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1 Introductory Remarks

For many years I have been fascinated by statements, found in numerous reference books and manuals, that Korean has multiple syntactic subjects [Subjs] and multiple direct objects [DirOs]; see, for instance, a detailed descriptive grammar Sohn 1994 (e.g., pp. 235 and 237), the paper MacDonald & Welch 2009 or the PhD thesis Cho 2011. It is commonly said that a simple Korean clause—that is, a clause with just one finite verb—can contain several non-coordinated subjects and several non-coordinated DirOs. Here are standard examples, one-clause sentences (1) and (2), in which sequences of “Subjs” and, respectively, of “DirOs” are shaded (the names of grammatical cases are used in these examples in the traditional way):

(1) \textbf{Kay}+\textbf{ka} \textbf{paym}+\textbf{i} \textbf{musep} +\textbf{ta}

\begin{tabular}{llll}
\textbf{NOM} & \textbf{NOM} & \textbf{DECL} & \\
\textbf{snake} & \textbf{fearful} & \textbf{(arative)} & \\
\end{tabular}

\textit{lit. ‘I snake fearful be’.} = ‘I am afraid of the snake’.

(2) \textbf{Kay}+\textbf{ka} \textbf{John}+\textbf{il} \textbf{son} +\textbf{il} \textbf{mul}+\textbf{ess}+\textbf{ta}

\begin{tabular}{llll}
\textbf{NOM} & \textbf{ACC} & \textbf{ACC} & \\
\textbf{dog} & \textbf{hand} & \textbf{bite} & \\
\end{tabular}

\begin{tabular}{llll}
\textbf{DECL} & \\
\textbf{PAST} & \\
\end{tabular}

\textit{lit. ‘I have a dog,’.} = ‘I have a hand that bites’.

References
lit. ‘Dog John hand bit’ = ‘The dog bit John on the hand’.

Sentence (1) presents a sequence of two nouns in the case known as nominative (marked by the suffix -ka after a vowel and -i after a consonant); both nouns are considered to be SyntSubjs. Sentence (2) presents two accusative nouns (suffixes -li-/il), both considered to be DirOs. (There is no full parallelism between multiple nominative and multiple accusative constructions; they receive different treatments and different descriptions, as we will see in Subsections 6.1 and 6.2.)

Longer sequences of nominative and accusative nouns are possible, but, for simplicity’s sake, the discussion will be at first limited to sequences of two nominative or accusative nouns.

**Transliteration and pronunciation**

Yale Romanization of Korean alphabet (hankil) is used—with some modifications aimed at a better one-to-one correspondence of transliteration symbols with Korean letters and digraphs. Here are some elementary pronunciation rules for the adopted transliteration:

- An unaspirated lax voiceless consonant is automatically voiced between vowels and semi-voiced in the word-initial position, so that Maryka is pronounced as [marigaa], hata ‘do’ as [hada], etc.
- A doubled consonant letter indicates “tenseness”: kk = [k̚], ss = [s̚], etc. A tense, or strong, consonant is never voiced.
- /l/ has an allophone [ɾ] in an intervocalic position.
- The letter e represents [æ] or [a]; the digraphs ay, ey and oy stand for [e], [e] and [œ].

Sequences of non-coordinated nouns in the same grammatical case \([\text{N}_{\text{CASE-x}} + \text{N}_{\text{CASE-y}} + \ldots]\) considered to play the same syntactic role are not such a rarity cross-linguistically: a similar situation, although with respect to multiple nominatives only, is observed in Japanese (for instance, Kuno 1973: 34, 62ff). Several caseless languages allow for sequences of non-coordinated nouns in the same syntactic role—for instance, Mandarin and quite a few languages across the linguistic board, such as Totonac (Beck 2011) and Kinyarwanda (Kimenyi 1980 and Dryer 1983). Multiple \(\text{N}_{\text{CASE-x}}\$\) are well known in ancient languages (Ancient Greek, Sanskrit, Biblical Hebrew, Old Church Slavonic: ‘The God his voice entered the room’, ‘People admired the King the face’, ‘He was killed by elephants by their legs’, etc. Here is an actual example of triple accusatives from the “Iliad”:

\[
\text{(3) Idomene}+\ddot{\text{us}} \quad \text{Oinóma}+\text{on} \quad \text{bále} \quad \text{gastér}+\text{a} \quad \text{méss}+\text{n} \\
\text{Idomeneus} \quad \text{NOM} \quad \text{Oinomaon} \quad \text{ACC} \quad \text{struck} \quad \text{belly} \quad \text{ACC} \quad \text{middle} \quad \text{ACC}
\]

lit. ‘Idomeneus Oinomaon struck belly middle’. =

‘Idomeneus struck Oinomaon in the middle of the belly’.

However, in order to simplify my task, I will leave out any attempt at typological generalizations, limiting myself to Korean.

There is no shortage of studies dedicated to multiple same-case noun sequences in Korean: the query (with quotes) “multiple subjects in Korean” returned about 100 hits on the Google,
“multiple nominatives in Korean” produced 64 000 hits, and “multiple accusatives in Korean”—2 600 000 hits! And this, without taking into account innumerable Korean-language publications. I cannot even try a review of the literature; the reader will have to be satisfied with a dire minimum of references.

The present study is carried out in the Meaning-Text framework (see, e.g., Mel’čuk 2012, 2013a, 2015), which means that syntactic problems are considered strictly within dependency syntax approach. My goal is to establish for Korean some clause elements and their case encodings that would ensure a straightforward transition from a dependency syntactic structure of a Korean sentence to the sentence itself. Therefore, the legitimate question for the examples that are given below is not “Why this expression is described as such and such clause element?”; each example is intended to illustrate the following implication: “If this expression is described as such and such clause element, then the passage from the syntactic structure to this sentence is simple and consistent with General Syntax.” The idea is to put Korean “multiple subjects” and “multiple objects” in the perspective of General Syntax—that is, into a sound typological perspective.

Three specific problems with the following discussion

The nature of the present paper leads to (at least) three complications that a benevolent reader has to deal with: the first is related to the character of the Korean language, the second is brought in by the topic itself, and the third one is very general, almost philosophical.

• Due—at least in part—to the agglutinative character of Korean, it is often the case that a given Korean sentence, especially taken out of context and stripped of its spoken prosody, allows for several readings. On the other hand, a given meaning can be expressed by means of different syntactic structures that underlie different, but more or less synonymous sentences. These additional options are, as a rule, logically irrelevant for the exposition and could be ignored.

• The study of multiple clause elements in Korean requires the consideration of the quasi-totality of Korean grammar: the morphology and semantics of grammatical cases, some inflectional categories of the verb (different gerunds), the communicative structure (Rheme ~ Theme, Focus, Contrast, etc.), word order, syntactic intonation and phrasing, and the inventory of the clause elements. It goes without saying that it is out of the question to seriously tackle all these outstanding tasks. I simply have to be less than precise and leave out several details that, with all their importance, are again logically irrelevant for my goals in this paper.
• Last, but not least, the proposed description of an interesting syntactic phenomenon of Korean is done within the framework of a particular linguistic approach: Meaning-Text perspective, based on general typological considerations, dependency syntactic representation and a formal system of linguistic notions and terms. Remember, you need not to agree with the framework in all the details, but to understand the discussion, you have to accept—at least, temporarily—its basic postulates.

Therefore, I kindly ask my reader to be lenient and avoid being led astray by supplementary considerations. To well understand the paper, you have to rigorously follow a narrow path it sketches, without looking left or right, where yawning chasms are waiting for you.

