

## Adverbials and Structural Case in Korean

Joan Maling

*Brandeis University*

Korean is famous for its multiple nominative and multiple accusative constructions. Various multiple accusative constructions have been discussed in the literature: Possessor Ascension, adversity passives, causatives, light verb constructions and ditransitive verbs. In this paper I will focus on the alternation between NOM and ACC, comparing the behavior of argument NPs with adverbials. What I will show here is (i) that adverbial phrases of various types can also bear ACC quite generally in Korean, and (ii) even more striking, they exhibit the same alternation between ACC and NOM characteristic of so-called "Structural" Case. These Case alternations lend support to the suggestion of Audrey Li (1985) that the domain of the Case Filter includes so-called adverbial NPs as well as argument NPs. Following Young-Se Kang (1986), I assume that NOM is not assigned by any functional or lexical head in Korean, but is a default Case not restricted to any configurational position such as SPEC, IP. Before turning to the Korean evidence, I will present Li's argument from Mandarin Chinese that certain adverbial NPs receive Structural Case.

## 1.0 Abstract Accusative Case in Chinese

Audrey Li (1985, in press) hypothesizes that all NPs are subject to the Case Filter, not just argument NPs. This hypothesis is based on the fact that in Chinese, verbal objects compete with certain adverbial NPs for a single Structural Case. Thus, a verb like *nian* 'read' can be followed by either an object NP or by an adverbial NP, but not both, as illustrated in (1a-c):

- (1) a. Ta nian le shu.  
he read ASP book  
'he read a book'
- b. Ta nian le sange xiaoshi  
he read ASP three hours  
'he read for three hours'
- c. \*Ta nian (le) shu sange xiaoshi. (Li 1985:57 (36a))  
he read ASP book three hours

Li suggests that there is no appropriate preposition in Chinese to serve as a Case assigner for certain adverbial phrases, e.g. those expressing Duration or Frequency (D/F phrases). She further argues that D/F phrases are categorially NPs in Chinese, and therefore must get Case in order to avoid a Case-Filter violation. The ungrammaticality of (1c) indicates that the D/F adverbial can get Structural Case only if there is no object NP also requiring Structural (Accusative) Case. Chinese resolves the competition for a single Structural Accusative by providing at least two alternative means for verbal objects to get Case: the *ba*-construction and verb reduplication. These are illustrated in (2) and (3) respectively.

- (2) Ta ba shu nian le sange xiaoshi. BA-construction  
he BA book read ASP three hours
- (3) Ta nian shu nian le sange xiaoshi. verb reduplication  
he read book read ASP 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 (in part) to provide Structural Case for the verbal object (see also Huang 1982, ch. 3.3-4). What is relevant here is rather the observation that adverbial NPs can bear (Abstract) Structural Case. In the preceding discussion, it was tacitly assumed that

1987

Harvard Studies in  
Korean Linguistics III

the Structural Case that D/F phrases receive in Chinese is Accusative; since Chinese is totally devoid of morphological Case marking, this assumption cannot be tested.

## 2.0 Structural Case in Korean

Fortunately Case-marking is morphologically overt in Korean, and it is clearly ACC which surfaces on such adverbials. This is illustrated in (4):

- (4) a. Chelswu-ka twu pen-ul/\*i ilk-ess-ta.  
Chulsoo-NOM two times-ACC/\*NOM read-Pst-Ind  
'Chulsoo read for three hours'  
b. Chelswu-ka sey sikan-tongan-ul/\*i ilk-ess-ta.  
Chulsoo-NOM 3 hours-for-ACC/\*NOM read-Pst-Ind  
'Chulsoo read for three hours'

The accusative case-marking is optional; ACC is generally optional in Korean for arguments as well as adverbials, and this optionality will not be indicated with parentheses in the examples. Note that the categorial status of the adverbial as either NP or PP does not matter; in either case, it can bear the accusative marker -(l)ul. This is not surprising given that Korean morphology quite generally allows stacking of Inherent and Structural Case, as shown by Gerds & Youn (1988).

Korean differs from Chinese in that the adverbial does not compete with the verbal object(s) for Structural Accusative; it is possible to have two or more accusative NPs in a single clause. This phenomenon of multiple accusatives is illustrated in (5):

- (5) a. Chelswu-ka chayk-ul sey sikan-tongan-ul ilk-ess-ta.  
Chulsoo-NOM book-ACC 3 hours-for-ACC read-pst-ind  
'Chulsoo read books for three hours'  
b. Cheli-ka ku munce-lul sey pen-ul sayngkak-ul het-ciman,...  
-NOM the problem-ACC 3 times-ACC thought-ACC did-though  
'Although Cheli gave the problem a thought three times,...'  
c. Cheli-ka Mary-lul panci-lul twu pen-ul senmul-ul ha-ess-ta  
Cheli-NOM Mary-ACC ring-ACC 2times-ACC gift-ACC do-Pst-Ind  
'Cheli presented Mary with a ring twice'

