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Abstract
This paper investigates the mechanism for nominative/accusative Case alternations in the siph-ta ‘want-to’ construction in Korean. I argue that the Case alternations in the Korean siph-ta construction are motivated by the peculiar property of siph- that it has dual argument structures and restructuring properties. Specifically, the structural Case on the embedded object is determined by 1) the type of the matrix vP that siph- takes—vP_{DO} or vP_{BE}—and 2) the presence/absence of the functional category responsible for accusative Case checking, which is selected by the matrix predicate siph-. In so doing, it is demonstrated that the dual argument structure analysis can be extended to account for the same type of Case alternations exhibited by Korean psych-verbs as well as the incompatibility between a nominative object and an embedded psych-verb in the siph-ta construction.¹

1 Introduction

An interesting property of the Korean Case system is that nominative Case and accusative Case are both acceptable in certain constructions. The embedded object in the siph-ta ‘want-to’ construction as in (1) illustrates one such case.

(1) a. Na-nun_{i} pro_{i} sakwa-ka mek-ko siph-ess-ta.²³
   I-TOP apple-NOM eat-to want-PAST-DECL

¹Acknowledgements: I am sincerely grateful to the committee members Dr. Heidi Harley, Dr. Simin Karimi and Dr. Andrew Carnie for their invaluable comments and insights, which are adopted throughout this paper. I would also like to thank Dr. Diana Archangeli and my classmates for their very helpful feedback on the earlier versions of the paper.

²The abbreviations that are used in this paper are as following: TOP = Topic, DECL = Declarative, PRES = Present tense, NOM = Nominative, ACC = Accusative, DAT = Dative, GEN = Genitive, NEG = Negation, HON = Honorific.

³The Topic marker on the logical subject na ‘I’ does not have any effect on the grammaticality of the sentence. A subject with the Topic marker -(n)un sounds more natural, in which case I assume that the grammatical subject is expressed as pro co-indexed with the Topic. Note that a sentence like (i) with a nominative subject is possible as well.

(i) Nay-ka sakwa-ka/-lul mek-ko siph-ess-ta.
   I-NOM apple-NOM/-ACC eat-to want-PAST-COMP
   ‘I wanted to eat apples.’
   I-TOP   apple-ACC eat-TO want-PAST-DECL
‘I wanted to eat apples.’

Given that the determiner phrase (DP) sakwa-ka ‘apples’ is the direct object of the embedded verb eat, the nominative case marker attached to the object is unexpected in (1a), as opposed to the expected accusative Case on sakwa-lul in (1b).

An immediate question that arises then is: What is the mechanism that triggers the nominative/accusative Case alternations? This paper investigates how and why the nominative/accusative Cases can be used interchangeably in the pair in (1) within the framework of the minimalist program.

I argue that two types of argument structure are available for siph- ‘want’. That is, siph-, as a psych-verb, can either occur with v₅₀ or vₓ in Korean. When it is associated with v₅₀, the complement clause must appear as a full-fledged vP. On the other hand, when it is associated with vₓ, it can lack the embedded vP and appear as a bare VP, which results in the Case alternations in (1). The current approach is in line with the restructuring analyses of infinitival complement clauses of Germanic and Romance languages (Aissen and Perlmutter, 1983; Rizzi, 1978; Sabel, 1996; Wurmbrand, 2001). In restructuring configurations, the embedded predicate lacks a vP layer, which is responsible for introducing an external argument and assigning accusative Case to the internal argument. I show that the Korean siph-ta construction exhibits this configuration with the stative siph- and a nominative object. On the other hand, when siph- appears with an accusative object, the construction shows canonical bi-clausal properties.

Such dual argument structures and restructuring properties of siph- add support for Burzio (1986)’s Generalization that verbs without an external argument lack an ability to assign accusative Case to its object. In addition, an especially welcome corollary is that the dual argument structure analysis can be extended to the Korean psych-verbs in general in that it successfully captures their case marking pattern.

This paper is structured as following: Section 2 examines the properties of the Korean siph-ta construction. Section 3 is divided into two parts. The first half of the section addresses the difference in the scope interpretation caused by the nominative/accusative case marking on the direct objects, which is a key component of the present analysis. In the remainder of Section 3, a series of subjecthood and objecthood tests in Korean are applied to the nominative objects in the siph-ta construction. The results show that the non-canonical nominative objects are indeed grammatical objects, rather than subjects. Section 4 provides an analysis of the siph-ta construction based on the results drawn from Section 3 and a set of new data. Section 5 shows that Korean psych-verbs can be incorporated into the dual argument structure analysis. Finally, concluding remarks are made in Section 6.