2 The Problem Stated: Is a Same-case Noun String a Sequence of Multiple Subjects/Multiple Objects?

The tendency to interpret a grammatical case as a marker of a specific syntactic role is quite understandable. In conformity with this tendency, many Koreanists conclude that a sequence of same-case nouns is a sequence of the same clause elements. As a result, they speak of multiple subjects and multiple direct objects in Korean. However, general linguistics tells us that a given Main Verb in a clause cannot have more than one subject or more than one direct object (discounting, of course, coordinated Subjs and DirOs). The Subj and the DirO are syntactic actants of a lexical unit L; L’s inherent syntactic actants correspond to L’s semantic actants (on semantic and syntactic actants, see Mel’čuk 2004 and 2015: 4–107; on non-repeatability of main syntactic actants, Mel’čuk 2009: 37–38).

Semantic and main syntactic actants of a lexical unit L—that is, the Subject, the Direct Object and the Indirect Object—are not repeatable with L. In other words, the Main Verb L of a clause can have just one Synt-actant of each of these three types.

This is so for an obvious semantic reason: each semantic actant saturates a specific semantic slot of L, implementing one of the arguments of the predicate ‘L’, and a given semantic slot cannot receive, by its very nature, more than one element at a time—within a given utterance. Since syntactic actants basically express semantic actants, the same is true of L’s main syntactic slots.

The element filling a semantic slot in ‘L’ can be either one semantic entity or a list of semantic entities. In the latter case, the corresponding syntactic element (= a phrase) that fills a corresponding syntactic slot of L is a chain of conjoined sentence elements, so that a sentence can actually have several conjoined Subjs or conjoined DirOs \([John, Peter and Mary]\) arrived or I saw
But a given syntactic actant slot can never have a multiple expression by non-coordinated actants.

Therefore, based on general linguistic knowledge, it is possible to state the following:

There cannot be and there are no multiple Subjs or multiple DirOs in Korean.

Having said this, I must solve the contradiction between the most Koreanist scholars’ statements and the corresponding general linguistic statements. In order to do this, I have to examine strings of Korean same-case nouns and explain what they are in reality. And for this, I need to answer two questions:

– What is the Subj and the DirO—in general and in Korean?
– What are the elements of a “suspect” Korean same-case noun sequence that are neither subjects nor direct objects?

But before these questions can be attacked, two auxiliary notions absolutely needed for the discussion have to be introduced: prolepsis (3) and nominative case (4).

3 The Prolepsis

3.1 The Notion of Prolepsis

A clause element illustrated by the French sentence in (4), which manifests three such (boldfaced) elements, is well known in linguistics, but strangely has no accepted name:

(4) Jacqueline, son père, le frigo, elle le lui a refilé
lit. ‘Jacqueline, her father, the fridge, she passed it to him’.

This clause element can be called prolepsis. More than half a century ago, A. Xolodovič (1954: 253–254) described this clause element in Korean, calling it “a complement of a special kind.”

Definition 1: Prolepsis (Mel’čuk 2001: 130ff)

A lexical unit \(L\) appearing in a clause is a prolepsis if and only if \(L\) satisfies simultaneously the following four conditions:

1. \(L\) is only loosely linked to the rest of the clause: it is neither a syntactic actant of the Main Verb nor one of its circumstantial. (Therefore, it can be omitted without affecting the syntactic correctness of the sentence; its pragmatic acceptability, may, of course, be violated.)
2. As a rule, \(L\) is linearly positioned clause-initially.
3. \(L\) can be prosodically “insulated” from the clause by a pause, a stress and a special intonation contour (under appropriate contextual conditions).
4. In a language with cases, \(L\) is (but not exclusively!) in the nominative, the least marked case. In Korean, a prolepsis can be marked also by the subjective case, see 4.2.

As far as we know today, a prolepsis \(L\) serves to express a communicative value assigned to the meaning ‘\(L\)’—more precisely, the Rheme or the Theme of the clause.
The Rheme (also known as focus) is the part of the clause that states what the Speaker wants the clause to communicate; the Theme (topic) is the part of the clause about which the Rheme is stated (e.g., Mel’čuk 2001 and 2012: 306ff). In a number of languages, a meaning selected by the Speaker to be presented as the Rheme or the Theme can or must be implemented as a prolepsis.

The communicative organization of a clause is quite complicated and cannot be properly dealt with in this paper. However, it is useful to indicate its two following properties.

– The Comm-organization is essentially **semantic**: the distribution of Rhemes and Themes concerns primarily the meaning of the clause; the marking of Comm-organization on the syntactic level (in the clause itself) underlies its surface implementation, which does not stand in one-to-one correspondence with its semantic source.

– The Comm-organization is recursive: a rhematic or thematic area (of the initial semantic structure) can have within it another Rheme ~ Theme division of a lower level. Thus, the sentence in (6a) has the following Comm-organization on the semantic level:

  ‘[[what is long]Theme² [is the trunk]Rheme²] [at the elephant]Rheme¹’

Prolepses, which are widespread in colloquial French, are also possible in English, albeit used rather sparingly: *John, as everybody knows, he is a nice guy*. But South-East Asian languages abound in prolepses, and Korean is no exception.

### 3.2 Prolepses in Korean

Korean prolepses are characterized by the following four features:

1. A rhematic prolepsis is marked by the subjective case (-ka/-i), see 4.2 below. A thematic prolepsis carries a special Theme marker -nin/-in, which is most frequently added to a bare noun stem—that is, to the nominative form, see 4.1; the -nin/-in marker can also attach to an oblique case form, an adverb and a converb:

   (5) a. Seoul+ey₃ox,+nin salam+Ø manhta     lit. ‘In. Seoul THEME person many’. =
          ‘In Seoul there are many people’.

   b. Usen+in nay+ka sakwa+lil meksessta     lit. ‘First THEME, I apple ate’.

          ‘To eat an apple, I want it’.

   NB: In (5c), we see a Focalized Theme, which is the focus of a contrast.
Note an interesting asymmetry: rhematicity is expressed by a grammatical case, while thematicity has a special marker, which can combine with a case form. For more on the meaning and use of -nin, see Lee & Ramsey 2000: 163–166.

2. Prolepses can be multiple, so that a clause can have several thematic and/or rhematic prolepses (Sohn 1994: 203; Chang 1996: 200); for simplicity’s sake, I limit the examples to two prolepses (shaded):

(6) a. \[k^h\text{okkili} + ka]_{\text{RHEME}} k^h o + ka]_{\text{RHEME}} k\text{il} + ta \ ‘It is the elephant [such that] it is [his] trunk [that] is long’.

b. \[K^h \text{okkili} + nin]_{\text{THEME}} k^h o + nin]_{\text{THEME}} k\text{il} + ta \ ‘As for the elephant, as for [its] trunk, [it] is long’.

c. \[k^h o + nin]_{\text{THEME}} k^h \text{okkili} + ka]_{\text{RHEME}} k\text{il} + ta \ ‘As for trunk, it is the elephant [whose trunk] is long’.

d. \[K^h \text{okkili} + nin]_{\text{THEME}} k^h o + ka]_{\text{RHEME}} k\text{il} + ta \ ‘As for the elephant, it is trunk [that] is long’.

Korean is a strong Pro-Drop language; no pronouns coreferential with prolepses can appear in the clause in the roles of Subj, DirO, Possessor, etc.