Such data provide a serious challenge to the usual hypothesis that Case-assigners can universally assign only one Case, but lend support to the suggestion of Yip et al. (1987) that some languages allow the so-called "structural" Cases to spread to any and all NPs lacking Case. Yip et al. hypothesize that surface case forms an autonomous Case Tier which is associated with the NPs of the phrase structure tier by general principles analogous to those of autosegmental phonology. The contrast between Korean and Chinese can be characterized very simply in the Case Tier framework: Korean and Chinese differ minimally in that only Korean allows "Case-spreading."

Various accounts of multiple accusative (and multiple nominative) constructions in different theoretical frameworks have been proposed in the literature (Choe 1985; Yim 1985; Kang 1986; O'Grady 1987; Kuroda 1988, inter alia). However, these accounts do not discuss the fact that adverbials quite generally bear ACC in Korean. The obvious question is what the source of the accusative case on the adverbial NP is. In Germanic languages such as Icelandic or German where adverbials are often morphologically accusative, it is usually assumed that there is an independent source of case marking, often called "Semantic Case," associated with these adverbials. For Korean, however, since the ACC alternates with NOM, the obvious hypothesis is that it is Structural Case. This is illustrated by the examples in (6), the passive counterparts of the examples in (5):

- (6) a. Ku chayk-i twu pen-i ilk-hi-ess-ta.  
the book-NOM two times-NOM read-pass-pst-ind  
'the book was read twice'  
b. Ku munce-ka sey pen-i sayngkak-(i) toy-ess-ta.  
the problem-NOM 3 times-NOM thought-NOM get-Pst-Ind  
'the problem was given a thought three times'  
c. Mary-ka panci-ka twu pen-i senmul-(i) toy-ess-ta.  
Mary-NOM ring-NOM 2 times-NOM gift-NOM get-Pst-Ind  
'Mary was presented a ring twice'

(Since (6a) contains a lexical passive, the adverbial can also bear ACC; see the discussion of example (16) below.) This looks strikingly like the Case alternations characteristic of Structural Case; it cannot be accidental coincidence that the markers surfacing on the adverbial phrases are morphologically identical to NOM and ACC. Structural Case alternations are unusually pervasive in Korean, where active Ss with multiple ACCs become multiple NOMs in the passive, as seen by the contrasts between (5) and (6).

Korean thus contrasts with languages like English, where the retained object in the passive of a ditransitive verb clearly bears Accusative rather than Nominative Case: Compare (7) with (6b,c).

- (7) Mary was given the rings/them/\*they.

This difference can be accounted for by hypothesizing that passive verbs are (potential) Case-assigners in English but not Korean. In the "Case in Tiers" framework of Yip et al. (1987), then, ACC will be available for the retained second object of ditransitive verbs in English (and Swedish) but not in Korean; as a consequence, it will be (default) NOM which spreads in Korean passives. In other words, I suggest that ACC is removed from the Syntactic Case Tier as a lexical property of passive and other non-Case-assigning verbs. This suggestion is consistent with (a parameterized version of) Burzio's Generalization.

How, then, is Structural Case, that is, standard NOM and ACC, assigned in Korean? As a first hypothesis, let's assume the Generalized Case-marking analysis of Young-Se Kang (1986), given in (8):

- (8) Generalized Case Marking in Korean  
a. ACC Case is assigned to NPs which are sisters of [-stative] V<sup>o</sup>  
b. NOM Case is assigned to all non-Case-marked NPs (default)

Kang claims that all Case-marking in Korean is structural, not "inherent." In particular, he argues that NOM is not assigned by AGR or INFL, but is a default Case. Thus NOM can be assigned in any position to NPs without Case, "irrespective of whether those NPs are inside V' or outside V'" (p. 122).

## 3.0 Case-marking on Adverbial NPs in Korean

If descriptively adequate, the simplicity of the Generalized Case-Marking Rules given in (8) makes them highly desirable. Let us now look more closely at the Case alternations on various adverbial NPs in the language. I will show that the correlation between ACC Case and [-stative] applies to adverbial NPs. This would at first seem to provide further support for Kang's Generalized Case-Marking Hypothesis, but as we shall see, the correlation unfortunately does not hold perfectly for the Case-marking of verbal arguments.