2 Properties of the Siph-ta Construction

One of the peculiarities of the siph-ta construction is that the verb siph- ‘want’ takes the -ko type embedded VP complement, as is illustrated in (2a). That is, siph- cannot stand on its own without the embedded complement V-ko, directly selecting for a DP complement. This can be seen from

---

4There has been disagreement on the categorical status of -ko in the siph-ta construction. Sohn (1999) considers it to be a nominalizer, while Kim and Maling (1998) treat it as an aspectual marker. Interestingly, according to a diachronic study of siph- by Kim (2010), -ko used to be a lexical category which was originally responsible for the
the ungrammaticality of (2b). To express the intended meaning of (2b), another verb wonhata, which also means ‘to want’, should be used instead.

(2) a. Na-nun; pro; sakwa-ka/-lul mek-ko siph-ta.
   I-TOP apple-NOM/-ACC eat-to want-DECL
   ‘I want to eat apples.’

   I-TOP apple-ACC want-DECL
   ‘I want apples.’

c. Na-nun sakwa-lul wonha-n-ta.
   I-TOP apple-ACC want-PRES-DECL
   ‘I want apples.’

In addition, the siph-ta construction does not allow tense information to be expressed between the matrix verb siph- ‘want’ and the embedded verb mek- ‘eat’, regardless of the case marking on the object, as illustrated in (3). This lack of tense in the embedded clause suggests that the size of the embedded clause is at least smaller than a tense phrase (TP).

(3) Na-nun; pro; sakwa-ka/-lul mek-ess-ko siph-ta.
   I-TOP apple-NOM/-ACC eat-PAST-to want-DECL
   ‘I want to have eaten apples.’

Another interesting property of the siph-ta construction is that the embedded subject must be co-indexed with the subject of the matrix verb, siph-. Therefore, it is not possible to have a sentence like (4), where the subject of siph- and the subject of the embedded verb are different.

(4) *Minho-nun; pro; [V_P1 [V_P2 Swunhi-ka ku il-ul/-i ha-ko] siph-]ess-ta
    Minho-TOP Swunhi-NOM the work-ACC/NOM do-to want-PAST-DECL
    Intended Meaning: ‘Minho wanted Swunhi to do the work.’

The restrictions on the embedded complement discussed in this section suggest that the embedded complement is somehow defective by virtue of lacking certain projections (i.e. CP or TP).

desiderative meaning while the original meaning of siph- was ‘to think to oneself’ before 1400. Later -ko underwent a grammaticalization to become a functional category, transferring the meaning of desire to siph-. In this paper, I will use -ko to simply refer to a functional element following the lexical verb and use to as its gloss to indicate that the embedded infinitival complement does not carry tense.

The fact that -ko is glossed as to (or to even consider it as to) may seem to be in conflict with the lack of TP in the embedded clause. However, Wurmbrand (2001, pp. 109–118) shows that the infinitival marker does not in fact represent Tense and I make a similar assumption about non-finite -ko. What is at issue is that embedded complement lacks tense specification.

Lim (1997) argues that the sentence (ii) below serves as independent evidence for the existence of PRO, where PRO is overtly realized as a reflexive caki ‘self’.

(ii) Minho-nun; pro; [V_P1 [V_P2 caki-ka ku il-ul/-i ha-ko] siph-]ess-ta
    Minho-TOP self-NOM the work-ACC/NOM do-to want-PAST-COMP
    ‘Minho wanted to do the work.’

However, there is no conclusive evidence that caki ‘self’ is an overt realization of PRO of the embedded subject in (ii). It may well be the case that the whole string Minho-nun, caki-ka is the subject of the matrix clause. In fact, it will be shown in Section 4 that PRO occurs only when the embedded object has accusative Case.
In particular, the fact that the embedded clause does not contain a functional category that is responsible for nominative Case checking necessitates support from the matrix clause when the embedded object is nominative case-marked.

3 Towards an Analysis

To determine the trigger for Case alternations in the siph-ta construction, it is worth comparing the semantics expressed by an accusative Case object and that by a nominative Case object. In Section 3.1, it is shown that accusative objects and nominative objects denote different readings when they interact with negation, which leads us to conclude that the two occupy different positions in the structure. Specifically, accusative objects are interpreted within the scope of negation whereas nominative objects scope over negation. Even though nominative objects occupy a structurally higher position than negation and receive nominative case marking, the tests for subjeckhood in Korean provided in Section 3.2. show that they do not function as true grammatical subjects. Rather, they behave like grammatical objects conforming to the typical property of objects, as discussed in Section 3.3.

