

“Multiple Subjects” and “Multiple Direct Objects” in Korean

Igor Mel’čuk
(Université de Montréal)

Mel’čuk, Igor. (2015). “Multiple Subjects” and “Multiple Direct Objects” in Korean. *Language Research*, 51.3, 485-516.

The paper discusses multiple same-case noun strings in a Korean clause. The notion of prolepsis is introduced (a detached fronted clause element expressing the Theme or the Focalized Rheme). The distinction is drawn between the unmarked (= zero marked) nominative case and the *-ka/-i* marked subjective case. General formal definitions of syntactic subject and direct object are proposed. It is shown that: 1) a string of multiple subjective nouns in Korean is resolved in one of the three following ways: Rhematic Prolepses + Subject, Subject + Agentive Complement (of a non-finite form), and Subject + Quasi-Conjuncts (clause elements adding a semantic elaboration to the preceding element); 2) a string of multiple accusative nouns is resolved in one of the four following ways: Indirect Object + Direct Object, Direct Object + Quasi-Direct Object (a clause element forming a whole with a light verb), Direct Object (of the Main Verb) + Direct Object of a non-finite form, and Direct Object + Quasi-Conjuncts.

Keywords: Korean syntax, prolepsis, Subject and Direct Object, the nominative vs. the subjective case, strings of same-case nouns

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) *Nay+ka paym+i musep +ta*
 I NOM snake NOM fearful.be DECL(arative)
 lit. ‘I snake fearful.be’. = ‘I am afraid of the snake’.

- (2) *Kay+ka John+i son +i mul+ess+ta*
 dog NOM ACC hand ACC bite PAST DECL
 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 **-hil/-i**), 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 two 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 [mæriga], *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 [r] in an intervocalic position.
- The letter *e* represents [ɐ] or [ʌ]; the digraphs *ay*, *ey* and *oy* stand for [ɛ], [e] and [œ].

Sequences of non-coordinated nouns in the same grammatical case [N_{CASE-x} + N_{CASE-x} + ...] 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 N_{CASE-x}s 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”:

- (3) *Idomene+ùs* *Oinóma+on* *bále* *gastér+a* *méssē+n*
 Idomeneus NOM Oinomaon ACC struck belly ACC middle 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 John, Peter and Mary*). 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 not 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 vs. subjective 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 expression 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 circumstantials. (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

- (6) a. $K^{\theta}okkili +ka_{\text{RHEME}} k^{\theta}o +ka_{\text{RHEME}}$ *kil +ta* 'It is the elephant [such that] it is [his]
 elephant SUB trunk SUB be.long DECL(arative) trunk [that] is long'.
 b. $K^{\theta}okkili +n\dot{n}_{\text{THEME}} k^{\theta}o +n\dot{n}_{\text{THEME}}$ *kil +ta* 'As for the elephant, as for [its] trunk,
 elephant-NOM TH trunk-NOM TH be.long DECL [it] is long'.
 c. $K^{\theta}o +n\dot{n}_{\text{THEME}} k^{\theta}okkili+ka_{\text{RHEME}}$ *kil +ta* 'As for trunk, it is the elephant
 trunk-NOM TH elephant SUB be.long DECL [whose trunk] is long'.
 d. $K^{\theta}okkili +n\dot{n}_{\text{THEME}} k^{\theta}o +ka_{\text{RHEME}}$ *kil +ta* 'As for the elephant, it is trunk [that]
 elephant-NOM TH trunk SUB be.long DECL 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) $Kay+eykey$ $John+n\dot{n}_{\text{THEME}}$ *son+i mul+li +ess+ko*
 dog DAT TH hand SUB bite PASS PAST CONV(erb)
 $Mary+n\dot{n}_{\text{THEME}}$ *tali+ka mul+li +ess+ta.*
 TH leg SUB bite PASS PAST DECL
 lit. 'By.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 the conceptual apparatus of general linguistics, the term *nominative* should be reserved for the “nominating” noun form.