3. Thematic and rhematic prolepses appear mainly in Theme – Rheme linear order, as seen in (6c–d).

4. A Korean prolepsis can follow a regular clause element, which is fronted for communicative purposes (boxed):

(7) \[kay\text{eykey]}_{\text{THEME}} john + in]_{\text{THEME}} son+i mul+li + ess+ko]_{\text{CONV(erb)}} Mary + nin]_{\text{THEME}} tali + ka mul+li + ess+ta]_{\text{DECL}}

lit. ‘By the dog John hand being bitten Mary leg was bitten’. =
‘It is by the dog that John had his hand bitten and Mary, her leg’.

In (7), the thematic prolepses Johnin and Marynin follow the Agent Complement kayeykey ‘by dog’.

Korean has over 50 converbs—non-finite verbal forms used as modifiers of the Main Verb. These converbs express various meanings: manner, purpose, intention, reason, result, concomitance, etc. However, since this is irrelevant for the present discussion, the type of the converb will not be indicated.
4 The Nominative vs. the Subjective Case

Now I have to introduce an important correction, which concerns the name of what is traditionally called nominative case in Korean grammar.

4.1 The Korean Nominative

The case in -ka/-i is called the nominative in Korean grammar, since it is used to mark the syntactic subject, thus continuing a Eurocentric tradition going back to Latin grammarians. However, such use of the term is incorrect: in a conceptual apparatus of general linguistics, the term nominative should be reserved for the “nominating” noun form.


| The nominative is the case of the form of the noun used for nomination. 

Korean has, of course, a genuine nominative with the zero marker -Ø, which is quite typical of the nominative: na+Ø ‘I’, kay+Ø ‘dog’, namu+Ø ‘tree’, salam+Ø ‘person’. Korean grammarians refer to it as the “basic form” of a noun or—as in Xolodovič 1954: 54—the “basic case”. The nominative is used in Korean dictionaries as the lexicographic form of nominal lexemes, as it should be; it appears in text in various syntactic roles, for instance:

(8) a. Subject : John+Ø kanta ‘John goes (somewhere)’.
   b. DirO : Na+Ø John+Ø ponta ‘I John see’.
   c. IndirO : Ne+Ø John+Ø kike ču+ess+ni? ‘You John this gave?’
   d. Copular attribute : Na+Ø sensayn+Ø ita ‘I teacher am’.
   e. Adnominal attribute : salam+Ø moksoi ‘person voice’ = ‘human voice’
   f. Direction circumstantial : Seoul+Ø kanta ‘[I/He to] Seoul go/goes’.
   g. Comparand : Nay+ka Mary+il John+Ø pota te salanjhanta ‘I love Mary more than John’ (as ambiguous as in English: either ‘more than I love John’ or ‘more than John loves her’).
   h. Address : Sensaymim+Ø, ili osipso! ‘Respected.teacher, come here!’
   i. Thematic prolepsis : Na+Ø+nin kanta ‘As for me, [I] go’.

NB: 1. As one can see in (8i), the Theme marker -nin/-in is added to the form of the nominative, which is the expected grammatical case of a prolepsis. (This was clearly stated in Xolodovič 1954: 57.)

2. The zero marked nominative can replace the subjective in -ka/-i (see immediately below), the accusative in -lil/-il and the genitive in -iy without affecting the meaning (especially, in colloquial speech).

Therefore, the case in -ka/-i is not a nominative. Since it is used to mark all types of Synt-Subj, it can be called subjective.

4.2 The Korean Subjective

Definition 3: Subjective (Mel’čuk 1988: 263, 2006: 107ff)
The subjective is the case used, first and foremost, for marking the syntactic subject of any type—but not for nomination.

The Korean subjective marks, of course, the Subj, this being its main function. It also marks at least the three following secondary syntactic roles.

1. The **Attribute of the copula** or a copula-like verb, as in (9):

   (9) a. John+i sensay+i ani +ta ‘John is not a teacher’.

     SUB  teacher  SUB  be.not  DECL

   b. John+i sensay+i toy +ess+ta ‘John became a teacher’.

     SUB  teacher  SUB  become PAST  DECL

2. The **Agentive Complement** [= AgCo] in several constructions.

   First, the subjective marks the AgCo of the manner converb in an analytical causative construction «V\(\text{CONV(erb)}\) + HATA ‘make’»; this AgCo semantically is the Causee Actor, as in (10):

   (10) a. John+i Mary+ka ċ\(\text{ay}\)+išil ilk+ke hay+s+ss +ta

     SUB  SUB  book  ACC  read CONV  make PAST  DECL

     lit. ‘John made Mary reading book’, where Mary is an AgCo of the converb inkke ‘reading’.

   This causative construction has two more government patterns—in other words, two further “case frames”—with different cases of the Causee Actor noun:

   b. John+i Mary+lil ċ\(\text{ay}\)+išil ilk +ke hay+s+ss +ta

     SUB  ACC  book  ACC  read CONV  make PAST  DECL

   c. John+i Mary+eykey ċ\(\text{ay}\)+išil ilk +ke hay+s+ss +ta

     SUB  DAT  book  ACC  read CONV  make PAST  DECL

   The subjective on the Causee Actor (here, ‘Mary’) alternates with the accusative and the dative (the dative signals voluntary agentivity of the Causee Actor). The use of an N\(\text{SUB}\) as an AgCo with a manner converb in Korean is similar to the use of an N\(\text{NOM}\) as an AgCo of the infinitive in Portuguese (as in *Ter eu\(\text{NOM}\) saude é bom* lit. ‘**Have I** health is good’. = ‘It is good that I have health’) or of a gerund in English (as in *I being unemployed, she had a hard time*).

   Second, the subjective marks the AgCo of the adjectivalized or nominalized verb—that is, it appears in what corresponds to a relative or a completive clause in a Standard Average European language, as in:

   (11) a. John+i ssu +n ċ\(\text{ay}\)+išil ‘by John written book’ = ‘book that John wrote’

     SUB  write ADJ(ectivalizer) book

   b. John+i ċ\(\text{ay}\)+išil ssu +m ‘John book write факт’ = ‘that John wrote a book’

     SUB  book  ACC  write NOMIN(alizer)

3. The **Oblique Object** of a parametric verb (‘weigh’, ‘be.long’, ‘cost’), as in (12):

   (12) I ċ\(\text{ay}\)+i paek kram+išil naka+n +ta ‘This book weighs 100 grams’.

     this book  SUB  hundred gram  SUB  weigh  PRES  DECL
The most important property of the Korean subjective, which it shares with the Japanese subjective in -ga, is its use to mark the Rheme (or the Rhematic Focus) of the clause (Chang 1996: 200); two cases have to be distinguished.

In the simplest case, we have a rhematic subject in the subjective case (boxed):

(13) \( K^h \text{okkili}+\emptyset \quad +n\text{in}_{\text{THEME}} \quad k^h o+ka_{\text{RHHEME}} \quad \text{kil} \quad +ta \)

\text{elephant} \quad \text{NOM TH} \quad \text{trunk} \quad \text{SUB} \quad \text{be.long} \quad \text{DECL}

‘As for the elephant, it is his trunk that is long’. \( \approx \) ‘With elephants, what is long is their trunk’.

Sentence (13) is good as an answer to the question \textit{As for elephants, what is long with them?} The \( \text{N}_{\text{SUB}} \) is syntactically the Subject, and communicatively the Rheme.