3.1 Scope Interpretation

Examining the patterns of the nominative object constructions in Japanese, Tada (1992), Koizumi (1994, 2008), and Bobaljik and Wurmbrand (2005, 2007) note that nominative objects tend to have wide scope over canonical accusative objects. This distinction can also be observed in the nominative/accusative objects in the siph-ta construction in Korean.

Consider the pair in (5), where the object DP is accompanied by -man ‘only’ and the matrix clause contains a negation marker -anh ‘not’.

I-TOP apple-only-ACC eat-to want-ASP NEG-PAST-DECL
[NEG > WANT > ONLY] ‘It is not the case that I wanted to eat only apples. (I wanted to eat some oranges and bananas as well.)’\(^7\)

I-TOP apple-only-NOM eat-to want-ASP NEG-PAST-DECL
[ONLY > NEG > WANT] ‘It is only apples that I did not want to eat. (However, I wanted to eat some oranges and bananas.)’

In (5a) the negation takes wide scope over want and only, while in (5b) only takes wide scope over negation and want. This difference in the scope reading suggests that the two objects sakwa ‘apples’ in (5), differing in terms of the case marking, occupy different structural positions by the time LF is reached. In other words, while accusative objects appear lower than negation in the tree structure, nominative objects take a higher position than negation.

\(^7\)Accusative objects can take a wide scope if stressed.
\(^8\)-ci is a suffix that follows the root of a verb, introducing negative markers anh ‘be/do not’, mot ‘cannot’, mal ‘do not (used as an imperative)’. Because it always appears with a negation marker, its categorical status is unclear. However, in this paper it is considered as an expression of Aspect for the sake of convenience, whose details will not be addressed.
Based on this observation, Koizumi (1994) argues that Japanese nominative objects occupy the Spec-TP position whereas accusative objects occupy the Spec-AgrOP position in the structure, diagrammed as (6).

\[ \ldots [\text{AgrSP SUBJ-NOM} [\text{TP OBJ-NOM} [\text{NegP} [\text{AgrOP OBJ-ACC} [\text{VP} \ldots]]]]] \]

Consider that the Korean siph-ta construction contains two predicates—the matrix and the embedded—inside it. Since each of the two predicates can be analyzed as projecting two VPs—the upper functional vP and the lower lexical VP—according to the Larsonian split-VP analysis, a slight modification to the structure in (6) results in the structure in (7), whose core properties will be maintained in the subsequent analysis in Section 4.

\[ \ldots [\text{TP SUBJ-NOM} [\text{TP OBJ-NOM} [\text{NegP} [\text{vP1} [\text{VP1} [\text{vP2 OBJ-ACC} [\text{VP2} \ldots]]]]]]] \]

### 3.2 Tests for subjecthood in Korean

Considering that the nominative object in (7) receives nominative case marking and appears in the Spec-TP, a position typically reserved for subjects, it is necessary to examine the grammatical function it serves in the sentence. In other words, are nominative objects in the siph-ta construction subjects or objects? Hong (1994) provides a series of diagnostics that can be used to identify grammatical subjects in Korean. The current paper applies two of the subjecthood tests introduced in Hong (1994) to the siph-ta construction: honorification and caki binding tests.\(^9\)

#### 3.2.1 Honorification test

In Korean, the verbal inflectional morpheme -si-, following the verbal root and preceding the Tense, can be optionally used to mark subject honorification, suggesting a particular instance of subject-verb agreement as in (8).

\[(8) \text{Halapeci-ka} \ \text{o-si-n-ta.} \]

Grandfather-NOM come-HON-PRES-DECL

‘Grandfather comes.’

The use of -si- in (8) expresses the speaker’s respect for the subject of the sentence.

Now let us consider the agreement pattern in the siph-ta construction in (9) in relation to subject honorification. In sentences in (9), halapeci ‘grandfather’ shows nominative/accusative Case alternation.

\[(9) \text{a. Chelswu-ka} \ \text{halapeci-ka} \ \text{po-ko siph-ess-ta.} \]

Chelswu-NOM grandfather-NOM see-to want-PAST-DECL

Lit. ‘Chelswu wanted to see his grandfather.’

