

Korean Resultatives Revisited: Complementation versus Adjunction

1. Introduction: Korean resultatives are divided into two types depending on whether the subject of a resultative secondary predicate is assigned accusative case or nominative case. The former is comparable to selected object resultatives (e.g., *Mary wipe the table clean*), and the latter to unselected object resultatives (e.g., *John screamed himself hoarse*) in English. Korean resultatives have received a great deal of attention in the literature due to different case markings on the subject of a secondary predicate. However, there has been no agreement regarding whether Korean resultatives should be analyzed as small clause complements or adjunct phrases. Some argue that both resultative types are small clause complements (e.g., Kim 1999, Chang and Kim 2001), but some argue that only the selected object resultatives are true small clause type resultatives while the unselected object resultatives are VP adjuncts (e.g., Song 2005, Yeo 2006). A recent proposal by Shim and den Dikken (2007), however, suggests that both types should be analyzed as TP adjuncts. This paper defends the second position, a split analysis for the two types of resultatives: a complementation analysis for selected object resultatives (i.e., stative resultatives on this abstract), and an adjunction analysis for unselected object resultatives (i.e., eventive resultatives).

2. Korean Resultatives Revisited: It has long been recognized that, unlike English, Korean allows both object-controlled, as in (1a), and subject-controlled resultatives, as in (1b).

- (1) a. Inho-ka chelphan-ul napcakha-key twutulki-ess-ta.
Inho-NOM iron.plate-ACC flat-KEY pound-PAST-DC
'Inho pounded the iron plate flat.'
- b. Inho-ka sinpal-i talh-key ttwi-ess-ta.
Inho-NOM shoes-NOM wear.threadbare-KEY run-PAST-DC
'Inho ran his shoes threadbare.' (Inho and shoes must be in a possessive relation).

The two resultatives differ in two respects; 1) in (1a) the subject of a resultative predicate (RP) is ACC-marked and secondary predicates (SP) are always stative, 2) in (1b), the subject of an RP is NOM-marked and SPs are always eventive. I will call the former "stative-resultative (SR)", and the latter "eventive-resultative (ER)". While most of the previous works on Korean resultatives agree that SR is a true resultative of the English-type (except for Shim and den Dikken 2007), the status of ER has been controversial between a true resultative with different case assigning properties (e.g., Kim 1993, Kim and Maling 1997) and an adjunct phrase (e.g., Song 2005).

In this paper, I argue that SR is a true resultative of the ECM type, while ER is an adjunct phrase. Supporting evidence for the split analysis is provided by a few syntactic and semantic facts that lead to the conclusion that the two resultatives must be structurally distinguished from one another in terms of their complementhood/adjuncthood. First, SR is compatible with the telic *in*-phrase, similar to English, but not with the atelic *for*-phrase, as in (2).

- (2) a. Inho-ka o-pwun-maney chelphan-ul *(napcakha-key) twutulki-ess-ta.
Inho-NOM five-minute-in iron.plate-ACC flat-KEY pound-PAST-DC
'Inho pounded the iron plate flat in five minutes.'
(Intended: measuring a time interval from the start of the pounding event, not prior to it)
- b. Inho-ka (*o-pwun-tongan) chelphan-ul napcakha-key twutulki-ess-ta.
Inho-NOM five-minute-for iron.plate-ACC flat-KEY pound-PAST-DC
'Inho pounded the iron plate flat for five minutes.' (excluding an iterative reading)

ER, in contrast, is compatible with *for*-phrase but not with *in*-phrase, as in (3).

- (3) a. . Inho-ka (*o-pwun-maney) sinpal-i talh-key ttwi-ess-ta.
Inho-NOM five-minute-in shoes-NOM wear.threadbare-KEY run-PAST-DC
'Inho ran his shoes threadbare in five minutes.' (excluding a lower scope reading)
- b. . Inho-ka o-pwun-tongan sinpal-i talh-key ttwi-ess-ta.
Inho-NOM five-minute-for shoes-NOM wear.threadbare-KEY run-PAST-DC
'Inho ran his shoes threadbare for 5 minutes.'