A more complex situation obtains when the subjective marks a rhematic prolepsis (boxed):

(14) \( \text{Nay}+\text{ka} \quad \text{John}+i \quad \text{coh} \quad +ta \)

\( \text{I} \quad \text{SUB} \quad \text{be.likable} \quad \text{DECL} \)

\text{lit.} ‘[It is] I [to whom] John likable.is’.

– Korean allows for an even more complex picture: the subjective case can mark as rhematic a clause element that is different from the Subj, is not a prolepsis and is already marked by another case; the result is what is known as “case stacking” (boxed):

(15) \( \text{Na}+\text{eykey}+\text{ka} \quad \text{kay}+\text{ka} \quad \text{musep} \quad +ta \)

\( \text{I} \quad \text{DAT} \quad \text{dog} \quad \text{SUB} \quad \text{be.fearful} \quad \text{DECL} \)

\text{lit.} ‘[It is] to.me [that] dog fearful.is’, where \( \text{naeykey} \) ‘to.me’ is an IndirO.

The phenomenon of case stacking led some researchers to say the -ka/-i suffixes are homophonous: they mark either the subjective case or the Rheme (see, for instance, Schütze 2001). However, the subjective has still another suffix—namely, -kkeyse, which is honorific; it also can be stacked in a corresponding situation. Thus, not only -ka and -i, but -kkeyse as well should be considered homophonous, which is irritating. In addition, the accusative suffix -li\(l\)/-il is also used to express the Rheme, thus producing case stacking as well (Sohn 1994: 184):

(16) \( \text{John}+i \quad \text{Mary}+\text{eykey}+\text{li}l \quad \text{ka}+\text{ss}+\text{ta} \)

‘As for John, it is to Mary that he went’.

Should we see the homophony “accusative vs. rhematization” in these suffixes, too?

On the one hand, the use of grammatical cases for the expression of communicative values and referentiality is well-known cross-linguistically (Tibetan, Yukagir, Daghestanian languages); on the other, the Korean subjective and accusative carry the nuance of focusing (emphasis, contrast) even when used in their genuine syntactic function. Therefore, I prefer to consider the corresponding markers to be case suffixes, allowing for rhematizing behavior.

Fortunately (for me), the solution of this additional problem is irrelevant to my topic here.
Summing up, the “suspect” noun strings are not \(N_{1,NOM} N_{2,NOM} \ldots N_{n,NOM}\), but \(N_{1,\text{SUB}} N_{2,\text{SUB}} \ldots N_{n,\text{SUB}}\). This correction does not, however, affect the essence of the problem considered in this paper—namely, the question whether such a string is a string of subjects. It was implied above and will be shown below, that it is not.\(^1\)

5 What is a SyntSubj and a DirO—in General and in Korean?

5.1 The Syntactic Subject

Definition 4: Syntactic subject (Mel’čuk 1988: 163 and passim, 2013b, 2014)

The (Syntactic) Subject is the most privileged surface syntactic actant in language \(L\).

Although this definition of Subject is language-universal, its privileges must be specified for each language individually. In Korean, these privileges are:

1) The Subj can depend only on the Main Verb [= MV], which is a genuine verb or a predicative adjective.

Recall that a clause that underwent adjectivalization or nominalization ceases to be a clause and does not have a Subject; the main actant of an adjectivalized or nominalized verb is its Aagentive Complement.

2) The Subj linearly precedes all other MV’s actants—with the exception of rhematic elements, which can be fronted. (The rhematic elements that can precede the Subj are prolepses and, therefore, not actants.)

3) The Subj is the only MV’s actant that accepts the subjective’s honorific suffix -kk\(\text{keyse}\) ≈ ‘highly respected’:

\[
\text{Eme} + \text{nim} + \text{kk\(\text{keyse}\) } ka+si +\text{ess } +\text{ta } \text{‘Mother went (somewhere)’}.
\]

An important remark: Some linguists consider the honorification imposed on the MV by an actant to be another privilege of the Korean Subject. This is, however, incorrect.

– On the one hand, some Subjects do not impose honorification (O’Grady 1991: 102):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } \text{John} + \text{eykey} & \quad \text{sensay\(\eta\) + nim + i} & \quad *\text{p}^\text{h}_1\text{lyoha} + si + ta & \quad (\text{p}^\text{h}_1\text{lyoha} + \text{ta}) \\
\text{DAT} & \quad \text{teacher} & \quad \text{HON SUB} & \quad \text{be.needed} & \quad \text{HON DECL}
\end{align*}
\]

\(^1\) Some Korean grammarians speak of the use of the subjective to mark a direct object (e.g., Sohn 1994: 237; the boxing is mine—IM):

(i) \(\text{Nay} + \text{ka} \quad \text{sensay\(\eta\)} + \text{p}^\text{h}_1\text{lyoh} + \text{a} + \text{ta} + \text{ess} + \text{ta} \quad \text{‘I missed [my] hometown’}\).

(ii) \(\text{Nay} + \text{ka} \quad \text{sensay\(\eta\)nim} + \text{mu}\text{sep} + \text{ess} + \text{ta} + \text{ta} \quad \text{‘I was afraid of [the] respected teacher’}\).

The boxed \(N_{\text{sub}}\) are described in Sohn 1994 as DirOs. This is, however, a simple misunderstanding provoked by the English translation. Korean KILIP means ‘X lacks to Y’ rather than ‘Y misses X’; in this respect, Korean is like French: \(\text{Ma ville natale me manque}\) lit. ‘My hometown to.me lacks’. Analogously, MUSEPTA means ‘X is fearful for Y’ rather than ‘Y is afraid of X’. The boxed nouns are quite regular Subjects.
lit. ‘To John respected.teacher is needed’.

– On the other hand, other actants of the MV (or even their Possessors) and prolepses can impose honorification (Gerdt & Youn 1990: 238 and Jang 1997: 36):

(19) a. Sensayŋ+nim+i y elkul+ey paykmuk+i mut +isi+ess+ta
teacher HON GEN face DAT chalk SUB smudge HON PASS DECL
‘The chalk respectfully.smudged respected.teacher’s face’.

b. Sensayŋ+nim+kkeyse son+i čaku+si +ta ‘The respected.teacher has small hands’.
teacher HON SUB,HON hand SUB small HON DECL
lit. ‘It is respected.teacher [whose] hands are respectfully.small’.

c. John+i sensayŋ+nim+il apb+s i +ta +ko mit +ess +ta
SUB teacher HON ACC sick HON DECL CONV believe PAST DECL
‘John believes the respected.teacher to be respectfully.sick’.

In (19a), honorification is imposed on the Main Verb by the Possessor of an IndirO, in (19b) by a rhematic prolepsis, and in (19c), the DirO of the MV imposes honorification on a different verb!

Honorification (as well as reflexivization) is controlled in Korean by the semantic role of the corresponding sentence elements. Cf.: “Phenomena such as reflexive interpretation and honorific agreement are sensitive to the most “prominent” of a verb’s semantic arguments” (O’Grady 1991: 105; emphasis mine—IM).

4) The syntactic role of the Subj is the “endpoint” of passivization of the MV: the DirO of the active form of the MV becomes the Subj of its passive form.

