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1. Introduction

• Double Nominative Construction (DNC) in Korean

(1) DNCs with intransitive verbs:

a. khokkili-ka kho-ka kil-ta.
   elephant- NOM trunk- NOM is-long- PRST-DEC
   ‘An elephant’s trunk is long.’

   John- NOM sister- NOM is-prettey- PRST-DEC
   ‘John’s sister is pretty.’

➔ the Nominative (NOM henceforth) case is realized with more than one NP in a clause.

• Some questions to be addressed.

✓ how more than one NP can appear with NOM case
✓ how two arguments can appear with a one-place predicate like kil-ta ‘is long.’, yeppeu-ta ‘is pretty.’

• New Empirical Observation: DNCs with transitive verbs

(2) DNCs with transitive verbs:

a. khokkili-ka kho-ka kwaca-lul cip-ess-ta.
   elephant- NOM trunk- NOM snack- ACC pick-up- PAST-DEC
   ‘An elephant’s trunk picked up the snack.’

   John- NOM sister- NOM child-ACC adopt- PAST-DEC
   ‘John’s sister adopted a child.’
Both intransitive and transitive verbs can take double nominatives as shown in (1) and (2), *khokkili-ka kho-ka* (elephant- NOM trunk- NOM) and *John-i dongsaeng-i* (John- NOM sister- NOM)

However, the constituency of those NPs varies depending on the verb type.

- I will show the difference between DNCs with intransitive verb and transitive verb in the following section.

2. Distinguishing on Double Nominative Constructions

In this talk, I will suggest:

1. A new observation in DNCs with **transitive verb**
   : focuses on the **verb**, especially in terms of **transitivity**.
   : focuses on the **constituency** of the double nominative.
   - The previous studies only introduced DNCs with intransitive verb.
   - The difference in terms of the constituency between nominative NPs may come from their relations with verbs.

2. Two diagnostics of identifying the constituency of DNCs:
   - Adverb insertion
   - Scrambling

3. The underlying structures of DNCs in Korean as in (1) and (2).
   - I provide two distinct underlying structures in terms of the verb types and constituency.

4. Case Agree of DNCs
   - Hybrid approach to Case

2.1. Previous Studies

- Two main approaches to the Case Assignment of DNCs
  - However, the approaches only presented DNCs under intransitive verb construction.

- **Indirect Case-assignment Hypothesis or Case-agreement** (Yoon, 1990)
  Case is assigned to NP2 and percolates to NP1 under Case-percolation) as shown in (3).
(3) Indirect Case assignment

(4) Direct Case assignment

✓ **Direct Case assignment Hypothesis** (Maling and Kim, 1992)

Nominative NP gets Case from two different heads; one from the verb and the other from T, as shown in (4).
Multiple Case Agree in Japanese.

A question arises …

How double Nominative case can be assigned one from T and the other from V respectively.

Upward Agree allows a probe to seek a goal c-commanding them multiply as opposed to the standard $\phi$-feature agreement (See Zeijlstra, 2012; Bjorkman and Zeijlstra 2014; Miyagawa et al., 2016).

without $\phi$-feature agreement: Korean & Japanese – one-to-many
with $\phi$-feature agreement: English – one-to-one

I will show that Double Nominative in Korean allows Upward Agree

I will suggest two different AGREE operation depending on the verb types.

2.2. Indirect-Case Agree (DNCs with transitive verb)

Adopting Indirect Case assignment and percolation

I propose that T (probe) can agree with NP2 (goal) first and percolate NOM case to the constituent NP1 under DNCs with transitive verb.

- A kind of Case sharing of one constituent
2.3. Direct-Case Agree (DNCs with intransitive verb)

I propose that T (probe) can agree with multiple NPs (goal) under DNCs with intransitive verb.

(6)

For double nominative with transitive verb, I assume Indirect-Case Agree.

For double nominative with intransitive verb, I assume Direct-Case Agree.

I suggest two different Agree depending on the verb types because the structures of two nominatives are different.