Definition 2: Nominative (Mel'čuk 1988: 208, 255-256, 2006: 107ff)

|| 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 $-\emptyset$, which is quite typical of the nominative: *na*+ \emptyset ‘I’, *kay*+ \emptyset ‘dog’, *namu*+ \emptyset ‘tree’, *salam*+ \emptyset ‘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 | : <i>John</i> + \emptyset <i>kanta</i> ‘John goes (somewhere)’. |
| b. DirO | : <i>Na</i> + \emptyset <i>John</i> + \emptyset <i>ponta</i> ‘I John see’. |
| c. IndirO | : <i>Ne</i> + \emptyset <i>John</i> + \emptyset <i>kike</i> <i>ču</i> + <i>ess</i> + <i>ni</i> ? ‘You John this gave?’ |
| d. Copular attribute | : <i>Na</i> + \emptyset <i>sensayn</i> + \emptyset <i>ita</i> ‘I teacher am’. |
| e. Adnominal attribute | : <i>salam</i> + \emptyset <i>moksoli</i> ‘person voice’ = ‘human voice’ |
| f. Direction circumstantial | : <i>Seoul</i> + \emptyset <i>kanta</i> ‘[I/He to] Seoul go/goes’. |
| g. Comparand | : <i>Nay</i> + <i>ka</i> <i>Mary</i> + <i>lil</i> <i>John</i> + \emptyset <i>pota</i> <i>te</i> <i>salajhanta</i> ‘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 | : <i>Sensaynmim</i> + \emptyset , <i>ili</i> <i>osipsio</i> ! ‘Respected.teacher, come here!’ |
| i. Thematic prolepsis | : <i>Na</i> + \emptyset + <i>nin</i> <i>kanta</i> ‘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 **-il/-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 SyntSubj, it can be called *subjective*.

= '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. $\overline{\text{John}+i}$ *ssu +n* $\check{c}^h\text{ayk}$ 'by.John written book' = 'book that John wrote'
 SUB write ADJ(ectivalizer) book
 b. $\overline{\text{John}+i}$ $\check{c}^h\text{ayk}+il$ *ssu +m* 'John book write.fact' = '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* $\check{c}^h\text{ayk}+i$ *paek* $\overline{\text{kram}+i}$ *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) $K^h\text{okkili}+\emptyset$ $+n\text{in}$ **THEME** $\overline{\text{k}^h\text{o}+\text{ka}}$ **RHEME** *kil +ta*
 elephant NOM TH trunk SUB be.long 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 *As for elephants, what is long with them?* The N_{SUB} is syntactically the Subject, and communicatively the Rheme.

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

- (14) $\overline{\text{Nay}+\text{ka}}$ *John+i* *čoh* $+ta$ 'I like John'.
 I SUB SUB be.likable DECL
 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) *Na+eykey+ka* *kay+ka musep +ta* 'I am afraid of dogs'.
 I DAT SUB dog SUB be.fearful DECL
 lit. '[It is] to.me [that] dog fearful.is', where *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 **-il/-il** is also used to express the Rheme, thus producing case stacking as well (Sohn 1994: 184):

- (16) *John+in Mary+eykey+il ka+ss+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 $N_{1-NOM} N_{2-NOM} \dots N_{n-NOM}$, but $N_{1-SUB} N_{2-SUB} \dots N_{n-SUB}$. 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 Agentive Complement.

2) The Subj linearly precedes all other MV's actants — with the exception of rhematic elements, which can be fronted. (The thematic 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 **-kkeyse** ≈ 'highly respected':

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) *Nay+ka* [*kohyan+Ǔ*] *kilip+ess+ta* 'I missed [my] hometown'.

(ii) *Nay+ka* [*sensaynim+Ǔ*] *musep+ess+ta* 'I was.afraid of [the] respected.teacher'.

