so-called A-position) and it is almost impossible to move the subject from an A-position to another A-position, then the EC is not a trace. Secondly, it is an undesirable downward movement that the subject of the matrix clause moves to the position of the subject of the embedded clause. Thirdly, the operation that the subject of the embedded clause moves to the subject position of the matrix clause is generally possible in case that it moves in order to be assigned a case in a raising construction, but the position of the subject of the embedded sentence is already a position in which a case can be assigned, so the motive of the movement lacks.

Now there remains only one question of what the EC subject of the embedded sentence is. It may be either PRO or pro from the viewpoint of GB theory. About this, some researchers may assume an equi-NP deletion rule as almost early transformational grammarians did. But there are a few cases in which it cannot explain linguistic data, for example, quantifier constructions. See the sentences which include universal quantifiers.

   NOM NOMINAL ACC PAST DCL

   (Everyone wants everyone else to die.)

   (Everyone wants to die.)

(6a) allows both readings of (6b) and (6c). If the equi-NP deletion rule is justifiable, (6b) must be able to transform to (6a). But (6b) does not allow the reading of (6c), while the only reading of (6b) is that everyone wants everyone else to die, therefore the equi-NP deletion rule which transforms (6b) to (6a) cannot be justified.
Consequently, as the subject of the embedded clause is an EC, the question reduces to whether it is PRO or pro. Both PRO and pro are covert and non-phonetic entities. PRO is pronominal and anaphoric simultaneously. Anaphors should be bound in its government category according to the Binding Principle A and pronominals should be free in its government category according to the Binding Principle B, therefore PRO has no government category in order to observe both the Principle A and B. That is, PRO should not be governed. This is well known as PRO theorem. On the other hand, there is an EC which is governed by agreement [AGR] like tense, person, gender, number in Romance languages, for example Italian. Its character collides with that of PRO as an anaphor, so it is regarded as a sort of pronominals, that is pro. In short, pro is a kind of non-phonetic (this is, covert) pronominals.\footnote{See Riemsdijk & Williams (1986: Ch. 8), Haegeman (1991: Ch. 5) about PRO and see Haegeman (1991: Ch. 8) about pro.}

The fact that PRO is set up in the embedded clause which has INFL phrase [IP] like the infinitive clause and the gerund clause in English is parallel to the fact that an overt tense category is not realized in the embedded clauses of the DVCs in Korean. In addition, (1b) observes PRO theorem. That is, PRO is located within the barrier CP which blocks the government by an exterior element and there is no exterior element which governs it and assigns a case to it in the embedded clause. It is natural, therefore, that the DVC be regarded as a Control construction for PRO. Furthermore, as the subject of the matrix clause and the embedded clause are the same generally in DVCs, so it is reasonable that we explain that DVs are those which trigger the Subject-Control construction. According to that, DVs get attached in a natural set.

But Heo (1991: 60) argues that as PRO is assigned a case by TENSE or non-phonetic AGR and it runs counter PRO theorem, so this empty category is not PRO but pro which is the non-phonetic entity. See (7).
He argues that although the embedded clause has no tense, its subject is assigned a subject case in a sentence like (7), the existence of non-phonetic AGR is confirmed. Surely such assertion is fairly reasonable from a standpoint of the standard GB theory. As long as the presupposition which AGR assigns the subject case is not proved yet, however, Heo (1990)’s opinion that non-phonetic AGR and pro exist can be criticized for its character of a circular argument.

When we adopt a foreign linguistic theory, we should give special attention to the Korean. Generally, pro is licensed in the languages in which AGR assigns the subject case to the subject structurally. It is true that describing that INFL elements like AGR or TENSE assigns the subject case is helpful to explain the distribution of the subject case in many languages, but we cannot ascertain the existence of AGR elements and cannot discover any evidence which shows that TENSE assigns the subject case to the subject in Korean. The honorific form ‘-(eu)si-’ is surely relevant to the subject, but it is not easy to say that it is an AGR form which can assign the subject case because ‘-(eu)si-’ does not always respect the referent of the subject and, syntactically, it is omitted freely as it is used on the basis of pragmatic consideration.

Briefly speaking, I doubt the existence of IP which has VP as a complement and the subject as SPEC in Korean. Eom (1990) holds the same opinion. Although Fukui (1986) about Japanese and Heycock & Lee (1990) about Korean do not deny the existence of IP itself, they also argue that INFL elements like AGR and TENSE do not assign the subject case.