‘Chelswu missed his grandfather.’

\(^9\) Among the various tests he lays out, Hong (1994) argues that honorification and the equi control construction are the most reliable diagnostics that pick out all and only grammatical subjects. However, the nominative object in the siph-ta construction is incompatible with equi verbs such as sitoha ‘attempt’, nolyekha ‘endeavor’, ayssu ‘endeavor’. Therefore, the honorification test and caki binding test are used in the current paper.
   Chelswu-NOM grandfather-ACC see-to want-PAST-DECL
   ‘Chelswu missed his grandfather.’

If the nominative object halapeci ‘grandfather’ in (9a) were a true subject, it should be able to allow the verbal honorific -si- to be attached to siph-.

The infelicity of the sentence in (10) suggests that such is not the case.

(10) #Chelswu-ka halapeci-ka po-ko siph-usi-ess-ta.
    Chelswu-NOM grandfather-NOM see-to want-HON-PAST-DECL
    ‘Chelswu missed his grandfather (with Chelswu receiving honorification).’

3.2.2 Caki binding test

Caki ‘self’ binding test is another way to identify the grammatical subject of the sentence. Caki is considered to have a strong tendency to prefer a grammatical subject as its antecedent. Let us consider the sentence in (11).

(11) Mary,-ka John,-i caki,-uy sangil-ey po-ko siph-ess-ta.
    Mary-NOM John-NOM self-GEN birthday-on see-to want-PAST-DECL
    ‘Mary missed John on her birthday.’

In (11), the logical/grammatical subject Mary is the only element that can function as the antecedent of caki, even though John also occupies a higher position than caki. The co-indexation between Mary and caki in (11) shows that despite the fact that John is marked as nominative in (11), it cannot function as the true subject of the sentence—rather, it must be moved from the downstairs complement after the binding relation is established.

3.3 Omission of nominative objects

Since Korean is a pro-drop language, it is often the case that the grammatical subject in a sentence like (12a) is omitted as in (12b). When (12b) is uttered without a particular context, the omitted subject refers to the speaker. On the other hand, omitting the object, regardless of whether it is nominative or accusative, results in ungrammaticality as in (12c) (Nam and Ko, 1985). The sentence in (12c) is not acceptable unless the object can be clearly identified by context.

    I-NOM grandfather-NOM/-ACC see-to want-PRES-DECL
    ‘I missed my grandfather.’

b. pro halapeci-ka/-lul po-ko siph-ess-ta
    grandfather-NOM/-ACC see-to want-PAST-DECL
    ‘I missed my grandfather.’

10 -si- can also be attached to the embedded predicate or two instances of -si- can be realized after both matrix and embedded verbs.

11 Note that caki binding test is not one hundred percent accurate in picking out the subject. There are cases where caki is bound by non-subject elements. However, the test successfully applies to the current example in (11).
The contrast in (12) shows that the nominative object patterns with the accusative object, not as the grammatical subject.

To conclude, application of subjeckthood and objecthood tests demonstrates that the nominative object in the siph-ta construction is not a true grammatical subject of the sentence but a grammatical object occurring in a structurally higher position than the canonical accusative object.

4 Proposal: Dual argument structures for siph-

Previous studies of siph-, which assume the Case assignment under government in the sense of Chomsky (1986), propose that the nominative Case in (1a) is attributed either to the matrix T (Kim and Maling, 1998; Lim, 1997) or the verb siph- (Chang and Cho, 1991) while the embedded verb mek- (Kim and Maling, 1998; Chang and Cho, 1991) or the little v above it (Lim, 1997) is responsible for the accusative Case in (1b).

Having examined the behaviors of the nominative/accusative objects in the siph-ta construction in Section 3, it would be valid to assume that the nominative object (1a) moves from its original VP-internal position in the embedded complement to a nominative Case-checking position in the matrix clause above Neg, namely Spec-TP. Two points to be considered in this section are: 1) Why does the nominative object have to move for nominative Case checking? 2) What licenses accusative objects? I address the second question first then return to the first question.

Chang and Cho (1991), Lim (1997), and Sohn (1999) pointed out an interesting asymmetry in the nominative/accusative Case alternations in the siph-ta construction—namely that when the the light verb eha- ‘do’ follows siph- ‘want’, the object DP can be only accusative case-marked, which is illustrated in the contrast in (13).