The boxed **N_{SUBS}** are described in Sohn 1994 as DirOs. This is, however, a simple misunderstanding provoked by the English translation. Korean **KHLIPTA** means 'X lacks to Y' rather than 'Y misses X'; in this respect, Korean is like French: *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.

- (17) *Eme +nim+kkeyse ka+si +ess +ta* 'Mother went (somewhere)'.
 mother HON SUB go HON PAST DECL

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):

- (18) a. *John+eykey sensayn+nim+i *p^hilyoha+si +ta <p^hilyoha+ta>*
 DAT teacher HON SUB be.needed HON DECL
 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. *Sensayn+nim+iy elkul+ey paykmuk+i mut +si+ess+ta*
 teacher HON GEN face DAT chalk SUB smudge HON PASS DECL
 'The chalk respectfully.smudged respected.teacher's face'.
 b. *Sensayn+nim+kkeyse son+i caku+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 sensayn+nim+il ap^hu+si +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) *Koyaji+ka čwi +lil mek+Ø +ess+ta* 'The cat ate the mouse'.

cat SUB mouse ACC eat ACT PAST DECL

vs.

Čwi +ka koyaji+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^hayk+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+st+ta* makes the sentence more acceptable).

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

(ii) *Hoysa +eyse Ø na+Ø hant^hey p^hosan^hkim+lil ču +ess+ta*

company LOC «they» I 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. *Tojmulwen+eyse Ø halu+ey tu+kki meki+lil ču +n +ta*

zoo LOC «they» day DAT two CLASS fodder ACC give PRES DECL

lit. 'In.the.zoo, «they» [= people] in.day twice [to animals] fodder give'.

vs.

b. **Tojmulwen+eyse Ø 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 **L**.

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 differ-

ent from the DirO and the Subject; on the **quasi-direct-objective** surface-syntactic relation in Persian, see Mel'čuk 2015: 331, and on the **quasi-subjective** 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 is 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. 6):

|| 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 $N_{1-CASE} N_{2-CASE} \dots N_{n-CASE}$ sequences in Korean. Thus, O'Grady 1991: 235-242 proposes a fine analysis of the N_{ACC} 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 $\langle \dots \rangle$ NPs are best considered topics."

- (21) *Nay+ka c^ha+ka t^haie+ka [keumen]+i na +ss +ta*
 I SUB car SUB tire SUB hole SUB occur PAST DECL
 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_{SUBS}; 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 prolepsis 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_{SUBS} 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* k'o+ka *kil* +*ta* '[It is] John [whose] nose is long'.
 SUB nose SUB be.long DECL
- b. *T^hakca+ka* c^hayk+i *manh* +*ta* '[It is the] table [where] books are many'.
 table SUB book SUB be.many DECL
- c. *Pom+i* kkoC^h+i *manh* +*ta* '[It is the] spring [when] flowers are many'.
 spring SUB flower SUB be.many DECL

The N_{2-SUB} can also represent a Rhematic Prolepsis, cf. (23), where the nominal clause elements have the same form as in (13):

- (23) *K^hokkili+Ø* +*nin*^{THEME} *k^ho+ka*^{RHEME} *kil* +*ta*
 elephant NOM TH trunk SUB be.long DECL
 '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_{SUBS} are Rhematic Prolepses, the last one being the Subject:

- (24) *John+i* *enehak +i* konpu+ka *toy* +*ess+ta*
 SUB linguistics SUB study_(N) SUB be.made PAST DECL
 lit. '[It is] John [and] linguistics [that] study was.made'. =
 'A study was done of linguistics by John'.²⁾

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):

2) Sentence (24) can be also obtained from a different surface-syntactic structure. Namely, JOHN is a Rhematic Prolepsis; ENEHAK 'linguistics' is the Subject; and KONPU 'study_(N)' 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'.