### 3.1 Correlation between [-stative] and [+ACC]

It is standardly assumed within GB that active verbs are Accusative Case-assigners, while their passive counterparts are not. Following Kuno (1973), Kang

suggests that "what is really relevant to absorption of the Accusative Case-assigning feature of a verb is the property [+stative]" (1986, p. 116). Unfortunately, however, his arguments are circular, since he provides no independent evidence for stativity other than inability to assign ACC Case to a complement. While it is clear that being a Case-assigner is very strongly correlated with being non-stative in Korean (as in Japanese), the correlation is not absolute, at least on any usual interpretation of stativity (see e.g. Dowty 1979, Ch. 2).

The most serious problem for Kang's analysis is the fact that certain non-Case-assigning predicates can occur with the progressive morpheme and/or an adverbial which implies an activity in the sense of Dowty/Vendler, and thus are presumably [-stative]. These are typically passive predicates, but can also be underlying DAT NOM predicates, as in (9). For example, the verb *na* 'to break out' is [-stative], as suggested by the fact that it can take the Progressive morpheme. This is illustrated in (9b):

- (9) a. I kongcang-ey pul-i na-ess-ta.  
this factory-DAT fire-NOM break-out-pst-ind  
'Fire broke out in this factory'
- b. I kongcang-ey pul-i na-ko iss-ess-ta.  
this factory-DAT fire-NOM breakout-PROG be-pst-ind  
'Fire was breaking out in this factory'

Two kinds of passives are distinguished in Korean: a productive syntactic passive formed with either *gi* or *toy* as auxiliary, and a lexical passive formed with the morpheme *hi/li/i/ki*. Only a limited set of verbs form lexical passives; some (but not all) of these can take either ACC or NOM complements (p. 134, n 17), a fact which Kang attributes to semantic ambiguity; i.e., they are either [+stative] or [-stative]. By way of contrast, neither *gi*- or *toy*- passives can assign Accusative Case to their complements, a fact which Kang attributes to their being unambiguously [+stative] (p.115). But this seems implausible. Note that many such predicates can co-occur with the PROG morpheme and/or an adverbial which implies an activity in the sense of Dowty/Vendler. This is illustrated in (10).

- (10) a. Pyenci-ka ssu-i eci-ko iss-ess-ta. (ci-passive)  
letter-NOM write-Pass Pass-PROG be-Pst-Ind  
'a letter was being written'
- b. Cha-ka twu sikan-tongan swuli-ka/\*lul toy-ess-ta.  
car-NOM two hours-for fixing-NOM/\*ACC get-Pst-Ind  
'the car got fixed for two hours'

I conclude that there exist some [-stative] predicates which do not assign ACC to their complements, contrary to the generalization stated in (8a). This indicates that being an Accusative Case-assigner is a lexical property of predicates, perhaps governed by Burzio's Generalization, but not perfectly predictable on the basis of the semantic feature of stativity.

### 3.2 Stativity and Case on Adverbial NPs

There does, however, seem to be a correlation between stativity and the appearance of NOM versus ACC Case on certain adverbials. Thus if an adverbial is added to the nonstative examples in (10), it will bear ACC rather than NOM, as shown in (11):

- (11) a. Pyenci-ka han sikan-tongan-ul/\*i ssu-i eci-ko iss-ess-ta.  
letter-NOM one hour for-ACC/\*NOM write-Pass Pass-PROG be-Pst-Ind  
'a letter was being written for an hour'

- b. Cha-ka twu sikan-tongan-ul/\*i swuli-ka toy-ess-ta.  
car-NOM two hours-for-ACC/\*NOM fixing-NOM get-Pst-Ind  
'the car got fixed for two hours'

The case on the adverbial seems to depend on the stativity of the predicate. There is no difference between the *gi*-passive and the lexical passive, as we would expect if *gi*-passives are always [+stative] whereas the lexical passive is ambiguous. Thus for the lexical passive in (12), only ACC is possible since the meaning of the predicate is clearly nonstative.

- (12) Pyenci-ka han sikan-tongan-ul/\*i ssu-i-ess-ta.  
letter-NOM one hour for -ACC/\*NOM write-Pass-Pst-Ind  
'a letter was written for an hour'

The same is true of the examples in (13); only ACC is possible, whether the passive is lexical as in (13a) or a *gi*-passive as in (13b):

- (13) a. Mun-i han sikan tongan-ul/\*i yel-i-ko tat-hi-ess-ta.  
door-NOM one hour for-ACC/\*NOM open-PASS-and close-Pass-Pst-IND  
'the door was opened and closed for an hour'
- b. Mun-i han sikan tongan-ul/\*i yel-i-ko tat-hi-eci-ess-ta.