There is a subtle semantic difference between the pairs in (13) and (14). The sentence (13a) with eha- ‘do’ implies that the subject of the sentence showed some behavioral signs of ‘wanting to

12 The status of the Korean (e)ha- ‘do’ as a light verb v was previously argued for by Jung (2002) and Lim (1997).
eat apples’, functioning like an Agent argument. On the other hand, the pair in (14) without eha- ‘do’ reports the internal emotional state of na ‘I’ (Kim, 2010; Sohn, 1999).

Based on the distinction between (13) and (14), I argue that siph- ‘want’ is a predicate that can either introduce an Agent argument (13) or an Experiencer argument (14) as its subject, by possessing dual argument structures. That is, when siph- hosts an Agent subject as in (13a), it takes v\textsubscript{DO}, which is typically known as introducing an external agentive argument. (See Hale and Keyser 1993, Kratzer 1996, and Chomsky 1995 for the little vP hypothesis and Folli and Harley 2005 for different flavors of little v.)\textsuperscript{13} In such case, the embedded complement clause is a full-fledged vP2, as illustrated in (15). Accordingly, the embedded v\textsubscript{2DO} allows the object DP to check its accusative Case in the outer Spec-vP2 position (Hornstein et al., 2005).

\begin{itemize}
  \item In such case, the embedded complement clause is a full-fledged vP2, as illustrated in (15). Accordingly, the embedded v\textsubscript{2DO} allows the object DP to check its accusative Case in the outer Spec-vP2 position (Hornstein et al., 2005).
\end{itemize}

\begin{figure}
\centering
\begin{dependency}
  \begin{deptext}
    na-nun_i
    'I'-TOP
    vP1
    pro_i
    v1'
    VP1
    vP2
    vP2
    v1\textsubscript{DO}
    v2\textsubscript{DO}
    V1
    siph- ‘want’
    siph- ‘do’
    sakwa-lul
    apples-ACC
    PRO_i
    V2
    mek-ko
    'eat'-to
    DP
    sakwa
    'apples'
    TopP
    TP
  \end{deptext}
\end{dependency}
\end{figure}

\textbf{AGENTIVE siph-}

In contrast, in the structures in (16)–(17), siph- is associated with the phonologically null v\textsubscript{BE} ∅, which does not take an external argument but an Experiencer subject originating in the Spec-

\textsuperscript{13} One interesting restriction on v\textsubscript{DO} eha- is that it is obligatory when used with the 3\textsuperscript{rd} person subject in the present tense, which is illustrated by the contrast in (iii).

I-Nom apple-ACC eat-to want-(do)-PRES-COMP
‘He wants to eat apples.’

This restriction is related to the notion of evidentiality which involves the speaker’s perspective. Since this property of siph- is beyond the scope of this paper, it will not be addressed in the subsequent discussion.
VP1 position (Harley, 2002). The stative \textit{siph-} \textit{v}_{BE} can either take a full-fledged vP layer as its complement (16) or lack it by directly taking a bare VP complement (17), triggering the Case alternations on the embedded object.

(16)

\begin{center}
\begin{tikzpicture}

\node {TopP}
    child {node {na-nun_{i}}
        child {node {\textit{\text{Top}}}}
        child {node {TP}}
    }
    child {node {vP1}
        child {node {\textit{\text{VP1}}}}
        child {node {\textit{\text{V1'}}}}
    }
    child {node {\textit{\text{vP2}}}}
    child {node {\textit{\text{vP2'}}}}
    child {node {\textit{\text{V2'}}}}
    child {node {\textit{\text{v2}_{DO}}}}
    child {node {\textit{\text{DP}}}}
    child {node {\textit{\text{sakwa-lul}}}
        child {node {\textit{\text{apples-ACC}}}}
    }
    child {node {\textit{\text{PRO}_{i}}}}
    child {node {\textit{\text{V1}}}}
    child {node {\textit{\text{ess-}}}
        child {node {\textit{\text{past}}}}
    }
    child {node {\textit{\text{v1}_{BE}}}}
    child {node {\textit{\text{\emptyset}}}}
    child {node {\textit{\text{siph-}}}}
    child {node {\textit{\text{\text{\text{want}}}}}}
    child {node {\textit{\text{\text{mak-ko}}}}}
    child {node {\textit{\text{\text{\text{eat}-to}}}}} \end{tikzpicture}
\end{center}

Non-restructuring \hspace{2cm} STATIVE \textit{siph-}
Specifically, in (16) the embedded verb *mek* ‘eat’ projects a functional vP2<sub>DO</sub> layer, which allows for accusative Case checking of the embedded object as in (15). On the other hand, the absence of the vP2<sub>DO</sub> in (17) results in the lack of a structural accusative Case position. Therefore, the embedded object has to depend on the matrix clause for its Case. Since the matrix predicate *siph-* in (17) is used statively with the v<sub>BE</sub>, the nominative Case on *sakwa* ‘apples’ is attributed to the matrix T, the only functional head capable of Case checking. Such Case checking patterns are in line with Burzio’s Generalization that verbs without an external argument lack an ability to assign accusative Case to its object.