2.4. Two diagnostics

Before arguing the reason why DNCs in Korean are affected by the transitivity of verbs, I suggest how to distinguish the difference between DNCs.

Focusing on the constituency of two NPs.

- Double nominative with the intransitive verb: not a constituent
  - Allow [free adverb insertion / scrambling]
- Double nominative with the transitive verb: a constituent
  - Not allow [free adverb insertion / scrambling]
Adverb insertion

The impossibility of the adverb insertion between two NOMs supports that two NPs form a constituent (cf. Kim 1995).

DNCS with intransitive verb

- Because both VP adverb *kkwayna* ‘pretty’ and TP adverb *wenlay* ‘naturally’ can be located freely between the two NOMs regardless of the adverb types, two NPs with intransitive are not a constituent as in (7) and (8).

(7) khokkili-ka *(kkwayna)* kho-ka *(kkwayna)* kil-ta.
   elephant- NOM (pretty- ADV) trunk- NOM (pretty- ADV) is-long- PRST-DEC
   ‘An elephant’s trunk is (pretty) long.’

(8) khokkili-ka *(wenlay)* kho-ka *(wenlay)* kil-ta.
   elephant- NOM (naturally- ADV) trunk- NOM (naturally- ADV) is-long- PRST-DEC
   ‘An elephant’s trunk is (naturally) long.’

DNCS with transitive verb

- Because both VP adverb *catppalukey* ‘quickly’ and TP adverb *ama* ‘may be’ cannot be located freely between the two NOMs regardless of the adverb types, two NPs with transitive are a constituent as in (9) and (10) and illustrated in (11).

(9) khokkili-ka *(catppalukey)* kho-ka kwaca-lul cip-ess-ta
   elephant- NOM *(quickly)-ADV* trunk- NOM snack- ACC pick-up- PAST-DEC
   ‘An elephant’s trunk picked up the snack *(quickly).*’

(10) khokkili-ka *(ama)* kho-ka kwaca-lul cip-ess-ta
   elephant- NOM *(maybe)-ADV* trunk- NOM snack- ACC pick-up- PAT-DEC
   ‘An elephant’s trunk *(may be)* picked up the snack.’

(11) TP
     /
    /
NP
   /
  /
NP1 NP2
   /
constituent

adverb cannot be inserted between constituent
2 Scrambling

- The impossibility of scrambling two NOMs supports that two NPs form a constituent.
- If two NOMs are a constituent, the word order is fixed.
- As two NPs with intransitive (12a) are not a constituent, scrambling one NP over the other is possible, and the second NP can precede the original first NP.
- As two NPs with transitive (12b) are a constituent, scrambling one NP over the other is not possible, therefore the word order is fixed.

   trunk- NOM elephant- NOM is-long- PRST-DEC
   ‘An elephant’s trunk is long.’

      trunk- NOM elephant- NOM snack- ACC pick-up- PAST-DEC
      ‘An elephant’s trunk picked up the snack.’

- One might argue that this scrambling is not the movement out of NP, but rather the movement within NP.

✓ The previous study assumes that…

- If double nominatives are a constituent, NP1 gets genitive case first and alternates to nominative case through extraction out of NP as in (13) and (14) (Kim, 1995).
- If NOM moves within NP, Case cannot be alternated from genitive to nominative.

(13) [khokkili-uy kho-ka] kil-ta.
    trunk- GEN elephant- NOM is-long- PRST-DEC
    ‘An elephant’s trunk is long.’

   GEN to NOM

(14) khokkili-ka [ t kho-ka] kil-ta.
    trunk- NOM elephant- NOM is-long- PRST-DEC
    ‘An elephant’s trunk is long.’

- If the structure of double nominatives of both intransitive verb and transitive verb are identical, there would be no difference.

→ However, the observed difference indicates that the double nominatives of the two constructions are distinct from each other.
3. Towards a new analysis of DNCs in Korean

3.1. Relational NP types

- There are various relations NP types in Korean such as whole-part, kinship, property, and alienability (Choi, 2008).

- In light of my new data on DNCs with transitive verbs, I will focus specifically on whole-part NPs.