---

9. For instance, in a Korean sentence “Abeoji-ga don-i manh-eusi-da (Father has much money),” ‘-eusi-’ doesn’t respect ‘don’ but ‘abeoji (father)’, nevertheless the subject of the predicate ‘manh-’ is still ‘don (money)’.
Whether or not the TENSE element is overt is a key to solve the question whether pro is justifiable or not, but it is not a key to solve the question whether the TENSE element can assign the subject case or not in Korean. Therefore, it does not matter whether the subject of the embedded clause is PRO or pro in Korean. Perhaps those who believe in the Binding Principle, PRO theorem, and the idea that an INFL element like AGR or TENSE assigns the subject case would not agree with me. But if we accept the fact that the complementary distribution of PRO and pro which supports the Binding Principle A & B is not perfect,\(^{10}\) then PRO theorem becomes not strict. That is, PRO theorem cannot show a perfect truth but a general tendency.

Let us think about the discrimination between PRO and pro again. It was when they paid their attention to the languages which had much developed AGRs that they distinguished the two in GB theory. So they regarded the EC which is governed by AGR as pro according to PRO theorem. It can be said that such an assertion was like a triumphal song of GB theory, for the fact is very clear and systematic that PRO and an overt NP, PRO and pro show complementary distributions. Certainly, however, the fact does not apply to Korean as well because it is very doubtful that there exists AGR, and, if any, AGR is able to assign the subject case in Korean. Therefore, we do not have to endorse GB theory as it is in distinguishing between PRO and pro in Korean. Henceforth, I will regard PRO as a syntactic EC with which we can find out a co-referential element in a sentence and pro as a pragmatic EC of which we can make certain of the existence through the context in discourse.

Huang (1984) has made a suggestion about this matter. According to Huang, even when there is no AGR, pro appears in Chinese, Japanese, and Korean. As Haegeman (1991: 418) says, Huang’s opinion is hard to accept from a standpoint of the standard GB

---

\(^{10}\) Chomsky (1986: 170) refers to the imperfection.
theory because the ungoverned pro cannot be justifiable in it. Consequently, there is much likelihood that pro in Chinese, Japanese, and Korean exists with the help of the context in the discourse. See (8).

(8) Question: Cheolsu-ga ga-ni? o-ni?
(Does Cheolsu go? Does Cheolsu come?)
Answer: e, o-nda.
(He comes.)

For example, the EC in the answer of (8) exists not as an AGR element but with the help of context because there is no AGR in the sentence.

The above assertion is pretty far from the standard GB theory but it is not so as it seems. The Control construction of PRO can exist in the sentences in which there is an antecedent and pro exists essentially by AGR in some Romance languages. But in researching languages which do not have AGR, we should assume a parameter through which pro is understood pragmatically.

Consequently, I conclude that the subject of the embedded clause in DVCs is PRO. PRO is preferable to pro in it because of two merits. Firstly, we can compose a natural set which is the Subject-Control construction in which the subject of the embedded clause is an EC. Secondly, It is an essential character of PRO that there must be a co-referential antecedent with it in a sentence.\footnote{Surely, there are some cases that pro had a antecedent, but it is not essential. Essentially, PRO presupposes the existence of a co-referential NP in a sentence and pro presupposes the government by AGR.}
3. Aspects of the Realization of the Arguments of DV ‘ju’, ‘ji’

3.1. ‘ju’

DV ‘ju’\textsuperscript{12} has been very controversial. Son (1993) says that DVs is irrelevant to the arguments in a sentence and such assertion is reasonable at large. But it is not always so. See (9).

\begin{align*}
(9) & a. \text{Cheolsu-ga Yeonghui-ege chaeg-eul ilg-eoss-da.} \\
& \text{(Cheolsu read a book to Yeonghui.)}
\\
& b. \text{Cheolsu-ga Yeonghui-ege chaeg-eul ilg-eo ju-eoss-da.} \\
& \text{(Cheolsu read a book to Yeonghui.)}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
(10) & a. \ast \text{Cheolsu-ga Yeonghui-ege Sunhui-leul manna-ass-da.} \\
& \text{(Cheolsu met Sunhui for Yeonghui.)}
\\
& b. \ast \text{Cheolsu-ga Yeonghui-ege Sunhui-leul manna-a ju-eoss-da.} \\
& \text{(Cheolsu met Sunhui for Yeonghui.)}
\end{align*}

As (9a) is not acceptable, it is clear that the dative ‘Yeonghui-ge’ is not an argument of ‘ilg-(read)’. So we can recognize that DV ‘ju’ is an important factor in realizing the argument from the fact that (9b) is very natural.