The peculiar structure in (17) is reminiscent of restructuring configurations, extensively researched in Romance languages, where the verbal complement displays transparency for otherwise clause-bounded phenomena (See Aissen and Perlmutter 1983, Rizzi 1978, Sabel 1996, and Wurmbrand 2001 among others). Indeed, the verbal complex in (17) exhibits mono-clausal properties whereas the structure in (16) shows bi-clausal properties. The sentences in (18) illustrate this point.

(18) a. Na-nun<sub>i</sub> *halucongil* Mary-*ka* pro<sub>i</sub><sup>14</sup> manna-ko siph-ess-ta.

I-TOP all day long Mary-NOM meet-to want-PAST-DECL

‘What I wanted all day long was meet Mary.’

b. Na-nun<sub>i</sub> pro<sub>i</sub> *halucongil* Mary-*lul* manna-ko siph-ess-ta.

I-TOP all day long Mary-ACC meet-to want-PAST-DECL

i) ‘What I wanted all day long was meet Mary.’

ii) ‘What I wanted is meet Mary all day long.’

<sup>14</sup>Notice that according to the current analysis, pro should appear in a lower position than the nominative object *Mary-ka* at LF.
With the nominative object Mary-ka in (18a), the time adverbial can only modify the whole verbal complex whereas the sentence (18b) with the accusative object Mary-lul is ambiguous between the low attachment and high attachment interpretations of the adverb. The fact that the matrix predicate and its verbal complement behave like one unit in the case of (18a) provides evidence for the idea that they form a single domain for Case checking.

Interestingly, Japanese also exhibits restructuring environments with a set of matrix stative predicates and German restructuring infinitives with an embedded nominative object involve passivized or unaccusative matrix predicates (Wurmbrand, 2001; Haider, 1993). Note that stative/-passive/unaccusative predicates all fall under the category of v_{BE} as the Korean case in (17).

A final point to be considered is the presence/absence of PRO in the embedded structures in (16) and (17). When the embedded complement contains the vP2_{DO} layer as in (16), the embedded syntactic subject PRO appears in the Spec-vP2 position. In contrast, when the embedded complement does not have a vP projection, appearing as a bare VP, it lacks a PRO subject—a typical property of restructuring constructions.\footnote{As Wurmbrand (2001, Chapter 4) notes, however, the absence of the embedded vP in (17) does not necessarily imply the lack of an embedded subject—what it points to is the lack of an embedded external argument. Nonetheless, Wurmbrand (2001) shows that restructuring configurations indeed do not involve an embedded syntactic subject whereas non-restructuring counterparts do based on the empirical evidence from German long passive constructions and binding patterns concerning anaphors.}

Then how is the control relation in (17) maintained? In this paper, I adopt the distinction between two basic forms of control—syntactic control and semantic control—proposed by Wurmbrand (2001) to account for the control effects in the siph-\textit{ta} construction. Specifically, non-restructuring configurations such as (16) exhibit syntactic control represented by an embedded PRO subject, which is controlled by its antecedent (i.e. the subject of the matrix clause na ‘I’). (Refer to Landau 1999, 2000 for further discussion of control structures involving PRO.)

On the other hand, to ensure that the control effect is captured in restructuring configurations, the structure in (17) manifests a case of semantic control even without a syntactic PRO subject, as is earlier argued for by Chierchia (1984a,b). In particular, in semantic control contexts, the meaning of the selecting verb contains the information about the control relation. That is, in the structure in (17), the lexical specification of the verb siph- guarantees the matrix subject and the embedded subject to be identical. Therefore, this lexical/semantic determination of control relation allows the syntactic PRO to be omitted.

