

# Metonymy Affects Grammar: Korean Double Object Constructions

Youngju Choi  
Chosun University  
ychoi1@chosun.ac.kr

Keywords: metonymy in grammar, Korean double object constructions, cross-linguistic comparison

**Introduction** It has been argued that the availability or unavailability of metonymy affects grammar and vice versa (Barcelona 2009, Panther and Thornburg 2000, Panther 2011, Radden 2009, Ruiz de Mendoza and Hernández 2001, Ziegeler 2007, Brdar 2009, Brdar and Brdar-Szabo 2017). Panther and Thornburg (2000), for example, argues that the metonymy EFFECT FOR CAUSE is available in English allowing the stative predicates in imperative constructions, which require action predicates. The sentences *Stand in line* and *Have your documents ready* are allowed in English while their counterparts are not in German. The stative predicates *stand* and *have* must be replaced by action predicates in German. The contrast in the two languages can be explained by the (un)availability of the metonymy EFFECT FOR CAUSE. English utilizes it while German does not. Following their lead, this paper will demonstrate peculiarities of Korean DOCs in comparison with English ones and explain the contrasts based on (un)availability of the metonymy ACTION FOR IMPLICATURE INDUCING A CAUSED EVENT. **Peculiar Properties of Korean Double Object Constructions (DOCs)** First, in English, ditransitive verbs such as *write* and *buy* consistently occur in DOCs, while in Korean, their compatibility with DOCs is not consistent. The verb *ssuta* 'to write' can occur in a DOC only when it comes with the complement *a letter*. Similarly, the compatibility of the verb *sata* 'to buy' with a DOC depends on the complement it takes. It can occur in a DOC only when it comes with the complement *lunch*. Another peculiarity is that in Korean, a regular transitive verb can increase its valency in certain contexts. The verb 'to hold' does not allow DOCs in English but its counterpart in Korean, *tulta*, can occur in a DOC when it comes with the complement *a welcome sign*. The English verb *take out* does not occur in a DOC but its counterpart in Korean is compatible with a DOC when it takes the complement *a sword*. The same thing happens with the metaphorical use of the verb *ssuta* 'to use'. Furthermore, the Korean verb meaning 'to kneel down' shows different behaviors depending on its context. When the action of kneeling down is used in the context of cleaning, the verb is not compatible with a DOC, but in the context of praying for forgiveness, it can occur in a DOC.

**Explanation** All the peculiar behaviors of Korean predicates regarding their compatibility with DOCs can be explained by the availability of the ACTION FOR IMPLICATURE INDUCING A CAUSED EVENT metonymy in Korean. Returning to the examples, the verb *ssuta* is compatible with a DOC because its complement *phyenci* 'a letter' implicates that the letter will be sent to someone. However, the combination of the verb and other complements do not have a similar implicature, and therefore they remain incompatible with DOCs. The verb *sata* 'to buy' can be explained in the same way. In Korean culture, buying lunch indicates that the lunch was bought for someone else, rather than for oneself. Because buying lunch implicates treating someone, it is compatible with a DOC. However, one can buy a pen or a bag for oneself rather than for someone else, and that is the default understanding of the act. Therefore, in these cases, the verb remains incompatible with a DOC. Similarly, holding a welcome sign is to show the sign to someone else. The implicated purpose 'showing' evokes a situation which requires an indirect object, resulting in a DOC. Similarly, drawing a sword implicates that it will be used to attack an enemy, a situation that includes an indirect object. Kneeling down to clean the floor does not require an indirect object but kneeling down to pray for forgiveness requires another object. **Conclusion** In Korean, verbs can become compatible with DOCs based on their complements and whether those complements invoke the ACTION FOR IMPLICATURE INDUCING A CAUSED EVENT metonymy. The finding provides one more cross-linguistic evidence to the claim that metonymy affects grammar.

## References

- Barcelona, Antonio. (2009). Metonymy is not just a lexical phenomenon: On the operation of metonymy in grammar and discourse. Christina Alm-Arvius, Nils-Lennart Johannesson & David C. Minuch, eds., *Selected Papers from the Stockholm 2008 Metaphor Festival*, 3-41. Stockholm University Press.
- Brdar, Mario. (2009). Metonymies we live without. Klaus-Uwe Panther, Linda L. Thornburg and Antonio Barcelona, eds., *Metonymy and Metaphor in Grammar*, 259-274. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Brdar, Mario and Rita Brdar-Szabó. (2017). On constructional blocking of metonymies: A cross-linguistic view. *Review of Cognitive Linguistics* 15(1): 183-223.
- Panther, Klaus-Uwe and Linda L. Thornburg. (2000). The EFFECT FOR CAUSE metonymy in English grammar. In Antonio Barcelona, ed., *Metaphor and Metonymy at the Crossroads: A Cognitive Perspective*, 215-231. Mouton de Gruyter.