This contrast suggests that the resultative phrase of SR-type must be inside VP affecting the Aktionsart of the VP by providing a terminal point to the event denoted by the main verb, while the result phrase of ER is outside VP. Secondly, SR does not allow a subject honorific marker in the SP, as in (4a), similar to a canonical ECM construction, as in (4b) (see Hong 2002). In contrast, ER allows a subject honorific marker in the SP, as in (4c).

- (4) a. Emeni-ka meli-lul nolah-(*si)-key yemsaykha-si-ess-ta.
 mother-NOM hair-ACC yellow-HON-KEY dye-HON-PAST-DC
 ‘My mother dyed her hair yellow.’
 b. Yenghi-ka emeni-lul hyullyungha-(*si)-key sayngkakha-n-ta.
 Yenghi-NOM mother-ACC magnificent-HON-KEY consider-PRESENT-DC
 ‘Yenghi considers her mother magnificent.’
 c. Halmeni-kkeyse sonkalak-i celi-si-key ttukaycil-ul ha-si-ess-ta.
 Grandmother-NOM finger-NOM ache-HON-KEY knitting-ACC do-HON-PAST-DC
 ‘My grandmother knitted so much that her fingers ached.’

Thirdly, SR allows only a resultative interpretation, while ER allows a wider range of interpretations, e.g., degree (6a), result (6b), and purpose (6c).

- (6) a. Senhi-ka ayin-ul phi-ka malu-key chac-ko iss-ta.
 Senhi-NOM boyfriend-ACC blood-NOM get.dry-KEY search-KO be-DC
 ‘Senhi is searching for her boyfriend so eagerly/to the degree that her blood could be drained away.’ (Degree/Extent)
 b. Inho-ka mok-i swi-key koham-ul chi-ess-ta.
 Inho-NOM throat-NOM get.hoarse-KEY scream-ACC hit-PAST-DC
 ‘Inho screamed so that/until his throat got hoarse.’ (Result)
 c. Chelswu-nun Yenghi-ka nemeci-key himkkes mil-ess-ta.
 Chelswu-TOP Yenghi-NOM fall-KEY with.force push-PAST-DC
 ‘Chelswu pushed Yenghi with force so that she would fall.’ (Purpose)

ER thus can often be ambiguous among the three readings without a clear context although some readings can be unavailable or preferred over the others due to pragmatics.

I argue that the syntactic and semantic facts observed from (2) to (6) can be accounted only if we analyze SR as a complement of VP and ER as an adjunct TP with different adjunction sites for each reading available. (Potential counterexamples to the current analysis from Shim and den Dikken (2007) are also explained but relevant discussion is omitted due to space limitations). Thus, the current observations and analysis of the two kinds of resultatives manifests itself that Korean does allow resultatives of the English type, contrary to the previous claim.

III. Universals and Variation: I argue that the syntactico-semantic functional structure of resultatives is universal (the syntactic representation I assume is omitted due to space), and that variation in resultatives arises from differences in the inventories of vocabulary items, following a micro-parametric approach to language variation (see also Son and Svenonius 2008). For example, the reason why Korean has ER-type is due to the fact that Korean often lacks stative counterparts of English adjectives that appear in resultative constructions. For example, the equivalent of ‘hoarse’ in Korean, (*mok-i* ‘throat-NOM’) *swi-* ‘get.hoarse’ is eventive/verbal, based on a number of diagnostics that distinguish stative predicates from eventive. Thus, the eventive ‘hoarse’ cannot be embedded in a canonical SR-type resultatives, since the adopted structure of resultatives requires a state/property-denoting constituent to be selected by the main verb (see Ramchand 2008 for the structure and semantic composition principles of resultatives). Rather, the verbal/eventive semantics of the Korean counterpart requires a projection of T in the resultative secondary phrase (see also Shim and Den Dikken 2007), and thus the TP is forced to merge as an adjunct outside VP, allowing flexibility of interpretation depending on where it is adjoined.

Selected Reference: Shim, J.Y. and den Dikken, M. 2007. The tense of resultatives: The case of Korean. To appear in the *Proceedings of NELS 38*.