

Korean Resultative Construction Redux

Choi, YoungSik

Soonchunhyang University

ABSTRACT

The Journal of Studies in Language 38.2, 169-187. I claim that the result phrase in Korean resultative construction is an adjunct *à la* Shim and den Dikken (2007). At the same time, diverging from them, I argue that the result phrase in Korean transitive resultative construction projects a finite CP, whereas the one in the intransitive resultative construction projects a nonfinite CP, based on important differences between the two resultative constructions. The present proposal can address various properties of Korean resultative construction in their entirety, including case on the antecedent NP, iteration of the result phrase, and obviation of the direct object restriction (Levin and Rappaport, 1995) as distinct from English resultative construction. The present research has an important implication on the cross-linguistic variation in the syntactic representation of the result phrase: adjunct in Korean and complement in English (Carrier and Randall, 1992; Hoekstra, 1988; Kayne, 1985; Voorst, 1986). (Soonchunhyang University)

Keywords: resultative, transitive, intransitive, antecedent, control



<https://doi.org/10.18627/jslg.38.2.202208.169>

pISSN : 1225-4770

eISSN : 2671-6151

Received: July 11, 2022

Revised: August 09, 2022

Accepted: August 10, 2022

This is an Open-Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution NonCommercial License which permits unrestricted non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Copyright©2022 the Modern Linguistic Society of Korea

본인이 투고한 논문은 다른 학술지에 게재된 적이 없으며 타인의 논문을 표절하지 않았음을 서약합니다. 추후 중복게재 혹은 표절된 것으로 밝혀질 시에는 논문게재 취소와 일정 기간 논문제출의 제한 조치를 받게 됨을 인지하고 있습니다.

1. Introduction

The resultative construction is applied to the form that expresses the result state brought about by the action of the resultative verb. Resultative constructions are generally composed of a verb denoting the event, an antecedent NP denoting the entity that has undergone a change and the so-called resultative phrase denoting the state achieved as the result of the action denoted by the verb as illustrated with the examples in English below in (1).

- (1) a. The blacksmith pounded the metal flat.
- b. The joggers ran the pavement thin.

(Levin and Rappaport, 1995: 50-53)

In the transitive resultative construction above in (1a), the antecedent NP is *the metal* and the result phrase is *flat*, meaning ‘The blacksmith pounded the metal and as a result it became flat.’ In the intransitive resultative construction above in (2a), the antecedent NP is *the pavement* and the result phrase is *thin*, meaning ‘The joggers ran and as a result the pavement became thin.’ The examples in (1a) and (1b) are called transitive and intransitive resultative constructions, respectively, since the verbs in the respective resultative constructions are transitive and intransitive, as shown below in (2a) and (2b).

- (2) a. The blacksmith pounded the metal.
 b. The joggers ran.

Semantically, the antecedent NP and the result phrase form a constituent in that they constitute a predication relation in both transitive and intransitive resultative constructions. Also, note that the result phrases in (1) are not the main predicates, serving as a secondary predicate. This type of predication, where the secondary predicate holds of the antecedent simultaneously with the main verb is called resultative predication.

It has been quite a topic of controversy how to map into syntactic representation the semantic relation of predication in the resultative construction in English, witnessing a variety of proposals, including small clause approach (Hoekstra, 1988; Kayne, 1985; Voorst, 1986, among others) and ternary branching analysis (Carrier and Randall, 1992; Levin and Rappaport, 1995; Rothstein, 1983; Schein, 1982, among others). According to the small clause approach, the antecedent NP and the result phrase together form a small clause constituent syntactically, which in turn serves as the sole complement of the main verb as schematically represented below in (3).

- (3) [IP [VP V [SC NP AP]]]

Meanwhile, the ternary branching approach posits the structure where the antecedent NP and the result phrase do not form a constituent syntactically, but each serves as a complement of the main verb as represented below in (4).

- (4) [IP [VP V NP AP]]

It is beyond the scope of the present paper to fully determine which of the two proposals fares better for the English resultative construction. At the same time, notice, however, that the two proposals share a common intuition beyond the surface difference in syntactic structure: the result phrase is related to the main verb as a secondary predicate, not as an adjunct, be it its direct complement as in the ternary branching approach or part of the small clause complement as in the small clause approach.

The organization of the present paper is as follows: Below in section 2, I will review syntactic properties of the Korean resultative constructions as distinct from English resultative constructions, and in section 3, I will critically review two competing proposals for Korean resultative constructions, namely, complementation approach (Kim, 1999, among others) and adjunction approach (Shim and den Dikken, 2007, among others). In section 4, building on the adjunction approach by Shim and den Dikken (2007), I will make a more empirically adequate proposal to address the

various properties of Korean resultative construction in their entirety, based on some key differences between the transitive and intransitive resultative constructions. Section 5 is a potential argument against the present proposal as based on telicity, which turns out not to be. Section 6 is the conclusion and theoretical implication.

2. Properties of Korean Resultative Construction

Korean also has transitive and intransitive resultative constructions corresponding to the English transitive and intransitive resultative constructions, as illustrated below in (5).