(20) Koyani+ka čwi +lil mek+Ø +ess+ta ‘The cat ate the mouse’.
cat SUB mouse ACC eat ACT PAST DECL
vs.
Čwi +ka koyani+eykey mek+hi +ess+ta ‘The mouse was.eaten by the cat’.
mouse SUB cat DAT eat PASS PAST DECL

NB: 1. Sometimes a dative IndirO of a verb or an adjective of affection/possession is called SyntSubj (Kim and Sells 2010: 609):

(i) Sensayŋ+nim+kkey č’ayk+i manh +ta
teacher HON DAT,HON book SUB be.many DECL
lit. ‘To.respected.teacher books are many’. = ‘The teacher has many books’.

However, the boxed clause element is the Subject only in English translation. It is a typical IndirO fronted for communicative and pragmatic reasons. Note that it does not obligatorily impose honorification on the MV (although the honorific form manh+si+ta makes the sentence more acceptable).

2. A noun in the locative is not the Subject in (ii), although (some consider it to be a subject):

(ii) Hoysa +eyse Ø na+Ø hanb’ey p’osankim+il ču +ess+ta
company LOC «they» NOM to award ACC give PAST DECL
lit. ‘In.company, «they» to me award gave’.
The Subj here is a zero lexeme, meaning ‘indefinite people’, like the Fr. ON or Ger. MAN, in conformity with Han’s (2004, 2006) proposal. This zero lexeme has a clearly human reference (as is to be expected):

(iii) a. Togmulwen+eyse Ø halu+ey tu+kki meki+lil ču +n +ta
zoo LOC «they» day DAT two CLASS fodder ACC give PRES DECL
In the zoo, «they» [= people] in day twice [to animals] fodder give.

vs.

*Toŋmulwen+eyse O halu+ey tu+kki meki+lil mek+nin+ta
zoo LOC «they» day DAT two CLASS fodder ACC eat PRES DECL
lit. ‘In the zoo, «they» [= animals] in day twice fodder eat’.

5.2 The Direct Object

Definition 5: Direct object (Mel’čuk 2013b)

The Direct Object is the second most privileged actant in a non-ergative language. The DirO exists only in non-ergative languages; its definition is also language-universal, but its privileges must be specified for each language individually. In Korean, these privileges are:

1) The DirO tends to linearly follow all other MV’s actants—that is, to be placed immediately before the MV (barring a Quasi-DirO).

A Quasi-Direct Object (and a Quasi-Subject) are clause elements different from the DirO and the Subject; on the quasi-direct-objectival surface-syntactic relation in Persian, see Mel’čuk 2015: 331, and on the quasi-subjectival surface-syntactic relation in English, Mel’čuk 2015: 445.

2) The DirO is the only MV’s actant that accepts the accusative case such that it does not alternate with any other case except for the nominative.

3) The DirO is the only MV’s actant that can be promoted to SyntSubj status by MV’s passivization.

The IndirO are defined in the same way: it is the third most privileged actant, whose privileges are specified for each individual language; etc. Note that the Quasi-Subj and the Quasi-DirO of a Main Verb are not its syntactic actants, since the corresponding actantial slot is already saturated—by the genuine Subj and the genuine DirO. The Quasi-Subj and the Quasi-DirO are adjuncts masquerading as actants, whose syntactic behavior they adopt to a certain extent.

6 Multiple Same-Case Nouns in a Korean Clause

After lengthy preparations, the ground is ready for answering the main question of the paper (2, p. 00):

What actually are, from a syntactic viewpoint, sequences of same-case nouns in Korean?

Several linguists in the past took steps towards a correct analysis of N₁-CASE N₂-CASE ... Nₙ-CASE sequences in Korean. Thus, O’Grady 1991: 235–242 proposes a fine analysis of the NACC that is in a collocational link with HATA ‘make’, insisting on its special syntactic role (which I propose to call Quasi-Direct Object). In a similar way, Sohn 1994: 204 explicitly says, considering sentence (21), that in this sentence, “the predicate is directly related to the last NP which is its subject [boxed—IM]. The other preceding <…> NPs are best considered topics.”
(21) Nay+ka  eʰa+ka  tʰaie+ka  [kumery+t]  na +ss +ta
   lit. ‘I car tire hole occurred’. = ‘I have a hole in a tire of my car’.

However, I don’t know of a systematic overview and formal description of same-case noun sequences in Korean. I undertake such overview here, beginning with so-called “multiple subjects” (6.1), then considering “multiple direct objects” (6.2), and finishing with a few remarks about “other multiple objects” (6.3).

6.1 “Multiple Subjects” in a Korean Clause

A Korean clause can contain several consecutive nouns in the subjective case, but only one of them is the surface-syntactic subject of the clause’s Main Verb. Let us consider two consecutive N_{SUB}; three situations are to be examined.

N_{1-SUB} and N_{2-SUB} are syntactically not linked

a) N_{1-SUB} and N_{2-SUB} depend in parallel on the Main Verb: N_{1-SUB} is a Rhematic Prolepsis and N_{2-SUB} is the Subject (6.1.1).

b) N_{1-SUB} is the Subject of the Main Verb, and N_{2-SUB} is the Agentive Complement (or the Subject) of a non-finite form (6.1.2).

N_{1-SUB} and N_{2-SUB} are syntactically linked

c) N_{2-SUB} is a Quasi-Conjunct of N_{1-SUB}, and this latter is the Subject of the Main Verb (6.1.3).

6.1.1 Rhematic Prolepsis + Subject

The N_{2-SUB} is the Subj, the N_{1-SUB} being syntactically a Pprolepsis that expresses the Rheme of the clause. This description was explicitly proposed in O’Grady 1991: 121ff. Lee & Ramsey 2000: 144 say that N_{1-SUB} is, so to speak a “subject” of the whole following clause rather than that of its MV; see also Kim & Sells 2010: 607, where several important references are given that buttress the treatment of N_{1-SUB} as a prolepsis, although they do not use this name.

The N_{SUB} that compose the string under consideration have the following important semantic property: the N_{2-SUB} and the N_{1-SUB} are linked by a metonymic semantic relation; for instance, ‘N_{2-SUB} is a part of N_{1-SUB}’, or ‘N_{2-SUB} is located in/on N_{1-SUB}’, or else ‘N_{2-SUB} happens during N_{1-SUB}’:

(22) a. John+i  [kʰo+ka]  kil +ta  ‘[It is] John [whose] nose is long’.
   SUB  nose SUB  be.long DECL

b. Tʰakča+ka  eʰayk+i  manh +ta  ‘[It is the] table [where] books are many’.
table SUB  book SUB  be.many DECL

c. Pom+i  kkočʰ+i  manh +ta  ‘[It is the] spring [when] flowers are many’.
The N2-SUB can also represent a Rhematic Prolepsis, cf. (23), where the nominal clause elements have the same form as in (13):

\[
(23) \text{K}^\text{h} \text{okkili}+\emptyset +\text{nin}_\text{theme} \quad \text{K}^\text{h} \text{o}+\text{ka}_\text{rheme} \quad \text{kil} +\text{ta} \\
\text{elephant} \quad \text{NOM TH} \quad \text{trunk} \quad \text{SUB} \quad \text{be.long} \quad \text{DECL} \\
\text{‘As for the elephant, it is his trunk, [it] is long’}.
\]

In (23), the Subject is a pronominal lexeme ‘it’, which does not appear in the sentence.