In contrast, although the predicate in (14) is morphologically passive (there is no adjective 'open' distinct from the morphological passive of *yel* 'to open'), the meaning is clearly stative, and thus the adverbial occurs only in nominative:

- (14) Mun-i han sikan tongan-i/\*ul yel-ie-iss-ta  
door-NOM one hour for-NOM/\*ACC open-PASS be-IND  
'the door remained open for an hour'

Now note that there are cases where either NOM or ACC is possible on the adverbial. This is true of example (6a) above; another example is given in (15):

- (15) Pyenci-ka twu pen-ul/i ssu-i-ess-ta.  
letter-NOM two times-ACC/NOM write-Pass-Pst-Ind  
'letters were written two times'

This might be attributed to an ambiguity in the interpretation of the predicate as either stative or nonstative. An alternative suggested by Soo-Won Kim (personal communication) is that the nominative marking on *twu pen* 'two times' involves quantifier floating (QF) from *pyenci* 'letters.' If so, the contrast between (12) where only ACC is possible, and (15) where either NOM or ACC is possible, is accounted for by the fact that duration adverbs (unlike frequency adverbs) can not be part of the subject NP. The contrast between (16a,b) confirms this suggestion:

- (16) a. Cheli-ka twu pen-uy pyenci-lul ponay-ess-ta.  
Cheli-NOM two times-GEN letter-ACC send-Pst-Ind  
'Cheli sent (me) a letter two times'
- b. \*twu sikan-tongan-uy pyenci  
two hours-for-GEN letter

Further notice the contrast between (17) and (18) in this respect. Example (17) contains both a floated quantifier and a true duration adverbial:

- (17) Cheli-ka yenghwa-lul han sikan-ccali-lul twu sikan-tongan-ul mantul-ess-ta.  
Cheli-NOM movie-ACC one hour-length-ACC two hours-for-ACC make-Pst-Ind  
'Cheli made an hour-long movie for two hours'

Example (18) is the passive of (17); note that in the passive, the underlying object of *mantul* 'make' (and hence the floated QP) can occur only in the Nominative, whereas the adverb of duration still occurs in the Accusative.

- (18) Yenghwa-kahan sikan-ccali-ka twu sikan-tongan-ul/\*i mantul-eci-ess-ta.  
movie-NOM one hour-length-NOM two hours-for-ACC/\*NOM make-Pass-Pst-Ind  
'An hour-long movie was made for two hours'

If this is correct, we arrive at the generalizations about Korean Case-marking stated in (19). Korean predicates are divided into two classes: Case-assigners and non-Case-assigners.

- (19) a. arguments of non-Case-assigning Predicates can only be NOM  
b. adverbials can be ACC if nonstative (and NOM if [+stative])

We have seen that the Case marking on Adverbial phrases in Korean is not a function of the Case-assigning properties of the predicate they modify. Nonetheless, it cannot be mere coincidence that the Case-markers are morphologically identical to the standard NOM/ACC Case-markers. Not only is the determining factor --stativity-- so nearly correlated with the Case-assigning properties of predicates, but they exhibit identical sequence and co-occurrence constraints. It is easy to imagine various technical ways of capturing the generalizations in (19), but for the moment I see no way to avoid the redundancy in the correlation between being stative and being a non-Case-assigner.

### 3.3 Previous discussions of ACC on Adverbials

In the remainder of this paper, I discuss briefly two instances of locative adverbials bearing ACC which have been mentioned in the literature. First, consider the interesting examples of locatives with ACC case cited by Kang (1986, p. 134-6, fn.18) and given in (20):

- (20) a. Pi-s-sok-ul catongcha-ka kosok -ulo mol-a-ci-ess-ta.  
rain-ACC car -NOM high speed-by drive-PASS-Dec  
'the car was driven at high speed in the rain'  
b. Pies kil-ul catongcha-ka kosok -ulo mol-a-ci-ess-ta.  
rainy road-ACC car-NOM highspeed-by drive-PASS-Dec  
'the car was driven at high speed on the rainy road'

Kang accounts for the Accusative Case-marking by adding the proviso 'with the  $\theta$ -role [+Patient]' to the rule governing assignment of Accusative: "Ci-passive verbs and *gye*-passive verbs cannot assign Accusative Case to their sister NPs with the  $\theta$ -role [+Patient], since they are [+stative]." This allows locative phrases (but not Patient/Themes) to be assigned Accusative by a default rule which Kang does not formulate. But this cannot be the correct analysis for two reasons: first, as we have seen, *gi*-passives are not necessarily [+stative], as suggested by (21), where the progressive morpheme has been added to (20a):

- (21) Pi-s-sok-ul catongcha-ka kosok-ulo mol-aci-ko iss-ess-ta.  
rain-in-ACC car-NOM highspeed-by drive-Pass-PROG be-Pst-Ind  
'the car was being driven at high speed in the rain'

Secondly, for predicates which clearly are [+stative], we find that such locative

phrases can bear NOM rather than ACC, as illustrated in (22):

- (22) a. Kkoch-i pom-i/\*lul yeppu-ta.  
flowers-NOM spring-NOM/\*ACC pretty-Ind  
'Flowers are pretty in the spring'  
b. Canti-ka pi-s-sok-eyse-ka/\*lul mikkulep-ta.  
grass-NOM rain-inside-at-NOM/\*ACC slippery-Ind  
'The grass was slippery in the rain'

The contrast in Case-marking is clear; ACC is simply impossible in the examples in (22). These examples thus provide further evidence for the general use of NOM and ACC on adverbials in Korean, where the choice of case is sensitive to the stativity of the predicate.