On the other hand, the fact that both (10a) and (10b) are ungrammatical shows ‘ju’ has no role in realizing the dative argument. In short, some ‘ju’ can realize a dative argument but some cannot. Some researchers discussed the problem which ‘ju’

\textsuperscript{12} The original meaning of ‘ju’ is ‘give’ in English.
can and which ‘ju-’ cannot and Seo (1978) described the contents of the discussion, but there is little mutual consent in it. See (11)-(13).


Cheolsu bought a book for me.


Cheolsu threw bread to Yeonghui.


Cheolsu met Yeonghui.


Cheolsu met Sunhui for {Yeonghui, Sunhui}.


Cheolsu met Sunhui for {Yeonghui, Sunhui}.

If ‘chaeg’ is interpreted as an argument of ‘ju-’, (11) is a conjunctional sentence, but if not, it is a DVC. And if ‘ppang’ is interpreted of an argument of ‘ju-’, (12) is a conjunction sentence, but if not, it is a DVC. That is, as Gim (1987: 14) refers, (11) and (12) are structurally ambiguous. On the other hand, (13) is a DVC which cannot realize a dative NP.

Now let us take a look at the aspects of the realization of arguments in these sentences. We should remember that what the arguments of the predicate are in order to observe aspects of the realization of the arguments. ‘Ju-’ requires an AGENT argument,

13. This sentence entails the meaning ‘for the sake of someone except Cheolsu himself’.
a BENEFECTIVE argument, a THEME argument. ‘sa-(buy)’ requires an AGENT argument, a THEME argument, a SOURCE argument.\(^5\) A SOURCE argument is weakly required syntactically. ‘Deonji-’ requires an AGENT, a GOAL argument, a THEME argument. ‘Manna-’ requires an AGENT argument, a THEME argument.\(^6\)

According to the Projection Principle, the BENEFECTIVE ‘naege’ is realized in the matrix clause in (11), the GOAL or the BENEFECTIVE ‘Yeonghuiege’ is realized in the embedded clause or in the matrix sentence in (12). Now it is necessary to be explained that ‘Yeonghuiege’ is realized only once in (12). To make it easy, as the GOAL argument of the embedded clause and the BENEFECTIVE argument of the matrix clause are the same, then one of the two is not realized.

From the standpoint of GB theory, it can be said that the GOAL argument of the embedded clause is interpreted as pro. In other words, it is not PRO because it is properly governed by the predicate ‘deonji-’. Accordingly, if there is a co-referential argument

---

14. I use capital letters for the thematic roles (or \(\varepsilon\)-roles).
15. In the conventionalized sentence like “Geu-ga na-ege sul/bab-eul sa-ass-da (He treated me to a drink/meal),” it is possible to understand ‘sa-’ as what is a three-place predicate which requires an AGENT argument, a THEME argument and a BENEFECTIVE argument. But ‘sa-’ in this conventionalized case is understood as ‘sa-a ju- (buy for)’. In other words, generally speaking, ‘sa-’ requires an AGENT argument, a THEME argument, a SOURCE argument.
16. GOAL and BENEFECTIVE are not in the exclusive relation. It can be said that the dative NP which is an argument of ‘ju-’ has BENEFECTIVE, but from a viewpoint of the spatial movement, it can be said that it has GOAL. The fact that thematic roles is assumed differently according to different viewpoints like this is a shortcoming of the \(\varepsilon\)-role theory. In order to solve this problem, Jackendoff (1990) divides action-tier, thematic-tier, temporal-tier in which thematic roles are given. For example, Jackendoff (1990: 7.1.) explains that ‘the ball’ in “John threw the ball.” has THEME in Thematic-tier but has PATIENT in action-tier. Similarly, it can be said that the dative NP of ‘ju-’ has GOAL in Thematic-tier but has BENEFECTIVE in Action-tier. Jackendoff’s principle clearly goes against Fillmore (1968)’s or Chomsky (1981)’s which firmly maintains the principle of one-to-one correspondence of NP and \(\varepsilon\)-role, so-called \(\varepsilon\)-role criterion. The truth is up to accepting two semantic tiers or more. There is only one semantic tier in which \(\varepsilon\)-role is given in the theory which maintains \(\varepsilon\)-role criterion, but there are three tiers in Jackendoff (1990). Examining the exact thematic role of an argument is not relevant directly to the contents of this paper and I don’t examine more.
with the empty NP which is properly governed by a predicate in an embedded clause, it is reasonable to regard it as pro. But I have not distinguished PRO and pro depending on whether it is governed or not in above argument. That is, I have regarded PRO theorem as being imperfect. Instead, whether the argument which is co-referential with the empty category exists or not is crucial in judging whether the empty category is PRO or pro, so the empty category is PRO. In short, DV ‘ju-’ can trigger not only the Subject-Control construction but also the Dative-Control construction in the case that the predicate verb of the embedded clause requires a dative NP.