In (24), the first two N\textsubscript{SUB}s are Rhematic Prolepses, the last one being the Subject:

\[
(24) \text{John+i enehak+i } \text{k} \text{onpu+ka} \quad \text{toy} +\text{ess+ta} \\
\text{lit. } \text{‘[It is] John [and] linguistics [that] study was made’.} = \\
\text{‘A study was done of linguistics by John’}.
\]

6.1.2 Subject + Agentive Complement/Subject of a Non-Finite Verb Form

This situation is found in a phrasal causative construction with the verb HATA ‘make’ and the gerund in -ke of the lexical verb, see (10a), repeated here as (25a), as well as in constructions with other non-finite forms, see (25b):

\[
(25) \text{a. } [\text{John+i Mary+ka} \quad \text{c}^\text{h} \text{ayk+il} \quad \text{ilk+ke} \quad \text{hay+ss} +\text{ta} \\
\text{SUB} \quad \text{SUB} \quad \text{book} \quad \text{ACC} \quad \text{read CONV} \quad \text{make PAST DECL} \\
\text{‘John made Mary read a book’.} \\
\text{b. } [\text{John+i Mary+ka} \quad \text{c}^\text{h} \text{ayk+il} \quad \text{ilk+in} +\text{ta} +\text{ko} \quad \text{mit} +\text{nin+ta} \\
\text{SUB} \quad \text{SUB} \quad \text{book} \quad \text{ACC} \quad \text{read PRES DECL CONV} \quad \text{believe PRES DECL} \\
\text{‘John believes Mary is reading a book’}.
\]

In both sentences, John is the subject of the Main Verb, and Maryka is the AgCo (or the Subject) of the gerund (ilkke and ilkintako).

The Agentive Complement can probably be considered to be the Subject of a non-finite verb form; based on available data, I cannot solve this dilemma. However, it is irrelevant to my point, since whatever the answer, there will be no multiple subjects of the Main Verb.

6.1.3 Subject + Quasi-Conjunct

The N\textsubscript{1-SUB} is the Subject, the N\textsubscript{2-SUB} being a Quasi-Conjunct dependent element.

**Definition 6:** Quasi-Conjunct (Mel’čuk 2013a: 63ff)

L\textsubscript{2} is a quasi-coordinate dependent, or a Quasi-Conjunct, of L\textsubscript{1}, iff L\textsubscript{2} follows L\textsubscript{1} immediately and can play the same surface-syntactic role as L\textsubscript{1}, but does not allow for a coordinate conjunction.

\footnote{Sentence (24) can be also obtained from a different surface-syntactic structure. Namely, JOHN is a Rhematic Prolepsis; ENEHAK ‘linguistics’ is the Subject; and KODPU ‘study\textsubscript{Nj}’ is the Quasi-Subject of the light verb TOYTA, parallel to the Quasi-DirO of the light verb HATA (6.2.2): ‘[It is by] John [that] linguistics was study done’.}
The semantic load of a Quasi-Conjunct \(L_2\) to \(L_1\) is to express an elaboration of \(L_1\): ‘\(L_1\), more precisely \(L_2\)’; for instance:

\[(26) \text{Leo lives in Spain,} - \text{quasi-coord} \rightarrow \text{in Barcelona,} - \text{quasi-coord} \rightarrow \text{on 4th May Street,} - \text{quasi-coord} \rightarrow \text{on the corner of Malaga street,} - \text{quasi-coord} \rightarrow \text{in a big building,} - \text{quasi-coord} \rightarrow \text{on the fifth floor.}\]

Thus, take sentence (27), which is the passive version of sentence (2):

\[(27) \text{Kay+eykey} [\text{John+i} \text{ son+i mul+li +ess+ta}] \text{ lit. ‘By.dog John hand was bitten’}.\]

\[\text{JOHN is the Subject, and the SON ‘hand’ is its quasi-conjunct: ‘John, more precisely his hand, was bitten by the dog’}.\]

Sentence (27) formally corresponds to two further syntactic structures:

– "JOHN is a rhematic prolepsis, while SON ‘hand’ is the subject: ‘It was John whose hand was bitten by the dog’ (see 6.1.1).

– Both JOHN and SON are rhematic prolepses: ‘It was John and his hand, it was bitten by the dog’.

This is possible because, as indicated above, Korean is a Pro-Drop language, and the resumptive pronouns such as ‘it’ or ‘his’ do not appear in the sentence. In sentence (28), both nouns in the subjective—MARY and JOHN—can be considered rhematic prolepses: ‘It was Mary and John, she put him to sleep’ (6.1.1).

\[(28) \text{Mary+ka} [\text{John+i} \text{ ca +ke} \text{ hay+ss +ta}] \text{ make PAST DECL} \]

Additional interpretations of (28) are also possible: JOHN can be an AgCo/a Subject of the gerund čake, while MARY is the SyntSubj of HATA ‘make’ (6.1.2) or a rhematic prolepsis.

A string of consecutive N\text{SUBs} containing more than two components is easily described in proposed terms: one of these N\text{SUBs} can be the SyntSubj of the Main Verb, one can be the CoAg of a non-finite verb form, and all the others are rhematic prolepses.

**6.2 “Multiple Direct Objects” in a Korean Clause**

The situation with strings of accusative nouns is slightly more complex. If we consider a sequence of two N\text{ACCS}, the following five (rather than three, as for the N\text{SUBs}) cases have to be distinguished.

N\text{1-ACC} and N\text{2-ACC} are syntactically not linked

a) N\text{1-ACC} and N\text{2-ACC} depend in parallel on a ditransitive Main Verb: N\text{1-ACC} is an IndirO, and N\text{2-ACC} the DirO (6.2.1).
b) \(N_{1-\text{ACC}}\) and \(N_{2-\text{ACC}}\) depend in parallel on a light Main Verb: \(N_{1-\text{ACC}}\) is its DirO, and \(N_{2-\text{ACC}}\) is its Quasi-DirO (6.2.2).

c) \(N_{1-\text{ACC}}\) is the DirO of the Main Verb, and \(N_{2-\text{ACC}}\) is the DirO of the gerund in a phrasal (= analytical) causative (6.2.3).

d) \(N_{2-\text{ACC}}\) is the DirO of the Main Verb, and \(N_{1-\text{ACC}}\) is the Affected Object of the same verb (6.2.4).

\(N_{1-\text{ACC}}\) and \(N_{2-\text{ACC}}\) are syntactically linked

e) \(N_{2-\text{ACC}}\) is a Quasi-Conjunct to \(N_{1-\text{ACC}}\) (6.2.5).

### 6.2.1 Indirect Object + Direct Object

(29) a. Mary+ka John+i̱ čayk+i̱ ču +Ø +ess+ta
      
      SUB      ACC      book  ACC            give  ACT  PAST  DECL
      
      ‘Mary gave John a book’.

On \(N_{1-\text{ACC}}\), but not on \(N_{2-\text{ACC}}\), the accusative freely alternates with the dative (without changing its syntactic role):

b. Mary+ka John+eykey čayk+i̱ ču +Ø +ess+ta
      
      SUB      DAT      book  ACC            give  ACT  PAST  DECL
      
      ‘Mary gave John a book’.

\(N_{1-\text{ACC}}\) does not passivize, while \(N_{2-\text{ACC}}\) does:

c. *John+i Mary+ey iyhay čayk+i̱ ču +eči +ess+ta
      
      SUB      DAT      book  ACC            give  PASS  PAST  DECL
      
      ‘John was given a book by Mary’.

vs.

Čayk+i Mary+ey iyhay John+eykey ču +eči +ess+ta
      book  SUB      DAT      by      book  ACC            give  PASS  PAST  DECL

‘The book was given by Mary to John’.

In this respect, Korean is different from English and Japanese, which both have indirect passives.