A second case of adverbials bearing ACC discussed in the literature is the so-called Possessor Ascension Construction, illustrated in (23).

- (23) a. John-i Mary-lul son-ul puthcap-ass-ta.  
John Mary-ACC hand-ACC catch-Pst-Ind  
'John caught Mary by the hand'  
b. Cengwensa-ka namu-lul kaci-lul ccall-ass-ta.  
gardener-NOM tree-ACC branch-ACC cut-Pst-Ind  
'the gardener cut the tree its branches'

The relationship between the two accusative NPs must be one of inalienable possession (Chun 1986); the second accusative NP is therefore typically a body-part. This construction has received considerable attention in the literature on Korean Case-marking. At issue is the source of the accusative case and the status of the second accusative NP as argument or adverbial. In the Possessor Ascension analysis of Relational Grammar (cf. various studies by Donna Gerds), the "body-part" NP is a verbal argument: an "initial 2" which gets put en chomage. 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 Susumo Kuno. 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 ACC, as in (24b):

- (24) a. Mary-ka son-i/\*lul raul-li eci-ess-ta.  
Mary-NOM hand-NOM/\*ACC bite-Pass Pass-Pst-Ind  
'Mary was bitten on the hand'  
b. Namu-ka kaci-ka/\*lul han sikan tongan-ul/\*j ccall-eci-ko iss-ess-ta.  
tree-NOM branch-NOM one hour for-ACC/\*NOM cut-Pass-Prog be-P  
'the tree branches were being cut for an hour'

We see that the "locative" in this construction is unlike the adverbials discussed earlier in that its Case-marking does NOT reflect stativity; rather its case is determined by the Case-assigning properties of the predicate. The Case-marking thus supports Young-Se Kang's suggestion that the locative NP in the Possessor Ascension Construction is actually an argument which gets both its Case and its theta-role from the verb.

Now consider the lexical passive of this construction, illustrated in (25). Here we find a different case pattern: the locative can receive either NOM or ACC as illustrated in (25).

- (25) a. Mary-ka son-i/ul mul-li-ess-ta. "lexical passive"  
Mary-NOM hand-NOM/ACC bite-PASS-Pst-Ind  
'Mary was bitten on the hand'

- (25) b Ku namu-ka cengwensa-ey-uyhayse kaci-ka/lul  
 that tree-NOM gardener-by branch-NOM/ACC  
 coal-li-ess-ta.  
 cut Pass-pst-IND  
 'that tree was branches-cut by the gardener'

Why is this so? O'Grady attributes the Case-alternation to a difference in the order in which the adverbial combines with the passive, and by "[a]ssuming, with Bach (1980), that Passivization can apply to phrasal TVs as well as word-level TVs" (p. 618). I will return to this analysis later; for the moment, suffice it to note that O'Grady's analysis does not explain why the Case-alternation is not found with *ci*-passive as well as lexical passives. Young-Se Kang (1986, p. 108ff) attributes the Case-alternation to a difference in stativity: "lexical passive verbs are in general ambiguous as either [-stative] or [+stative]" (p.109). As noted earlier, this correlation does not hold.

I would like to suggest here that the lexical passive is indeed ambiguous, but in a different way. I hypothesize that when the locative NP bears ACC, the "lexical passive" is simply an ordinary Case-assigning predicate. Although passive in meaning, it is not a syntactic passive resulting in Case-absorption. My claim is then that this construction has the same syntactic and case-assigning properties of certain other predicates in the language, e.g. the Adversity Passive and the *taŋg-ha* passive (Yang 1972, p. 121), at least some of which are clearly basic, not derived, lexical items. This is illustrated in (26).

- (26) a Mary-ga John-eykey meli-lul mac-ass-ta. "adversity passive"  
 Mary-NOM John-DAT head-ACC beat-Pst-Ind  
 'Mary got beat on the head by John'  
 b. Mary ga ton-ul sey pen-ul torwuk-ul mac-ass-ta.  
 Mary-NOM money-ACC 3 times-ACC theft-ACC beat-Pst-Ind  
 'Mary had the money stolen 3 times'

Note further that some lexical passives of this type do not have active sources, as indicated by the ungrammaticality of (27b).