3.2. Hybrid analysis of DNCs in Korean

- Previous analyses attempt to explain all types of DNCs under either Direct-Case assignment or Indirect-Case assignment analysis.

- I argue that both analyses are required to explain the data under discussion.

Therefore, I suggest…

- Direct Case-Agree (Upward Agree) for DNCs with intransitive verb
- Indirect Case-Agree for DNCs with transitive verb
- Hybrid analysis of DNCs in Korean
DNCs with intransitive: Direct Case-Agree.

- T agrees with each NP and NPs get NOM case multiply.

(15) Direct-Case Agree

1. Probe T agrees with its goal NP when the former is c-commanded by the latter. (Upward Agree)
2. T agrees with two NPs at the same time.
   - Multiple Agree is possible in Korean and Japanese without \( \phi \)-feature agreement.
3. As a reflex of agreement (Chomsky, 1995), both NPs get NOM case and their interpretable case features get deleted.
DNCs with transitive: Indirect Case-Agree.

- T agrees with one NP and gets NOM case and percolates the case to the other NP.

(16) Indirect Case-Agree

### 4. Prediction

4.1. Honorific Agreement

Intransitive and transitive verb structures are subject to different Agree systems.

DNCs with intransitive - each nominative: **not a constituent**

- each NP can participate in honorific agreements respectively.

1) NP1 with the predicate

   halapeji 'grandfather' [+HON] agrees with -si [+HON] as in (17a)

2) NP2 with the predicate

   non-honorific subject son 'hand' [-HON] cannot get the honorific marking
   -si [+HON] as in (17b)

→ because both NPs are assigned the NOM case respectively as a subject in the clause, both have the possibility to participate in the honorific agreement
11

(17) a. halapeji-kkeyse son-i khu-si-ta.
    grandfather- HON hand- NOM is-big-HON-PRST-DEC

b. halapeji-kkeyse son-i khu-ta.
    grandfather- HON hand- NOM is-big- HON-PRST-DEC

**DNCs with transitive - each nominative: a constituent**

- A constituent NP participates in the honorific agreement together.
  → However, the honorific agreement is not percolated to NP1.

- Inanimate NP2 *son* ‘hand’ cannot participate in the honorific agreement with the predicate.
  → Without the honorific agreement as in (18a), is acceptable.
  → With the honorific agreement and percolation of the honorific marker as in (18b), is not acceptable.

    grandfather- NOM hand- NOM wallet- ACC catch- HON-PAST-DEC

    grandfather- HON hand- NOM wallet- ACC catch- HON-PAST-DEC

4.2. **DNCs in Japanese**

- Double Nominative Constructions in Japanese exhibit the same behaviors when it comes to verb types.

- Double nominatives with intransitive verb do not form a constituent.
  → the word order of NP1 and NP2 are free as in (19)

- Double nominatives with transitive verb form a single constituent.
  → the word order of NP1 and NP2 are fixed as in (20)

(19) a. zoo-ga hana-ga naga-i.
    elephant- NOM trunk-NOM long- PRES-DEC
    ‘An elephant is such that its trunk is long.’

b. hana-ga zoo-ga naga-i.
    trunk- NOM elephant-NOM long- PRES-DEC
    ‘An elephant is such that its trunk is long.’

(20) a. zoo-ga hana-ga kasi-o tsuama-mwu.
    elephant- NOM trunk- TOP snack- ACC pick-up- PAT-DEC
    ‘An elephant’s trunk picked up the snack.’
5. Conclusions

- The relations between the two NPs with nominative differ depending on the verb types: intransitive or transitive.

- Indirect Case-Agree: DNC with transitive
  - T agrees with NP2 and get NOM case and percolates NOM case to NP1.

- Direct Case-Agree: DNC with intransitive
  - T agrees with two NPs and gets NOM Case through Upward Agree

- The constituency of multiple nominatives is an important property of DNCs.

- Two diagnostics to distinguish the constituency difference between DNCs: adverb insertion and scrambling

- The hybrid analysis is able to offer new accounts for DNC in Korean.
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