Another example of the same construction, where \(N_{1-\text{ACC}}\) implements an IndirO:

(30) Mary+ka robot+i̱ lil p̱al+i̱ tal +Ø +ass +ta
      
      SUB      ACC      ACC      arm  ACC            attach  ACT  PAST  DECL
      
      ‘Mary attached the arm to the robot’.

On multiple accusatives in various languages, see Mel’čuk 2009: 96, endnote [3]. In Latin, Serbian and German, \(N_{1-\text{ACC}}\) turns out to be an IndirO or OblO, while \(N_{2-\text{ACC}}\) is a genuine DirO (Ger. \(W_{\text{ACC}}\)fragt er mich\(\)lit. ‘What asks he me?’, where WAS ‘what’ is an OblO: this WAS alter-
nates with WORÜBER ‘about what’; only WAS and DAS ‘this’ are possible in the accusative in this position, while any semantically convenient noun can replace mich).

### 6.2.2 Direct Object + Quasi-Direct Object

(31) a. *John* + *i*  
\[ \text{enehak} + \\text{î} \quad \text{konpu} + \text{îl} \]  
\[ \text{hay} + \text{ss} + \text{ta} \]  
(Collins-O’Grady 1991: 236; see also O’Grady 1992)  

lit. ‘John makes [a] study linguistics’. = ‘John studies linguistics’.

b. *John* + *i*  
\[ \text{enehak} + \text{îy} \quad \text{konpu} + \text{îl} \]  
\[ \text{hay} + \text{ss} + \text{ta} \]  

‘John does a study of linguistics’.

c. *John* + *i*  
\[ \text{enehak} + \text{O} \quad \text{konpu} + \text{îl} \]  
\[ \text{hay} + \text{ss} + \text{ta} \]  

‘John does a linguistics study’.

Sentence (31a) presents a well-known phenomenon—a so-called transitive “compound, or complex, verb.” This is a collocation whose base is a predicative noun \( N_{\text{predic}} \) (KODPU ‘[a] study’), and the collocate is a support verb \( V_{\text{support}} \) (HATA ‘make’); as a whole, the collocation “\( N_{\text{predic}} V_{\text{support}} \)” is syntactically equivalent to a transitive verb having a regular DirO N (here, ENEHAK ‘linguistics’), something like “[\( V_{\text{support}} \) \( a \) study \( N_{\text{predic}} \) \( V_{\text{trans}} \) linguistics] \( N_{\text{DirO}} \)” ≈ “[\( \text{to} \) study linguistics]”. Inside this collocation, the \( N_{\text{predic}} \) must be encoded as a Quasi-DirO of the \( V_{\text{support}} \) HATA, since the latter cannot have two DirOs:

**ENEHAK ‘linguistics’ ←→ dir-obj—HATA ‘make’—quasi-dir-obj→KODPU ‘study’**

‘make [a] study linguistics’ = ‘[\( \text{to} \) study linguistics’

Passivization of (31a) produces (24), in which KODPU ‘study’ can be considered as a Quasi-Subject (6.1.1).

The same meaning can be expressed by different syntactic structures, where KODPU is a regular DirO of the verb HATA, and it takes ENEHAK as its adnominal attribute (in the genitive or the nominative), see (31b–c).

The quasi-dir-objectival Surface-Syntactic Relation is necessary for many languages, the best-known among these being, perhaps, Persian, where the role of a transitive verb is played, most of the time, by a phrase “support verb \( V_{\text{support}} \) + deverbal noun \( s_o \)” (“[N-ra]” stands for their DirO, -ra being a postposition that obligatorily marks a definite DirO; Mel’čuk 2009: 39–40, (23)):

(32) Persian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘[( \text{to} ) end [N]’</td>
<td>( \text{tāmām kārdān} )</td>
<td>‘ending’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘[( \text{to} ) begin [N]’</td>
<td>( \text{āgāz kārdān} )</td>
<td>‘beginning’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘[( \text{to} ) light up [N]’</td>
<td>( \text{aṭeš kārdān} )</td>
<td>‘fire’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘[( \text{to} ) beat [N]’</td>
<td>( \text{kotāk zādān} )</td>
<td>‘beating’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘[( \text{to} ) show [N]’</td>
<td>( \text{nešān dādān} )</td>
<td>‘sign’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
‘[to] learn [N]’ = yad geresiň [N-ra] lit. ‘memory take [N]’
‘[to] congratulate [N]’ = tabrik gofiň [N-ra] lit. ‘congratulation say [N]’

Since the quasi-direct-objectival SyntRel is not commonly accepted, it seems worthwhile to indicate four properties of the Quasi-DirO in Korean that illustrate its status.

(33) a. A Quasi-DirO does not accept an adjectival modifier:

\[ \text{John enehakil} *\text{simtoissnin konpulil haysta} \text{lit. ‘John linguistics} \text{deep study did’}. \]

b. A Quasi-DirO cannot be pronominalized with KUKES ‘that thing’:

\[ \text{John enehakil konpulil hayko, Maryka suhakil} *\text{kukesil haysta} \\text{lit. ‘John linguistics} [\text{a}] \text{study having done, Mary mathematics} [\text{a}] \text{the same did’}. \]

c. A Quasi-DirO should not be linearly separated from HATA (otherwise, the sentence is judged awkward by some speakers):

\[ ‘\text{John konpulil enehakil haysta’}. \]

d. A Quasi-DirO cannot undergo relativization:

\[ \text{Johni ha+nin konpu ‘by John made [a] study’ = ‘atudy made by John’} \text{ vs.} \text{‘Johni enehakil ha+nin konpu ‘by John [of] linguistics made [a] study’}. \]

A Quasi-DirO is more constrained than a regular DirO; it seems to “coalesce” with HATA.

6.2.3 Direct Object of the Main Verb + Direct Object of a Non-Finite Form

The sentence in (10b), reproduced here as (34), contains two DirOs (boxed), which depend on two different clause elements: \textit{Marylit} is the DirO of the MV HATA ‘make’, while \textit{čaykil} is the DirO of the converb ilkke ‘reading’; cf. (34):

(34) a. \[ \text{John+i \ Mary+i+m} \ \čaykil \ ilk+ke \ hay+ss+ta} \]

\[ ‘\text{John made Mary read a book’}. \]

As is normal for the DirO of an MV, MARY can be promoted to subject in a periphrastic passive construction (similar to the English GET-passive):

b. \[ \text{Mary+ka John+ey iyhay \ čaykil \ ilk+ke \ toy+ess+ta} \]

\[ ‘\text{Mary was made by John read a book’}. \]

This situation obtains with the phrasal (= analytical) causative construction.

6.2.4 Affected Object + Direct Object

(35) a. \[ \text{Mary+ka John+i sacin+i cil \ cčić +ess +ta} \ ‘\text{Mary tore up John’s picture’}. \]

It is the picture that Mary tore up, not John: \textit{SACIN} ‘picture, photo’ is the DirO of the Main Verb. And what about \textit{JOHN}? This clause element is an Affected Object [= AffO], referring to the
entity affected by the event. The meaning is roughly like this: “What Mary did to John was tear up his picture.” In Mandarin Chinese, the AffO is introduced by the preposition BA and is called “Retained Object” (Li & Thompson 1981: 470–471):

b. Mali bā Juhen bāng-le liàngzhì jiāo ‘Mary tied up John’s feet’.