- (27) a. Mary-ka Cheli-eykey kwaca-lul ttamek-hi-ess-ta.  
 Mary-NOM Cheli-DAT cookies-ACC eat-PASS-Pst-Ind  
 'Mary had her cookies eaten by Cheli'  
 b. \*Cheli-ka Mary-lul kwaca-lul ttamek-ess-ta.  
 Cheli-NOM Mary-ACC cookies-ACC ate-Pst-Ind  
 'Cheli took and ate Mary the cookies'

I conclude with a comment on the combinatorial analysis proposed by O'Grady 1987. O'Grady observes (correctly) that the "Case in Tiers" analysis of Yip et al. (1987) does not account for the multiple Nominatives found in Korean passives. I have suggested one possible modification of the Case in Tiers analysis which allows for Structural Nominative to spread. But any such modification will, I think, share with O'Grady's combinatorial analysis the following prediction: all instances of structural NOM will precede any instance of structural ACC. Although this is by and large true (ignoring the effects of scrambling), it is not absolute, as shown by the examples in (11b) above and (28):

- (28) Colepang-t haksayng-tul-eykey twu sikan tongan-ul/\*i  
 diplomas-NOM students-pl-DAT 2 hours for-ACC/\*NOM  
 swaye-ka/\*lul toy-ko iss-ess-ta.  
 award NOM/\*ACC get-Prog be-Pst-Ind  
 'Diplomas were being awarded to students for two hours'

The word order here can not be attributed to scrambling; the theta-noun in the light-verb construction must be adjacent to the verb. Thus Case-marking does not always "consistently record[...] the combinatorial relations into which NPs enter in surface structure," as O'Grady claims (1987, p.618).

#### 4.0 CONCLUSION

We have seen that the Case marking on Adverbial phrases in Korean is not a function of the Case-assigning properties of the predicate they modify. Nonetheless, the morphological identity with the standard NOM/ACC Case-markers cannot be the result of accidental homophony. While it is not yet clear to me how best to formally express the generalizations, the parallelism suggests that Case Theory does not draw a distinction between arguments and nonarguments - both kinds of NPs are in principle subject to the Case Filter. In the familiar European languages, the effect of this assumption is not usually apparent for a very simple reason: like lexically case-marked arguments, such NPs receive Case from an independent source, thus bleeding the Case-marking rules assigning structural Case. However, Korean has the prerequisites to make this hypothesis visible: default Nominative and a morphology that tolerates Case-stacking.

#### Footnotes

\*I am grateful to Professors Susumø Kuno and Ik-Hwan Lee for allowing this paper to be presented at the workshop at the last moment. The grammaticality judgments reported here are those of Soo-Won Kim, who was born and raised in Taegu in southern Korea. I am indebted to Soo-Won not only for native speaker judgments, but also for fruitful discussions and insightful grammatical observations of the sort that only a linguist-native speaker can provide. I am aware that there is considerable ideolectal variation with respect to Case marking. If you happen not to share Soo-Won's judgments, blame the data on him and the analysis on me.

1. Note that this interpretation of the Domain of the Case Filter casts doubt on the Case-theoretic account of NP-movement, which is of course restricted to arguments. See also M.-Y. Kang (1988:35, fn. 5). Thus the Korean evidence can be taken as strong support for the other empirical challenges to the standard account. For example, in Icelandic, lexically case-marked NPs are forced to move under exactly the same conditions as structurally case-marked arguments (see e.g. Sigurdsson 1989 for discussion).

2. Other adverbials, e.g. locative phrases, do have appropriate Case assigners, typically *zai*, presumably a P. Locatives can occur without *zai* in Case positions, e.g. subject and object position; however, *zai* is obligatory in non-Case positions. See Li (1985, in press) for discussion.

3. The (b, c) examples contain the so-called "light Verb" construction (see Grimshaw & Mester 1988 for discussion of the Japanese counterpart). Thus a (di)transitive verb alternates with a theta-marking Noun plus dummy verb *ha*, creating a clause with one additional NP to bear Case (although some speakers prefer not to realize Case overtly on the theta-noun):

- (i) Cheli-ka ku yeca-lul chayk-ul cwu-ess-ta  
 Cheli-NOM the girl-ACC book-ACC gave-Pst-Ind  
 'Cheli gave the girl a book'  
 (ii) Cheli-ka Mary-lul panci-lul senmul-(ul)ha-ess-ta  
 Cheli-NOM Mary-ACC ring-ACC gift-ACC do-Pst-Ind  
 'Cheli presented Mary with a ring'

Grimshaw & Master argue that the Japanese light Verb suru is not a theta-role assigner, but does assign Accusative Case.