- (25) a. $\overline{\text{John}+i}$ *Mary+ka* *č^hayk+ił* *ilk+ke* *hay+ss* *+ta*
 SUB SUB book ACC read CONV make PAST DECL
 'John made Mary read a book'.
- b. $\overline{\text{John}+i}$ *Mary+ka* *č^hayk+ił* *ilk+iñ* *+ta* *+ko* *mit* *+niñ+ta*
 SUB SUB book ACC read PRES DECL CONV believe PRES DECL
 'John believes Mary is.reading a book'.

In both sentences, *Johmi* 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. $\overline{\text{Subject}}$ + Quasi-Conjunct

The $N_{1\text{-SUB}}$ is the Subject, the $N_{2\text{-SUB}}$ being a Quasi-Conjunct dependent element.

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

L_2 is a quasi-coordinate dependent, or a Quasi-Conjunct, of L_1 , iff L_2 follows L_1 immediately and can play the same surface-syntactic role as L_1 , but does not allow for a coordinate conjunction.

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) *Leo lives in Spain, -quasi-coord* → *in Barcelona, -quasi-coord* → *on 4th May Street, -quasi-coord* → *on the corner of Malaga street, -quasi-coord* → *in a big building, -quasi-coord* → *on the fifth floor*.

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

- (27) *Kay+eykey* $\overline{\text{John}+i}$ *son+i* *mul+li* *+ess+ta* lit. 'By.dog John hand was.bitten'.
 dog DAT SUB hand SUB bite PASS PAST DECLAR

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) *Mary+ka John+i ča +ke hay+ss +ta*
 SUB SUB sleep CONV 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_{SUBS} containing more than two components is easily described in proposed terms: one of these N_{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_{ACC}s, the following five (rather than three, as for the N_{SUB}) cases have to be distinguished.

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

- a) N_{1-ACC} and N_{2-ACC} depend in parallel on a ditransitive Main Verb: N_{1-ACC} is an IndirO, and N_{2-ACC} the DirO (6.2.1).
- b) N_{1-ACC} and N_{2-ACC} depend in parallel on a light Main Verb: N_{1-ACC} is its DirO, and N_{2-ACC} is its Quasi-DirO (6.2.2).
- c) N_{1-ACC} is the DirO of the Main Verb, and N_{2-ACC} is the DirO of the gerund in a phrasal (= analytical) causative (6.2.3).
- d) N_{2-ACC} is the DirO of the Main Verb, and N_{1-ACC} is the Affected Object of the same verb (6.2.4).

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

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

6.2.1. Indirect Object + Direct Object

- (29) a. *Mary+ka John+il č^hayk+il ču +Ø +ess+ta*
 SUB ACC book ACC give ACT PAST DECL
 'Mary gave John a book'.

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

- b. *Mary+ka John+eykey č^hayk+il ču +Ø +ess+ta*
 SUB DAT book ACC give ACT PAST DECL
 'Mary gave John a book'.

N_{1-ACC} does not passivize, while N_{2-ACC} does:

- c. **John+i Mary+ey iyhay č^hayk+il ču +eči +ess+ta*
 SUB DAT by book ACC give PASS PAST DECL
 'John was given a book by Mary'.

vs.

- Č^hayk+i Mary+ey iyhay John+eykey ču +eči +ess+ta*
 book SUB DAT by DAT 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-ACC} implements an IndirO:

- (30) *Mary+ka loboti+il p^hal+il tal +Ø +ass +ta*
 SUB robot 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, end-note [3]. In Latin, Serbian and German, N_{1-ACC} turns out to be an IndirO or OblO, while N_{2-ACC} is a genuine DirO (*Ger. Was_{ACC} fragt er mich_{ACC}?* lit. 'What asks he me?', where WAS 'what' is an OblO: this WAS alternates 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* enehak+i *konpu+i* *hay+ss +ta* (O'Grady 1991: 236; see also)
 SUB linguistics ACC study_(N) ACC make PAST DECL O'Grady 1992)
 lit. 'John makes [a] study linguistics'. = 'John studies linguistics'.
- b. *John+i* *enehak +iy* konpu+i *hay+ss +ta* 'John does a study of linguistics'.
 SUB linguistics GEN study_(N) ACC make PAST DECL
- c. *John+i* *enehak +Ø* konpu+i *hay+ss +ta* 'John does a linguistics study'.
 SUB linguistics NOM study_(N) ACC make PAST DECL