To summarize, this section has shown that the dual argument structures for the matrix verb siph- (cf. (15) vs. (16)–(17)) and the restructuring properties of the stative siph- (cf. (16) vs. (17)) are responsible for the different case markings on the embedded object. First, in both (15)–(16), the embedded v2_{DO} allows the object DP sakwa ‘apples’ to check its accusative Case, though they are selected by different flavors of matrix v—v_{DO} and v_{BE}. In (17), on the other hand, since the matrix verb siph- ‘want’ is projecting a stative vP_{BE} and the embedded verb mek ‘eat’ lacks a vP layer, no element can check the accusative Case of sakwa. Therefore, it has to move to the matrix Spec-TP position, where it can check the nominative Case.

5 Dual Argument Structures and Psych-Verbs in Korean

A welcome result of the present analysis is that the dual argument structures for siph- can be extended to other psych-verbs in Korean. Cross-linguistic investigations of psych-verbs and their
arguments classify psych-verbs into three categories—Class I (Experiencer-NOM, Theme-ACC), Class II (Theme-NOM, Experiencer-ACC) and Class III (Theme-NOM, Experiencer-DAT) (See Belletti and Rizzi 1988, Pesetsky 1995, and Landau 2010 among others). Of the three classes above, Class I and Class III are relevant in the current discussion of Korean psych-verbs, which are illustrated in (19a) and (19b), respectively.16

(19) a. Transitive (Agent-NOM + Theme-ACC): Class I
   Nay-ka paym-lul musew-eha-ess-ta
   I-NOM snakes-ACC be.fearful-do-PAST-DECL
   ‘I feared snakes.’

   b. Intransitive (Experiencer-DAT + Theme-NOM): Class III
   Na-ekey paym-i musew-ess-ta
   I-DAT snakes-NOM be.fearful-PAST-DECL
   ‘I was fearful of snakes.’

When a psych-verb appears as a transitive verb by preceding the light verb ha- ‘do’ as in (19a), it is only compatible with an accusative object. In contrast, when used intransitively with a dative subject, the logical object receives nominative Case as in (19b).

Notice that the same case marking pattern as in (19) can be observed in the sentences in (20) with the matrix predicate siph-.

    Mary-NOM grandfather-ACC see-to want-do-PAST-DECL
    ‘Mary missed her grandfather.’ (=19a)

   b. Mary-ka halapeci-lul po-ko siph-∅-ess-ta.
    Mary-NOM grandfather-ACC see-to want-vBE-PAST-DECL
    ‘Mary missed her grandfather.’

   c. Mary-ekey halapeci-ka po-ko siph-∅-ess-ta.
    Mary-DAT grandfather-NOM see-to want-vBE-PAST-DECL
    ‘Mary missed her grandfather.’ (=19b)

The present account predicts a correlation between the structures in (19) and (20). Specifically, the sentence in (19a), in which the little v eha- ‘do’ follows the psych-predicate musep- ‘be fearful’, is considered to correspond to the Agentive argument structure for siph- in (15). On the other hand, the sentence in (19b) with an Experiencer subject and a nominative object is expected to have a structure like that of (17).17

---

16Note that the subject nay ‘I’ in (19a) is considered to be an ‘Agent’ here, rather than an ‘Experiencer’, which differs from the classification of Belletti and Rizzi (1988). This is due to the light verb eha- ‘do’ in (19a) and for reasons of consistency throughout the paper. However, since strictly speaking, nay ‘I’ in (19a) is not performing an action denoted by the verbal root musep- ‘be fearful’, an alternative term ‘externalized Experiencer’ can be used instead of ‘Agent’. Nonetheless, what is at issue is that nay ‘I’ is an external argument, showing behaviors suggestive of the emotional state musep-, rather than the distinction between the two terms.

17Despite the identical case marking on the arguments, (19a) does not correspond to (20b), the non-restructuring siph-ta construction, both in meaning and structure. (20b) does not have an agentive—expressing the emotion behaviorally—reading due to the matrix vBE. The source of accusative Case is different—in the bi-clausal (20b), the accusative Case on halapeci ‘grandfather’ is checked via the vDO associated with the downstairs predicate po- ‘see’ whereas in (19a), the vDO of the psych-verb musep- ‘be fearful’ is responsible.
The semantic difference resulting from the presence/absence of *eha- ‘do’* discussed in (13) and (14) is also exhibited in (19) and (20). With *eha- ‘do’* following the psych-verbs *musep-* (19a) or *siph-* (20a), the subject’s behavioral clues about the mental state are reported while (19b) and (20b–c) denote the internal mental state of the subject with the $v_{BE}$ associated with the psych-verbs.