The BENEFECTIVE argument is not realized in (13a). Perhaps some may interpret ‘Yeonghui’ as the BENEFECTIVE referent. In other words, (13a) may be read for the meaning that Cheolsu met Yeonghui for the sake of Yeonghui. But such reading is questionable because, for example, the expression (13a) can be also used when Cheolsu met Yeonghui for another person. Therefore, it is judged not by syntactic consideration but by pragmatic consideration whether ‘Yeonghui’ is the BENEFECTIVE referent or not. But (13b) is ungrammatical which the BENEFECTIVE argument is realized as a dative NP, no matter it is ‘Yeonghuiege’ or ‘Sunhuiyege’, while only sentences like (13c) are grammatical.17 This is a contrast to (11) in which the BENEFECTIVE argument can be realized as a dative NP.

Now let us explain these two contrastive sentences. Above all, let us hypothesize that two NPs which bear a semantic feature [+ human] cannot appear twice successively, for both the BENEFECTIVE argument and the THEME argument are NPs which has a semantic feature [+ human] in (13). But such hypothesis is easily denied by following counterexamples in (14).

17. Of course, (13c) “Cheolsu-ga Sunhui-leul wiha-yeo Sunhui-leul manna-a ju-eoss-da” is somewhat odd. As most situations are cases in which someone meets Sunhui for Sunhui, the expression ‘Sunhui-leul wiha-yeo’ becomes redundant. But this consideration is not syntactic but pragmatic.
   \[\text{NOM } \text{DAT } \text{ACC } \text{PAST } \text{DCL}\]
   (Cheolsu took an examination for Yeonghui.)

   \[\text{NOM } \text{DAT } \text{ACC } \text{PAST } \text{DCL}\]
   (Cheolsu ate the bread for Yeonghui.)

(14a) and (14b) are ungrammatical although two NPs which bear a semantic feature [+human] do not appear twice successively. Accordingly, the above hypothesis is incorrect.

Secondly, let us hypothesize that this phenomenon results from a certain character of the verb of the embedded clause. More observations seem to support this hypothesis.

   (Yeonghui read a book for me.)

b. ??Yeonghui-ga na-ege chaeg-eul ilg-eoss-da.
   (Yeonghui read a book for me.)

   \[\text{TOP}\]
   (The book inspired me with a dream.)

   (The book inspired me with a dream.)

   (Cheolsu made me a time machine.)

b. ??Cheolsu-ga na-ege taimmeosin-eul mandeul-eoss-da.
   (Cheolsu made me a time machine.)

   \[\text{TOP}\]
   (Cheolsu chose a bicycle for Yeonghui.)

   \[\text{PAST}\]
   (Cheolsu chose a bicycle for Yeonghui.)

   (Cheolsu built a house for me.)

The verbs of the embedded clauses are ‘ilg-(read)’, ‘kiu-(enlarge)’, ‘mandeul-(make)’, ‘goll-(choose)’, ‘ji-(build)’ respectively and all the BENEFECTIVE arguments of ‘ju-’ are realized as dative NPs in (15a)-(19a). Considering (15b)-(19b) respectively, we can recognize that although those dative NPs are not the arguments of the embedded clause, sentences (15a)-(19a)\textsuperscript{18} are grammatical.