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_{predic} (KONPU ‘[a] study’), and the collocate is a support verb V_{support} (HATA ‘make’); as a whole, the collocation “N_{predic} V_{support}” is syntactically equivalent to a transitive verb having a regular DirO N (here, ENEHAK ‘linguistics’), something like “[make_{Vsupport} [a] study_{Npredic}]_{Vtrans} linguistics_{N=DirO}” ≈ “[to] study linguistics”. Inside this collocation, the N_{predic} must be encoded as a Quasi-DirO of the V_{support} HATA, since the latter cannot have two DirOs:

ENEHAK ‘linguistics’ ← dir-obj-HATA ‘make’-quasi-dir-obj → KONPU ‘study’
 ‘make [a] study linguistics’ = ‘[to] study linguistics’

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

The same meaning can be expressed by different syntactic structures, where KONPU 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_{support} + deverbal noun S₀” (“[N-ra]” stands for their DirO, -ra being a postposition that obligatorily marks a definite DirO; Mel’čuk 2009: 39-40, (23)):

(32) Persian

'[to] end [N]'	= <i>tämäm kârdân</i>	[N-ra] lit. 'ending do [N]'
'[to] begin [N]'	= <i>ağaz kârdân</i>	[N-ra] lit. 'beginning do [N]'
'[to] light up [N]'	= <i>ateš kârdân</i>	[N-ra] lit. 'fire do [N]'
'[to] beat [N]'	= <i>kotak zâdân</i>	[N-ra] lit. 'beating hit [N]'
'[to] show [N]'	= <i>nešân dadân</i>	[N-ra] lit. 'sign give [N]'
'[to] learn [N]'	= <i>yad gereftân</i>	[N-ra] lit. 'memory take [N]'
'[to] congratulate [N]'	= <i>tabrik goftân</i>	[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:

*Johni enehakil *simtoissnin konpulil hayssta* lit. 'John linguistics_{ACC} **deep** study did'.

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

*Johni enehakil konpulil hayko, Maryka suhakil *kukesil hayssta*
lit. 'John linguistics_{ACC} [a] study_{ACC} having.done, Mary mathematics_{ACC} the.same_{ACC} did'.

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

?*Johni konpulil enehakil hayssta.*

d. A Quasi-DirO cannot undergo relativization:

Johni ha+nin konpu 'by.John made [a] study'= 'study made by John'
vs.

**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 (34a), contains two DirOs (boxed), which depend on two different clause elements: *Marylil* is the DirO of the MV HATA 'make', while *c^haykeil* is the DirO of the converb *ilkke* 'reading':

- (34) a. *John+i* *Marylil* *c^haykeil* *ilkke* *hay+ss+ta*
SUB ACC book ACC read CONV do PAST DECL
'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. *Mary+ka John+ey iyhay č^hayk+il ilk +ke toy+ess+ta*
 SUB DAT by book ACC read CONV get PAST DECL
 '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. *Mary+ka John+il sačⁱⁿ+il čcič +ess +ta* 'Mary tore up John's picture'.
 SUB ACC picture ACC tear.up PAST DECL

It is the picture that Mary tore up, not John: SAČIN 'picture, photo' is the DirO of the Main Verb. And what about 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 bă Juhēn băng-le liǎngzhi jiǎo* 'Mary tied up John's feet'.
 Mary John tie.up PERF two foot

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+il son +il mul+ess +ta* (O'Grady 1991: 3)
 dog SUB ACC hand ACC bite PAST DECL
 'The dog bit John on the hand'.³⁾

