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Korea is famous for its multiple monolinguistic and multiple accusative
organisations. Various multiple monolinguistic organizations have been
discussed in the literature. However, the general agreement seems to be that
verb objects are accusative in Korean. In this paper, the focus will be on the
discussion between NOM and ACC, comparing the behavior of argument NPs with
adverbial. This will show where the distinction of various types of

1.0 Abstract: Adverbs Case in Chinese

Anders Li (1983) proposed that all NPs are subject to the Case Filter, and that
argument NPs are not subject to Case. This hypothesis is based on the fact that
in Chinese, verbal objects can be followed by certain adverbial NPs for a single
structural case. Thus, a verb like 'give' can be followed by either an object NP or by
an adverbial NP, but not both, as illustrated in (1a-c):

(1) a. Taehan neun yoo.
   he read ASP book
   'He read a book.'

b. Taehan neun yoo, tanki
   he read /with those hours
   'He read for those hours.'

c. *Taehan neun yoo, tanki
   he read ASP book /with those hours
   *He read ASP book for those hours.

Li suggests that there is no appropriate configuration in Chinese to serve as a
case designator for certain adverbial phrases, e.g., those expressing duration or
frequency. However, the phrase 'give' is not a case designator in Chinese, and
therefore does not pass the Case Filter test. The ungrammaticality of (1c) suggests that
the Case Filter is not a structural filter that is subject to Case Filter violations.

1.1. An adverbial Noun Phrase (ANP) can be followed by an NP as a
structurally adverbial complement. Thus, we can say 'He read for
those hours.'

In (1c), the NP 'those hours' modifies the NP 'read.'

(2) Taehan neun yoo seung yaxi
   he read ASP three hours
   'He read for three hours.'

(3) *Taehan neun yoo seung yaxi
   he read ASP book three hours
   *He read ASP book for three hours.

These constructions have been extensively discussed in the literature on
Chinese Syntax, and I will assume with Li and others that their function is to
give a passive construction for the verb object in a passive case. However, the
construction in (3) is ungrammatical. In the preceding discussion, it was tacitly
assumed that
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(6) a. Ku ch'ak-yi
twu pet-i

b. Ku mose-tii

twu pet-i

(7) Mary was given the ring/thrua/this.
(13) Chibi-n na yarigusa/nut-sikan-nani-ka to sikan-tongan-ni manasil-ssa-ta. Chibi-ROM manasil-ni 1st-before ACC one-hour-length ACC two-hours-for ACC make-Pas-Inf

'Chibi made a one-hour-long movie for two hours.'

(14) Yoko-bi-ni sikan-tongan-ni manasil-eci-ssi-ta. manasil-ni hour-length ACC two-hours-for ACC/NOM make-Pas-Inf

'Yoko-bi spent two hours making a movie.'

If this is correct, we arrive at the generalization about Korean Case-marking stated in (12). Korean predicates are divided into two classes: Case-assigners and non-Case-assigners.

(19) a argument of non-Case-assigning Predicates can only be NOM

b. adverbial can be ACC or negative (and NOM if [essive]

We have seen that the Case marking on Adverbial phrases in Korean is not a function of the Case-assigning properties of the predication they modify. Nonetheless, it cannot be too much consideration that the Case-markers are morphologically identical to the standard NOM/ACC Case-markers. Not only is the Case-marking factually non-accidental —— so strictly correlated with the Case-assigning properties of the predication, but they exhibit identical acceptability and non-occurrence constraints. It is easy to imagine various technical ways of capturing the generalization in (19), but for the moment I take it as not the redundancy in the interrelation between being static and being a non-Case-assigner.

(20) a. Precious division of ACC on Adverbials

b. Adverbs bearing ACC which have been mentioned in the literature. First, consider the following examples of adverbials with ACC cited by Kang (1986), ch. 13, 15, 16, 18, and given on (20).

(24) a. Mary-ni kare-ni ashi/varrenchi na kare-ni varrenchi varrenchi-

Mary-NOM hand-NOM,ACC hand-NOM,ACC

'hand the hand'

b. Mary-ni kare-ni ashi/varrenchi na kare-ni varrenchi varrenchi-

Mary-NOM hand-NOM,ACC hand-NOM,ACC

'hand the hand'

We see that the [locative] in this construction is unlike the adverbs discussed earlier in that its Case-marking does not reflect stative, rather in case is determined by the Case-marking properties of the predicate. The Case-marking does not support Young-Se Kang's suggestion that the NEG in the negative is actually an argument which gets both Case and its-accusative from the verb.

Now consider the lexical passive of this construction, illustrated in (25), which is illustrated in (25).

(25) a. Mary-ni mano/nai ashi/varrenchi na kare-ni varrenchi varrenchi-

Mary-NOM hand-NOM,ACC hand-NOM,ACC

'hand the hand'

Mary-NOM hand-NOM,ACC hand-NOM,ACC

'hand the hand'

The concept in Case-marking is clear, ACC is simply impossible in the examples in (27). These examples once again provide further evidence for the general use of NOM and ACC on adverbials in Korean, where the choice of case is sensitive to the stative of the predicative.

A second case of adverbials bearing ACC discussed in the literature is the so-called Presentative-Accusative construction, illustrated in (23).


John taught Mary by the hand.

b. Congenital ka nam-ni nam-ni kare-ni ashi/varrenchi

congenital-NOM nom-NOM hand-NOM,ACC hand-NOM,ACC

'gardeners-NOM verb-Acc/ACC catch-Pas-Inf

'gardeners catch the tree by its branches'.

The relationship between the two accusative NPs must be one of inalienable possession (Chappell 1980), the second accusative NP is therefore typically a body-part. This construction has received considerable attention in the literature on Korean Case-marking. A word is the source of ACC and the stative of the second accusative NP as argument or adverbial. In the Presentative Acession analysis of Relational Grammar (cf. relational analysis by Hanna (1992)), the 'body-part' NP is a verbal argument of 'hit' which gets put on stative. Kang (1986) and O'Grady (1987) on the other hand analyze it as an adverbial NP with locative meaning, following an observation originally due to Toronto (1970). I will refer to this second accusative as the 'locative NP'.

Note what happens in the passive. First, consider the ci-passive, illustrated in (24). We see that the locative NP can only be NOM, this is true even when an adverb of duration bears NOM, as in (24):
I am grateful to Sou-Youn Kim for this observation. See Brown (1989, Ch. 5) for relevant discussion of the Japanese construction. This was suggested independently by Young-jo Kim in response to a question after the presentation of her paper "On Multiple Accumulative Construal of Logical Structures in Japanese" at the Workshop.

There is evidence from other languages to suggest that the claim that it is standard ("canonical") Case which is applying on Adverbial phrases. Peter Kiparsky (1978) and Pacific (1981) suggest that NPs which bear Accusative Case are treated with the Participle Case under negation, just as do NPs bearing the ergative Case, and are not interpreted as Adverbial adjuncts. In the Australian languages, 

\[\text{基 wet (\textbf{base})} \]

This is consistent with the idea that the Case-marking of NPs which bear Accusative Case are treated with the Participle Case under negation, just as do NPs bearing the ergative Case, and are not interpreted as Adverbial adjuncts. In the Australian languages,
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