4. An exception is the excellent description of In-Seok Yang (1972), who observes that "intrusion" of ACC on adverbials of duration (his Time(2)) as well as on certain other theta-roles is very general. Yang does not discuss the fact that this ACC alternates with NOM on adverbials. I am grateful to Donna Gerdt for drawing my attention to Yang's dissertation.

5. It is often claimed in the literature that the indirect object/recipient of a ditransitive verb cannot undergo passive in Korean (e.g. Chun 1985: 35) on the basis of ungrammatical examples like the following:

- (i) \*Suni-ka chayk-ul cwu-e-ci-ess-ta.  
 Suni-NOM book-ACC give-Pass-Pst-Ind

Within RG, the ungrammaticality of such sentences has been used to argue that only initial (and not derived) objects can passivize. Gerdt's (1986:176, fn. 15) notes that such sentences are grammatical with the lexical passive; for the *ci*-passive as in (i), however, they are totally unacceptable for all speakers with ACC on the retained object. As noted by Kang (1986: 88-91), there is idiolectal variation as to whether these *ci*-passives are grammatical with NOM on the retained object. My informant finds them perfectly grammatical, and thus belongs to Kang's "Group A." Kang (1986: 90) observes that for all Korean speakers, if the theme argument is passivized, then the only acceptable Case-marking is NOM DAT and not NOM NOM. I assume that the explanation for this lies outside of Case-theory.

6. Gerady (1987) noted independently that the spreading of NOM in Korean is a problem for the Case-in-Tiers framework.

7. Various researchers have suggested that Nominative Case is "inherent" in Japanese (Saito 1983; Whitman 1986). It is clear, however, that their use of the term "inherent" means something more like "default" than lexically-governed and associated with a particular theta-role or verbal argument. Thus, Saito says that "nominative Case is inherent in that it is not assigned by any element, e.g. INFL" (1983: 247). Whitman claims that "Case in Japanese is in general inherent" (1988: 364), citing as evidence the facts that Case assignment is not restricted by adjacency and not directly linked to fixed structural positions, e.g. NOM is not limited to SPEC, IP. Saito (1983) further suggests that there are two types of NOM markers: one structural, assigned by INFL, the other inherent ('default'); Myung-Yoon Kang (1988) makes the same assumption for Korean. While it is a priori simpler to have only a single type of NOM assignment, there is evidence for having both types based on the fact that every clause contains a NOM NP. This fact could be made to follow from the assumption that INFL must assign its NOM Case. (Note that Korean and Japanese differ from Icelandic in this respect, since Icelandic has many monadic predicates, both active and passive, containing an oblique subject but no nominative NP.)

Kang (1986) claims that all Case-assignment in Korean is Structural. He does not discuss the assignment of DAT to the arguments of certain predicates, as illustrated in the following examples adapted from Young-joo Kim (1989) and Gerdt & Youn (1989):

- (i) Hay-ka Yuni-eykey kissuhay-ess-ta.  
 I (NOM) Yuni DAT Kiss Pst-Ind

- (ii) Haksayng-tul-eykey ton-i philyoha-ta.  
 student-pl-DAT money-NOM need-Ind  
 'Students need money'

I will assume that this lexically-governed use of morphological DAT is an instance of "inherent" rather than Structural Case assigned by the postposition). The DAT in (ii) is optional, alternating with NOM. As Gerdt & Youn discuss at length, many speakers of Korean also allow the option of Case-stacking: realizing both lexical and structural Case on a single NP.

8. Another potential problem which I will not explore here is the class of verbal counterparts to transitive adjectives. These are (morphologically?) derived by the addition of a dummy verb *ha* (see Kang 1986: 71, fn. 17); as a result, they become Case-assigners, taking ACC complements, whereas transitive Adjectives take Nominative complements. Kang analyzes so-called transitive adjectives as stative verbs (p. 45); the nominative assigned to complements of transitive adjectives in Korean is thus a default Case, a consequence of the fact that such predicates are stative, and stative predicates by hypothesis do not assign ACC Case. Kang accounts for the Case-assigning properties by suggesting that the addition of *ha* makes the predicate nonstative. Adj+*ha* acquire some but not all properties of nonstative predicates; in particular, they fail to passivize.

9. Kwang-Sup Kim informs me that for him, the adverbial in (11a) can be NOM.

10. Accusative is also possible for some speakers. Young-joo Kim (p.c.) reports that accusative is actually preferable for her. This is totally unexpected given the generalizations stated in (19).

11. Kang gives these examples a question mark, reflecting his own judgments. He dismisses this as a very marked phenomenon in Korean, asserting that most speakers reject these examples as ungrammatical. However, other speakers, including my informant, accept these sentences as perfect.

12. I am grateful to Soo-Won Kim for this observation. See Rosen (1989, Ch. 5) for relevant discussion of the Japanese counterpart. This was suggested independently by Young-joo Kim in response to a question after the presentation of her paper "On Multiple Accusative Constructions" at this Workshop.