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

N_{1-ACC} is the DirO, and each of the following N_{i-ACC} s is a quasi-coordinate conjunct of the preceding N_{ACC} . N_{i-ACC} do not easily allow permutation and can be omitted without affecting the grammaticality of the sentence:

- b. (i) ²/_{*}*Kay+ka son+šl John+šl mulessta.*
 (ii) *Kay+ka John+šl 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 N_{ACCS} (O’Grady 1991: 77):

- (37) *John+i ki mune+lšl tali+lšl kkšt pupun+šl čokim+šl čal+ass+ta*
 SUB the octopus ACC leg ACC end part ACC bit ACC cut PAST DECL
 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 N_{ACC} MUNE ‘octopus’ is the DirO, and the following N_{ACCS} are Quasi-Conjuncts:

ČALITA-dir-obj → MUNE-quasi-coord → TALI-quasi-coord →
 KKŦT+PUPUN-quasi-coord → ČOKIM

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 distributions of case suffixes. Thus, we can have sentences in which MUNE remains in the accusative, but some of other nouns receive the nominative (these are boldfaced):

- (38) a. *John+i ki mune +lšl tali+lšl **kkšt** pupun+Ø čokim+šl čal+ass +ta*
 SUB the octopus ACC leg ACC **end part** NOM bit ACC cut PAST DECL
 b. *John+i ki mune +lšl **tali+Ø** kkšt pupun+šl čokim+šl čal+ass+ta*
 SUB the octopus ACC **leg** NOM end part ACC bit ACC cut PAST DECL
 c. *John+i ki mune +lšl **tali+Ø** **kkšt** pupun+Ø čokim+šl čal+ass+ta*
 SUB the octopus ACC **leg** NOM **end part** NOM bit ACC cut PAST DECL

attribute in the genitive: *Kay+ka John+uy son+šl mulessta* ‘The dog bit John’s hand’.

In sentences (38) an N_{NOM} is an adnominal attribute of the following N; all N_{ACCS} keep their syntactic role. Formally: $\text{KKIT}+\text{PUPUN} \leftarrow \text{adnom-attrib-}\check{\text{COKIM}}$, $\text{TALI} \leftarrow \text{adnom-attrib-KKIT}+\text{PUPUN}$, etc. An adnominal attribute can also be in the genitive (the suffix $-\dot{\text{y}}$): $\text{kk}\dot{\text{i}}+\text{pupun}+\dot{\text{y}}$ $\check{\text{cokim}}+\dot{\text{i}}$ 'bit of end part' or $\text{tali}+\dot{\text{y}}$ $\text{kk}\dot{\text{i}}+\text{pupun}+\dot{\text{i}}$ 'end part of the leg'.

A string of many consecutive N_{ACCS} can also be described in proposed terms: one of the N_{ACCS} 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_{NOMS} :

- (39) *John*+ \emptyset *ki mune*+ \emptyset *tali*+ \emptyset *kk* $\dot{\text{i}}$ *pupun*+ \emptyset *čokim*+ \emptyset *čalassta*
 NOM NOM NOM NOM NOM
 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 JOHN is the Subject and MUNE 'octopus' is the DirO; each of the following N_{NOMS} is a Quasi-Conjunct to the preceding noun ('John cut the octopus, on the leg, the end part, a bit').
- Or JOHN is the Subject and ČOKIM 'bit' is the DirO; each of the N_{NOMS} that precede 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_{DATS} (Maling & Kim 1992):

- (40) a. *Nay+ka* *Mary+eykey* *kwi+ey* *pimil+il* *soksaki+ess +ta*
 I SUB DAT car DAT secret ACC whisper PAST DECL
 lit. 'I to.Mary to.car secret whispered'. = 'I whispered the secret into Mary's ear'.
- b. *Koŋčaj+ey* *č^hajŋko +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 (\approx 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 $N_{1\text{-SUB}}$ is the Subject and the $N_{2\text{-SUB}}$ is an AgCo of a non-finite verb form;
 - or else the $N_{1\text{-SUB}}$ 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 $N_{1\text{-ACC}}$ is the Indirect Object, the $N_{2\text{-ACC}}$ being the Direct