The argument structures of *musep- ‘be fearful’* in (19a) and (19b) are represented as (21) and (22), respectively.

![Sentence Diagram](image)

**AGENTIVE musep-**
The Case checking mechanism which is responsible for the structures in (15)–(17) is naturally extended to the derivation of the corresponding structures of *musep*- ‘be fearful’ in (21) and (22). As for (21), the object DP *paym*-lul ‘snakes’ checks its accusative Case in the outer Spec-vP. In contrast, the stative predicate *musep*- ‘be fearful’ in (22) hosts an Experiencer subject *na-ekey* ‘I-dat’, which receives an inherent Case. Without having a little v that can license its accusative Case, *paym*-i ‘snakes’ in (22) undergoes movement to the Spec-TP position to check its nominative Case.

The additional advantage of treating *siph*- and other psych-verbs uniformly based on the dual argument structures is that it provides an explanation for the different grammaticality in the pair in (23)—a question not answered in the previous analyses of *siph*- based on government (Chang and Cho, 1991; Lim, 1997; Kim and Maling, 1998). The pair in (23) shows that while it is acceptable to have a psych-verb as an embedded predicate with an accusative object as in (23a), a sentence like (23b) is ungrammatical with an embedded psych-verb and a nominative object.

(23) a. Na-nun *paym-*lul musew-eha-ko siph-ess-ta
   I-TOP snakes-ACC be.fearful-do-to want-PAST-DECL
   ‘I wanted to fear snakes.’

   b. *Na-nun *paym*-i musep-ko siph-ess-ta
      I-TOP snakes-NOM be.fearful-to want-PAST-DECL
      ‘I wanted to be fearful of snakes.’

To address the asymmetry exhibited in (23), let us recall the dual argument structures for *siph*- proposed in Section 4. In a restructuring environment, where the matrix predicate *siph*- is associated with the vBE as in the structure (17), *siph*- selects for a downstairs predicate without a vP layer, establishing a semantic control relation. Semantic control is invoked by having a syntactically unsaturated argument position in the embedded predicate due to the absence of a downstairs vP layer. However, in the case of psych-predicatives, the embedded subject does not
occupy the Spec-vP position in the first place, rather it originates in Spec-VP. That is, PRO is directly present in the argument structure of the embedded predicate, receiving an inherent dative Case. As a consequence, the lexically/semantically licensed PRO appearing in the Spec-VP position cannot be eliminated, hence, the semantic control relation cannot be created, leading the derivation to crash. The structures in (24) and (25) below show the derivation of the sentences in (23a) and (23b), respectively.

(24)

Non-restructuring STATIVE siph-
Since the matrix predicate *siph-* in the structure in (24) selects for an embedded agentive vP2, the syntactically unsaturated embedded subject is replaced by PRO, forming a syntactic control relation. On the other hand, the ungrammaticality of the example (23b) is attributed to the derivation in (25). In the structure in (25), *siph-* selects a bare VP2 as its complement expecting a semantic control relation due to the lack of a downstairs vP layer. However, the Experiencer argument of *musep-* ‘be fearful’ originates in Spec-VP, thus is not eliminated with the elimination of the embedded vP. Therefore, the inherently present PRO resists semantic control by the matrix predicate, rendering the derivation illegitimate. In short, the reason why nominative objects are not compatible with embedded psych-predicates in the *siph*-ta construction is the unwanted presence of PRO.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, it is demonstrated that the Case alternations in the Korean *siph*-ta construction are motivated by the peculiar property of *siph-* that it has dual argument structures and restructuring properties. Specifically, the two key components determining the different structural Cases on the embedded object are 1) the type of the matrix vP that *siph-* takes, according to which the theta-role of the subject can either be an Agent or an Experiencer and 2) the presence/absence of the functional category responsible for accusative Case checking.

When *siph-* appears with an Agent subject, it always selects for a vP<sub>DO</sub> complement, allowing the embedded object to participate in accusative Case checking with the embedded v<sub>DO</sub> head. In
the case where *siph*- is associated with \( v_{BE} \), the embedded complement can either appear as a vP or a VP form, lacking a vP layer. The latter—the restructuring configuration—results in the movement of the object DP to the matrix Spec-TP position for nominative Case checking.

Finally, I showed that the dual argument structure analysis provides a unified account of *siph*- and other Korean psych-verbs and explains the incompatibility between a nominative object and an embedded psych-verb in the *siph-ta* construction.
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