This phenomenon is caused by a semantic character of the verbs of the embedded clauses. In short, as ‘deonji-’ in (12) entails a [+ directional] feature for the THEME argument, that is, ‘deonji-’ has a GOAL argument, and the verbs of (15)-(19) entail a [+ potentially directional] feature for the THEME argument although those do not require a dative NP. In other words, although the verbs do not require a GOAL argument, namely a dative NP, those verbs are like what requires the THEME argument to bear the semantic feature [+ directional], for those require the THEME argument to bear the semantic feature [+ potentially directional]. Because the THEME argument can be shifted to another person after reading, enlarging, mading, choosing, and building. The object of the shift can be both concrete and abstract. For example, the abstract objects are shifted in (15) and (16), the concrete objects are shifted in (17)-(18).\textsuperscript{19} Although the THEME argument is concrete in (19), the real object of the shift is abstract, namely the ownership of the built house.\textsuperscript{20}

To sum up, in the case that the verb of the embedded clause

\textsuperscript{18} ‘Goll-’ is an allomorph of ‘goleu-’ and ‘ji-’ is an allomorph of ‘jis-’.

\textsuperscript{19} Some English ditransitive verbs bear the similar semantic character to the Korean verbs which require the BENEFECTIVE argument to have the [+potentially directional] feature. For example, if the English ditransitive verbs ‘get, find, leave, choose, build, read’ are translated into ‘guha-, balgyeonha-, namgi-, goleu-, jis-, ilg-’ of Korean respectively, these Korean verbs cannot take a dative NP. But if they are translated into ‘guhayeo ju-, balgyeonhayeo ju-, namgyeo ju-, golla ju-, jieo ju-, ilgeo ju-’ of Korean respectively, these Korean verb phrases can take a dative NP. In other words, the DV ‘ju-’ enables the use of a dative NP.

\textsuperscript{20} Yi (1995: 72-75) already refers to the [+ directional] and [+ potentially directional] features. And Gang (1998: 52-57) also refers to the shift of the concrete thing or the abstract thing in explaining the DV ‘ju-’ construction.
requires the THEME argument to bear the semantic feature [+ directional] or [+ potentially directional], ‘ju-’ is be able to have the BENEFECTIVE argument in the matrix clause.

It is interesting that (15b) is less ungrammatical than (16b)-(19b). Maybe this results from the interpretation that the activity of reading aloud often entail the shift of the book’s contents to a hearer pragmatically. Therefore, it can be said that the verb ‘ilg-’ lies somewhere between verbs which require the THEME argument to bear the [+directional] feature and verbs which require the THEME argument to bear the [+ potentially directiona] feature. The verbs ‘yeonjuha-’, ‘(nolaeleul) buleu-’ etc. seem to be like ‘ilg-’.

But the verbs like ‘manna-’ in (13), ‘ddaeli-’ (beat), ‘meog-’, ‘masi-’ (drink) cannot require the THEME argument to have even the [+ potentially directional] feature. This becomes a semantic obstacle which disables ‘ju-’ to take the BENEFECTIVE argument, namely the dative NP. In order to realize the referent which has the meaning of BENEFECTIVE, for example, in (13), it should be expressed by paraphrasal forms using ‘-leul wihayeo’ as in (13c).

In short, a specific semantic character of verbs of the embedded clauses in the DV ‘ju-’ construction is be able to affect the realization of the dative NP argument of the DV ‘ju-’, namely the verb of the matrix clause.

3.2. ‘ji-’21

An adjective [stative verb], an intransitive verb (including a passive verb), a transitive verb (including a causative verb) can be posited just before ‘ji-’. Accordingly, it is most natural when it is