13. There is evidence from other languages to support the claim that it is standard ("structural") Case which is appearing on Adverbial phrases. Paul Kiparsky (personal communication) informs me that in Finnish, Adverbial NPs which bear Accusative Case alternate with the Partitive Case under negation, just as do Accusative objects; NPs bearing inherent cases do not participate in this alternation, be they verbal arguments or adverbial adjuncts. In the Australian languages Warlpiri and Warumungu, Case-suffixes may appear on nominals indicating place, time or manner of an action, and more striking, the Case-marker used depends on the transitivity of the verb (Simpson 1989, Ch. 4.3). This surprising alternation is exactly as expected if the Case suffix appearing on adverbials is not just homophonous with but identical to the structural Ergative Case. Warlpiri and Warumungu are like Korean in allowing structural Case-markers to attach to semantic Case-markers, but unlike Korean in that there seems to be no evidence for spreading of Structural Case.

## References

- Bach, Emmon (1980) "In defense of passive," *Linguistics & Philosophy* 3,297-341.
- Choe, Hyon Sook (1985) "Remarks on Configurationality Parameters," *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics* 1, pp. 14-29.
- Chun, Soon Ae (1985) "Possessor Ascension for Multiple Case Sentences," in *Korean Linguistics* 1, pp. 30-39.
- Chun, Soon Ae (1986) "Possessor Ascension in Korean," in Chun (ed.) pp. 51-97.
- Chun, Soon Ae (ed.) *Relational Studies on Korean*, Buffalo Working Papers in Linguistics, SUNY Buffalo.
- Dowty, David (1979) *Word Meaning and Montague Grammar*, D. Reidel, Dordrecht.
- Gerdts, Donna (1986) "Causatives and Passives in Korean: Evidence for Clause Union without Revaluation," in Chun (ed.) pp. 98-185.
- Gerdts, Donna & Cheong Youn (1989) "Non-nominative Subjects in Korean," *Harvard WOKL* 3 (this volume).
- Grimshaw, Jane (1989) *Argument Structure*, to appear, MIT Press.
- Grimshaw, Jane & Armin Mester (1988) "Light Verbs and Theta-Marking," *Linguistic Inquiry* 19:205-232.
- Huang, C.T. James (1982) *Logical Relations in Chinese and the Theory of Grammar*, Ph.D. dissertation, MIT.
- Kang, Myung-Yoon (1988) *Topics in Korean Syntax*, Ph.D. dissertation, MIT.
- Kang, Young-Se (1986) *Korean Syntax and Universal Grammar*, Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University; published by Hanshin, Seoul.
- Kim, Young-joo (1989) "On Multiple Accusative Constructions," *Harvard WOKL* 3 (this volume).
- Kuno, Susumu (1973) *The Structure of the Japanese Language*, MIT Press.
- Kuroda, S.-Y. (1988) "Whether We Agree or Not: A Comparative Syntax of English and Japanese," in W. Poser (ed.) *Papers from the Second International Workshop on Japanese Syntax*, CSLI, Stanford University, pp. 103-143.
- Li, Audrey Yen-hui (1985) *Abstract Case in Chinese*, Ph.D. dissertation, University of Southern California; revised version entitled *Order and Constituency in Mandarin Chinese* (in press), Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht.
- O'Grady, William (1987) "Against the Case Tier: Evidence from Korean," *Language Research* 23, 4:607-619.
- Rosen, Sara Thomas (1989) *Argument Structure and Complex Predicates*, Ph.D. dissertation, Brandeis University.
- Saito, Mamoru (1983) "Case and Government in Japanese," in M. Barlow et al. (eds.), *WCCFL* 2, pp. 247-259.
- Sigurdsson, Halldor Armann (1989) *Verbal Syntax and Case in Icelandic*, Doctoral dissertation, University of Lund, Sweden.
- Simpson, Jane (1989) *Warlpiri Morpho-syntax: A Lexicalist Approach*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht.
- Whitman, John (1986) "Configurationality Parameters," in Takashi Imai & Mamoru Saito (eds.) *Issues in Japanese Linguistics*, Foris, Dordrecht, pp. 351-374.
- Yang, In-Seok (1972) *Korean Syntax*, Ph.D. dissertation, University of Hawaii; published by Baekhap-Sa, Seoul.
- Yim, Young-Jae (1985) "Multiple Subject Constructions," in Kuno et al. (eds) *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics*, pp. 101-109.
- Yip, Moira, Joan Maling & Ray Jackendoff (1987) "Case in Tiers," *Language* 63:217-250.

Linguistics Program  
 Dept. of Psychology  
 Brandeis University  
 Waltham, MA 02254