Object;

- or the N_{1-ACC} is the Direct Object, the N_{2-ACC} being a Quasi-Direct Object with a light verb;
- or the N_{1-ACC} is the Direct Object of the Main Verb, while the N_{2-ACC} is the Direct Object of the lexical converb in the periphrastic causative;
- or the N_{1-ACC} is the Direct Object, each of the following N_{ACCs} being a Quasi-Conjunct to the previous N_{ACC}.

Acknowledgments

This paper was started many years ago, after the reading of O'Grady 1991. On the very first stage, I received invaluable help from Chai-Song Hong and Seong-Heon Lee; without their data, advice, criticisms and support I would never dare to tackle the problems in a language which I do not know! They also reread the prefinal version and saved me from several blunders. Then Geun-Seok Lim and Mi-Hiyun Kim checked the text for linguistic mistakes and thus gave me a big push. The first sketch of the paper was scrutinized and criticized, as always, by Lidija Iordanskaja; the subsequent versions were read by David Beck, Jasmina Milićević and Alain Polguère, whose remarks helped me significantly improve the presentation. Then Reviewers I and II of *Korean Linguistics* and Reviewers A, B and C of *Language Research* caught several omissions, misformulations, and unclear spots. I ask all of them to receive here a humble expression of my heartfelt gratitude. Usual disclaimers apply.

References

- Beck, David. (2011). Sorting Out Grammatical Relations in Multi-object Constructions in Upper Necaxa Totonac. *Unpublished manuscript*.
- Chang, Suk-Jin. (1996). *Korean*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
- Cho, Sungdai. (1992). Korean Periphrastic Causatives as a Verb Incorporation Process. In: *SICOL '92 Proceedings*, 595-606.
- Cho, Yongjoon. (2011). *Multiple Nominative Construction in Korean and its Second*

- Language Acquisition by Adult English Speakers*. [PhD Thesis.] University of Southern California, Los Angeles. See also: <http://digitallibrary.usc.edu/cdm/compoundobject/collection/p15799coll127/id/674491/rec/3140>
- Dryer, Matthew. (1983). Indirect Objects in Kinyarwanda Revisited. In: D. Perlmutter (ed.), *Relational Grammar 1*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago/London, pp. 129-140.
- Gerds, Donna and Youn, Cheong. (1990). Non-Nominative Subjects in Korean. In: S. Kuno *et al.* (eds), *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics III: Proceedings of the 1989 Workshop on Korean Linguistics*, Hanshin Publishing Company, Seoul, 235-248. See also: <http://www.sfu.ca/~gerds/papers/GerdsYounNonNominativeSubjects.pdf>
- Han, Chung-hye and Rambow, Owen. (2000). The Sino-Korean Light Verb Construction and Lexical Argument Structure. In: *Workshop Tag+5 Proceedings*; see also: <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.28.3689&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- Han, Na-Rae. (2004). Korean Null Pronouns: Classification and Annotation. In: *Proceedings of the ACL 2004 Workshop on Discourse Annotation*, 33-50. See also: <http://aclweb.org/anthology//W/W04/W04-0205.pdf>
- Han, Na-Rae. (2006). Korean Zero Pronouns: Analysis and Resolution. [PhD Thesis.] University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia. See also: <http://search.proquest.com/docview/305243795>
- Jang, Youngjun. (1997). Multiple Subject Construction in Korean: A Functional Explanation. *Kansas Working Papers in Linguistics* 22.1, 25-40.
- Kim, Hong-Bok and Sells, Peter. (2010). Oblique Case Marking on Core Arguments in Korean. *Studies in Language* 34.3, 602-635.
- Kimenyi, Alexandre. (1980). *Relational Grammar of Kinyarwanda*. UCLA Press, Berkeley, CA.
- Kuno, Susumo. (1973). *The Structure of the Japanese Language*. The MIT Press, Cambridge, MA/ London.
- Lee, Iksop and Ramsey, S. Robert. (2000). *The Korean Language*. SUNY Press, Albany, N.Y.
- Li, Charles and Thompson, Sandra. (1981). *Mandarin Chinese. A Functional Reference Grammar*. UCLA Press, Berkeley etc., CA.
- MacDonald, Danica and Welch, Nicholas. (2009). Topic, Focus and Double Subjects in Korean. In: *Proceedings of the 2009 annual conference of the Canadian Linguistic Association*, 1-14.
- Maling, Joan and Kim, Soowon. (1992). Case Assignment in the Inalienable Possession Construction in Korean. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 1, 37-68. See