A caveat: “Affected Object” is simply the name of a surface-syntactic clause element; it should not be construed as a semantic characterization. In this technical sense, WOLF in John killed the wolf is not an AffO, but a DirO.

6.2.5 Direct Object + Quasi-Conjunct

(36) a. Kay+ka [John+i] son+il mul+ess ta (O’Grady 1991: 3)

   dog    SUB hand    ACC bite   PAST DECL

   ‘The dog bit John on the hand’.

   N1-ACC is the DirO, and each of the following N1-ACCs is a quasi-coordinate conjunct of the preceding N1-ACC. N1-ACC do not easily allow permutation and can be omitted without affecting the grammaticality of the sentence:

b. (i) */Kay+ka son+il John+il mulessta.

   (ii) Kay+ka John+il mulessta ‘The dog bit John’.

This is exactly what is to be expected from a Quasi-Conjunct since it expresses an elaboration of the preceding element.

6.2.6 “Quadruple Direct Objects”

Sentence (37) features four consecutive N1-ACCs (O’Grady 1991: 77):

(37) John+i ki mune+i il talil+i il kkit pupun+i il čokim+i il čal+ass+ta

   lit. ‘John the octopus leg end part bit cut’ =

   ‘John cut a bit from the end part of a leg of the octopus’.

   The first N1-ACC MUNE ‘octopus’ is the DirO, and the following N1-ACCs are Quasi-Conjuncts:


   The situation is, however, furthermore complicated by the fact that (roughly) the same semantic content can be expressed by different syntactic structures, which determine different dis-

---

3 The meaning of sentence (36a) can be also expressed by a different sentence with a different syntactic structure, in which SON ‘hand’ is a DirO and JOHN is a possessor attribute in the genitive: Kay+ka John+u son+il mulessta ‘The dog bit John’s hand’.
tributions of case suffixes. Thus, we can have sentences in which MUNE remains in the accusative, but some of other nouns obtain the nominative (these are boldfaced):

(38) a. \(\text{John+i+} \ \text{ki mune+k+} \ \text{tali+l+} \ \text{kkit+pupun+i+0+} \ \text{ćokim+i+} \ \text{ćal+ass+t+} \)
    \(\text{SUB the octopus ACC leg ACC end part NOM bit ACC cut PAST DECL} \)

b. \(\text{John+i+} \ \text{ki mune+t+} \ \text{tali+t+i+} \ \text{kkit+pupun+i+} \ \text{ćokim+i+} \ \text{ćal+ass+t+} \)
    \(\text{SUB the octopus ACC leg NOM end part ACC bit ACC cut PAST DECL} \)

c. \(\text{John+i+} \ \text{ki mune+t+} \ \text{tali+t+i+} \ \text{kkit+pupun+i+} \ \text{ćokim+i+} \ \text{ćal+ass+t+} \)
    \(\text{SUB the octopus ACC leg NOM end part NOM bit ACC cut PAST DECL} \)

In sentences (38) an \(N_{\text{NOM}} \) is an adnominal attribute of the following \(N \); all \(N_{\text{ACC}} \)s keep their syntactic role. Formally: \(\text{KKIT+PUPUN\leftrightarrow adnom-attrib-ČOKIM, TALI\leftrightarrow adnom-attrib-KKIT+PUPUN, etc.} \)

An adnominal attribute can also be in the genitive (the suffix -iy): \(\text{kkit+pupun+iy+ćokim+i+} \) ‘bit of end part’ or \(\text{tali+iy+tali+kkit+pupun+i+} \) ‘end part of the leg’.

A string of many consecutive \(N_{\text{ACC}} \)s can also be described in proposed terms: one of the \(N_{\text{ACC}} \)s can be the DirO of the Main Verb, one can be the DirO of a different non-finite verb form, still one can be an IndirO, and all the others are Quasi-Conjuncts of one of these elements.

Due to optional “subjective ~ nominative” and “accusative ~ nominative” alternations, Korean allows for sequences of \(N_{\text{NOM}} \)s:

(39) \(\text{John+O+k+} \ \text{mune+O+t+} \ \text{tali+O+kkit+pupun+i+0+ćokim+i+0+ćalassta} \)

lit. ‘John the octopus leg end part bit cut’.

However, such a sequence does not present new problems. The wordform sequence in (39) implements one of the two syntactic structures:

– Either \(\text{JOHN} \) is the subject and \(\text{MUNE} \) ‘octopus’ is the DirO; each of the following \(N_{\text{NOM}} \)s is a quasi-conjunct to the preceding noun (‘John cut the octopus, on the leg, the end part, a bit’).

– Or \(\text{JOHN} \) is the subject and \(\text{ČOKIM} \) ‘bit’ is the DirO; each of the \(N_{\text{NOM}} \)s that precede \(\text{ČOKIM} \) is an adnominal attribute to the following \(N \) (‘John cut a bit of the end part of the leg of the octopus’).

The syntactic ambiguity of the sequence (39), as well as of all such sequences, is in fact resolved by prosody, which is not considered in this paper.

6.3 Other “Multiple Objects” in a Korean Clause

As it could be expected, Korean allows for other “multiple cases”; thus, it has sequences of \(N_{\text{DAT}} \)s (Maling & Kim 1992):

(40) a. \(\text{Nay+ka+} \ \text{Mary+eykey+} \ \text{kwi+ey+} \ \text{pimil+i+} \ \text{soksaki+ess+t+} \)
    \(\text{I SUB DAT ear DAT secret ACC whisper PAST DECL} \)

lit. ‘I to.Mary to.ear secret whispered’. = ‘I whispered the secret into Mary’s ear’.
b. Koŋčaŋ+ey ć'anko +ey pul+i na +ss +ta
    factory DAT storeroom DAT fire SUB occur PAST DECL
    lit. ‘In. factory in. storeroom fire occurred’. = ‘A fire broke out in the factory’s storeroom’.

Such examples do not add anything new: the first N_DAT is an IndirO or a circumstantial, and the second is its quasi-conjunct.

7 Conclusions

1. Korean has neither “multiple Subjects“ nor “multiple Direct Objects”: what is theoretically not possible is impossible in any of the possible worlds (≈ in any language). Korean does have, however, multiple subjectives and multiple accusatives—that is, strings of N_SUBs and N_ACCs.

2. The noun form commonly called “nominative” in Korean grammar is in fact the subjective case (in -ka/-i/-kkeyse); the nominative exists as well and is marked by a zero suffix: -Ø.

3. The Korean subjective marks the (syntactic) Subject, the Attribute of a copula-like verb, the Agentive Complement of a non-finite verb form, a Rhematic Prolepsis, and the Oblique Object of a parametric verb.

4. A string of N_SUBs represents one of three possibilities:
   – either the last N_SUB is the Subject, all the preceding ones being Rhematic Prolepses;
   – or the N1_SUB is the Subject and the N2_SUB is an AgCo of a non-finite verb form;
   – or else the N1_SUB is the Subject, each of the following N_SUBs being a Quasi-Conjunct to the previous N_SUB.

5. A string of N_ACCs corresponds to four possibilities:
   – either the N1_ACC is the Indirect Object, the N2_ACC being the Direct Object;
   – or the N1_ACC is the Direct Object, the N2_ACC being a Quasi-Direct Object with a light verb;
   – or the N1_ACC is the Direct Object of the Main Verb, while the N2_ACC is the Direct Object of the lexical converb in the periphrastic causative;
   – or the N1_ACC is the Direct Object, each of the following N_ACCs being a Quasi-Conjunct to the previous N_ACC.
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