21. According to the school grammar of Korean, we should not write leaving a space between ‘ji-’ and the preceding word. But I do in order to show that the word ‘ji-’ is a DV in this paper. ‘Ji-’ of Korean has a similar meaning to ‘become’ of English.
combined with adjectives or causative verbs. Among sentences in which ‘ji-’ is combined with transitive verbs, some are grammatical, but others are almost ungrammatical.\textsuperscript{22} Sentences in which ‘ji-’ is combined with passive verbs as in “Dodug-i gyeongchal-ege jabhi-eo ji-eoss-da (The thief was arrested by a policeman)” are also acceptable.\textsuperscript{23} It is the sentences in which ‘ji-’ is combined with intransitive verbs like in “Eoleum-i jal nog-a ji-nda (The ice melts well)” that seem most unnatural. But it is without question that such sentences are also grammatical, for a sentence such as “Chaga jal ga-a ji-nda (This car runs well)” is well-formed. See (20)-(23), the sentences in which ‘ji-’ is combined with an adjective, an intransitive verb, a passive verb, a causative verb respectively.\textsuperscript{24}

\begin{flushleft}
\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{c}
(20) Yeonghui-ga yebbeu-eo ji-nda. \hfill \\
\text{PRESENT} \hfill \\
\text{DCL} \hfill \\

dc{\text{(Yeonghui is getting prettier and prettier.)}}
\end{tabular}
\end{center}
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{c}
(21) I cha-neun jal ga-a ji-nda. \hfill \\
\hfill \\
\hfill \\

dc{(This car runs well.)}
\end{tabular}
\end{center}
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{c}
\text{\footnotesize 22. For example the sentence “Geu cha-ga Cheolsu-e uiha-yeo mandeul-eo ji-eoss-da (The car was made by Cheolsu)” is very natural, but the sentence “/Geu munje-ga Cheolsu-e uiha-yeo theulli-eo ji-eoss-da (The Question was answered wrongly by Cheolsu)” is almost unacceptable. This phenomenon seems to result from the character of the verb of the embedded clause. If it is the verb which has a semantic character of agentivity strongly, the combination of it and ‘-eo ji-’ becomes natural. This problem is somewhat out of point in this paper, and I won’t argue any more.}
\end{tabular}
\end{center}
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{c}
\text{\footnotesize 23. This sort of sentences is said to be badly-formed because they are double passive sentences from the viewpoint of the prescriptive grammar, but it is often used and grammatical from the viewpoint of the descriptive grammar. Generally such sentences are interpreted as emphatic expressions of ordinary passive one.}
\end{tabular}
\end{center}
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{c}
\text{\footnotesize 24. As far as the realization of the arguments is concerned, both two types of sentences in which ‘ji-’ is combined with transitive verbs and causative verbs are the same. For instance, sentences in which ‘ji-’ is combined with a transitive verb ‘mandeul-(make)’ like in “Taimmeosin-i mandeul-eo ji-ess-da (A time machine was made)” are the same as (23) in the realization of the arguments. ‘nogi-’ in (23) is a causative verb bearing the meaning of ‘to make melt’.}
\end{tabular}
\end{center}
\end{flushleft}
(22) a. Dodug-i gyeongchal-ege\textsuperscript{25} jabhi-eo ji-eoss-da.  
                     \textit{(The thief was arrested by a policeman.)} 

b. Dodug-i [e\textsubscript{i} gyeongchal-ege jabhi-eo] ji-eoss-da.

(23) a. Eoleum-i nogi-eo ji-eoss-da. 
                     \textit{(The ice melted.)} 

b. Eoleumi-i [pro PRO\textsubscript{i} nogi-eo] ji- 

c. *Cheolsu-i [PRO\textsubscript{i} eoleum-eul nogi-eo] ji-

The DV ‘ji’ is a two-place predicate which requires a THEME argument and a GOAL argument, and the essence of its meaning lies in expressing a process in which a certain event or state is formed.\textsuperscript{26} ‘Ji’ has not just the meaning of process, but also the role to make transitive (including causative, ditransitive) sentences be passive sentences. Theoretically speaking, ‘ji’ can bring out the change of a grammatical relation. (20) and (21) have no relation to the passivization because those include ‘an adjective + -eo ji’ and ‘an intransitive verb + -a ji’. The structure of (22a) is assumed as (22b), and the embedded clause in it is originally a passive sentence. Therefore ‘-a/eo- ji’ only emphasizes the original passive meaning, but does not trigger the passivization for itself.

On the other hand, (23a) in which ‘-eo ji’ is combined the causative (transitive) verb has something to do with the passivization, so it is necessary to explain more minutely. In other words, as the grammatical relation is changed by passivization, it is necessary to explain minutely about the realized arguments. The passivization is understood as a phenomenon that an not-subject NP which has a \(\varepsilon\)-role moves to the empty subject position in order to be assigned a subject case from the viewpoint of GB theory. But it is unreasonable to relate the ‘transitive verb + -a/eo ji’ construction to

\textsuperscript{25} the dative ‘-ege’ in Korean is interpreted like ‘by (an agent)’ in English.