- also: http://ak243.user.srpf.net/gvt/presentations/sgas2011_handout_maling.pdf
- Mel'čuk, Igor. (1988). *Dependency Syntax: Theory and Practice*. The SUNY Press, Albany, N.Y.
- Mel'čuk, Igor. (2001). *Communicative Organization in Natural Language. The Semantic-Communicative Structure of Sentences*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
- Mel'čuk, Igor. (2004). Actants in Semantics and Syntax I: Actants in Semantics. *Linguistics* 42.1, 1-66; Actants in Semantics and Syntax II: Actants in Syntax. *Linguistics* 42.2, 247-291.
- Mel'čuk, Igor. (2006). *Aspects of the Theory of Morphology*. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin/New York.
- Mel'čuk, Igor. (2009). Dependency in Natural Language. In: A. Polguère & I. Mel'čuk, eds., *Dependency in Linguistic Description*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1-110.
- Mel'čuk, Igor. (2012). *Semantics. From Meaning to Text*. [Vol. 1]. John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
- Mel'čuk, Igor. (2013a). *Semantics. From Meaning to Text*. Vol. 2. John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
- Mel'čuk, Igor. (2013b). Syntactic Subject, Once Again. In: V. Apresjan, B. Iomdin & E. Ageeva, eds., *Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Meaning-Text Theory, Prague, August 30-31, 2013*, iii - xxxiii. See also: http://meaningtext.net/mtt2013/proceedings_MTT13.pdf
- Mel'čuk, Igor. (2014). Syntactic Subject: Syntactic Relations, Once Again. In: V. Plungjan with M. Daniel, E. Ljutikova, S. Tatevosov & O. Fedorova, eds., *Jazyk. Konstanty, Peremennye. Pamjati Aleksandra Evgen'eviča Kibrika*, Sankt-Peterburg: Aletejja, 169-216.
- Mel'čuk, Igor. (2015). *Semantics. From Meaning to Text*. Vol. 3. John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
- O'Grady, William. (1991). *Categories and Case. The Sentence Structure of Korean*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
- O'Grady, William. (1992). On the Status of *ha-ta* in the Multiple Complement Structures. In: *1992 Seoul International Conference on Linguistics [SICOL'92]*, The Linguistic Society of Korea, Seoul, 238-247.
- Schütze, Carson. (2001). On Korean “Case Stacking”: The Varied Functions of the Particles **ka** and **lul**. *The Linguistic Review*, 19: 193-292. See also: http://homes.chass.utoronto.ca/~cla-acl/actes2009/CLA2009_MacDonald_Welch.pdf
- Sohn, Ho-Min. (1994). *Korean*. Routledge, London/New York.

Xolodovič, Aleksandr. (1954[2013]). *Očerk grammatiki korejskogo jazyka [Outline of a Korean Grammar]*. URSS, Moskva.

Igor Mel'čuk
Department of Linguistics and Translation
Université de Montréal
3200 Jean-Brillant
Montréal, Québec H3C1J7, Canada
Email: igor.melcuk@umontreal.ca

Received: October 28, 2015

Revised version received: December 10, 2015

Accepted: December 15, 2015