\textsuperscript{26} ‘ji’ is a one-place predicate when used as an ordinary verb, namely independent verb.
a passivization by movement. Because the landing position of the movement, which is the subject position of the complex predicate ‘transitive verb + -a/eo ji-’, is an A-position, namely, the position at which the subject NP is already realized. Therefore, the syntactic character of passivization in this case should be explained in a different way.

Now it is necessary to ask a fundamental question: if it is assumed that Cheolsu melted the ice in (23a), can (23c) be the D-structure of (23a) indeed? It cannot because the ‘ji-’ takes its external argument as a THEME argument, not an AGENT argument according to the argument structure of it. Therefore, the syntactic structure of (23a) should be analyzed like (23b).

The subject of the embedded clause can be understood pragmatically in a discourse in (23b), namely pro. Those who stick to the standard GB theory may assume the empty category ‘PROarb’ in this place. While PROarb as the indefinite subject in the to-infinitive phrase in English functions as an unmarked reference to general persons, pro in Korean is a marked empty category which is given by pragmatic context. Futhermore, the object of the embedded clause is given as PRO in (23b), which is impossible in the frame of GB theory because the verb of the embedded clause governs it properly. Nevertheless, it is possible as long as whether PRO is governed or not does not matter much as we have seen in this paper. Consequently, it is can be said that the DV ‘ji-’ construction is an exception in which the subject of the matrix clause controls the object of the embedded clause unlike other DVCs.

---

27. PROarb is the PRO which is controlled by a general, non-specific subject. For example, PRO in the sentence “[PRO to study English] is hard” is the PROarb.
4. Conclusion

I summarize this paper as follows:

(1) The dependent verbs [DVs] in the dependent verb constructions [DVCs] is the main verbs of the matrix clause which has an embedded complement clause, and the restructuring rule which the verb of the matrix clause and the verb of the embedded clause form a complex predicate is applied to the DVCs.

(2) In general, the DVCs in which PRO exists covertly in the embedded clause are the Subject-Control constructions.

(3) The DV ‘ju-’ triggers not only the Subject-Control constructions, but also the Dative-Control constructions when the predicate of the embedded clause is a verb which can take a dative NP, namely a verb which requires the THEME argument to bear the [+ directional] feature.

(4) Although in cases in which the predicate of the embedded clause is a verb which cannot take a dative NP, in other words, the whole DVC is not a Dative-Control construction, if the THEME argument bears the [+ potentially directional] feature, then a dative NP can appear in the matrix clause.

(5) The subject of the embedded clause is pro and its object is PRO in the DV ‘ji-’ construction, and the DV ‘ji-’ construction is an exceptional case in which the subject of the matrix clause controls the object of the embedded clause.
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ABSTRACT

On the Realization of Arguments In
Dependent Verb Constructions Of Korean
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In this paper, I discuss the realization of arguments in dependent verb constructions of Korean. My points are as follows. Firstly, the dependent verbs [DVs] in the dependent verb construction [DVC] is the main verbs of the matrix clause which has an embedded complement clause, and the restructuring rule which the verb of the matrix clause and the verb of the embedded clause form a complex predicate applies to the DVCs. Secondly, in general, the DVCs in which PRO exists covertly in the embedded clause are the Subject-Control constructions. Thirdly, the DV ‘ju-’ triggers not only the Subject-Control constructions, but also the Dative-Control constructions when the predicate of the embedded clause is a verb which can take a dative NP, namely a verb which requires the THEME argument to bear the [+ directional] feature. Fourthly, although in cases that the predicate of the embedded clause is a verb which cannot take a dative NP, in other words, that the whole DVC is not a Dative-Control construction, if the THEME argument bears the [+ potentially directional] feature, then a dative NP can appear in the matrix clause. Fifthly, the subject of the embedded clause is pro and the object of it is PRO in the DV ‘ji-’ construction. And the DV ‘ji-’ construction is an exceptional in that the subject of the matrix clause controls the
object of the embedded clause.
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