- (5) a. John-un **soy-lul** napcakha-key twutulyessta.
 John-TOP metal-ACC flat-COMP hammered
 ‘John hammered the metal flat.’
- b. John-un **mok-i** swi-key oychessta.
 John-TOP throat-NOM hoarse-COMP shouted
 ‘John shouted his throat hoarse.’

Korean resultative constructions exhibit several notable properties that set them apart from English counterpart (Hong, 2011; Kim and Maling, 1997; Kim, 1999; Ko, 2015; Kim et al., 2020; Song, 2005; Shim and den Dikken, 2007; Son, 2008; Wechsler and Noh, 2001, among others).

One has to do with the case on the antecedent NP. The antecedent NP in the transitive resultative construction bears accusative case, whereas it bears nominative case in the intransitive resultative construction as shown above in (5).¹⁾ The case fact on the antecedent NP in Korean resultative construction contrasts sharply with the English counterpart, where the antecedent NP in both transitive and intransitive resultative constructions bears accusative case only across the board, as shown below in (6).

- (6) a. The blacksmith got two pieces of metal and he pounded **them** flat.
 b. The joggers got new Nikes and they ran **them** threadbare.

Another is that the result phrase can be repeated in Korean resultative construction, again contrasting sharply with the English counterpart, which does not allow the result phrase to be iterated, as respectively illustrated below in (7) and (8).

1) An anonymous reviewer observes that the antecedent NP in the intransitive resultative construction shows case alternation as below in (i).

- (i) Tungsankayk-tul-i sankil- $\{ul/i\}$ talh-tolok keletanyessta.
 mountaineer-PL-NOM mountain path-ACC/NOM bare-COMP walked
 ‘Mountaineers trod the mountain path bare.’

I observe that the construction is not a genuine intransitive resultative construction in that it can be also analyzed as a transitive resultative construction, especially given that keletanyessta can be a transitive verb as well as shown below in (ii).

- (ii) Tungsankayk-tul-i sankil-ul keletanyessta.
 mountaineer-PL-NOM mountain path-ACC walked
 (Lit) ‘Mountaineers walked the mountain path.’

- (7) a. John-un soy-lul **napcakhya-key** **yalp-key** twutulyessta.
 John-TOP metal-ACC flat-COMP thin-COMP pounded
 *‘John pounded the metal flat thin.’
- b. John-un **mok-i** **swi-key** **kwi-ka** **mengha-key** oychyesta.
 John-TOP throat-NOM hoarse-COMP ear-NOM deaf-COMP shouted
 *‘John shouted his throat hoarse his ears deaf.’

- (8) a. *John pounded the metal **flat thin**.
 b. *John shouted **his throat hoarse his ear deaf**.

Moreover, as shown below in (9), Korean resultative constructions do not observe direct object restriction (Kratzer, 2005; Levin and Rappaport, 1995; Simpson, 1983, among others), according to which the result phrase may be predicated of the immediate accusative marked object NP, but may not be predicated of a subject or of an oblique complement.

- (9) John-un kangaci-lul cichi-key kelyessta.
 John-TOP puppy-ACC tired-COMP walked
 ‘John walked the puppy tired.’

Quite unlike the resultative construction in English above in (1a), repeated below as (10), where the result phrase takes the object NP as its antecedent in accordance with the direct object restriction, the result phrase in Korean transitive resultative construction above in (9) can take the subject NP as its antecedent as well, crucially violating the restriction.

- (10) The blacksmith pounded the metal flat.

So, when the object NP serves as the antecedent NP of the result phrase in (9), the sentence has the reading of ‘John walked the puppy and as a result it got tired.’ In the meantime, when the subject NP serves as the antecedent NP, it yields the reading of ‘John walked the puppy and as a result he got tired.’

Last but not least, in addition to the aforementioned properties of Korean resultative constructions as distinct from English counterpart, I crucially observe that the result phrase in Korean resultative construction as above in (5) is not AP but VP. Indeed, there recently has been a body of research including Kim (2002) and Choi (2019), which suggest that Korean does not have the adjective as a separate syntactic category.

As a matter of fact, the result phrase above in (5) can take tense and aspect morphology among others, as evidenced below in (11-12), with ASP and IND respectively standing for aspect and indicative morphemes.

- (11) a. Ku soy-nun napcakhay-ss-ta.
 that metal-TOP flat-PAST-IND
 ‘That metal was flat.’

- b. Ku soy-nun napcakhay-ss-ess-ta.
that metal-TOP flat-PAST-ASP-IND
'That metal had been flat.'
- (12) a. John-un mok-i swi-ess-ta.
John-TOP throat-NOM hoarse-PAST-IND
'John's throat was hoarse.'
- b. John-un mok-i swi-ess-ess-ta.
John-TOP throat-NOM hoarse-PAST-ASP-IND
'John's throat had been hoarse.'

Given that tense and aspect are characteristically marked on the verbs (Hamann, 1991: 658), the paradigm above in (11-12) strongly suggests that the result phrases above in (5) belong to the syntactic category of VP. This is quite different from English, where the result phrase in the resultative construction cannot be VP, as shown below in (13).

- (13) a. *The blacksmith pounded the metal get flat.
b. *The joggers ran the pavement get thin.

As we saw, Korean resultative constructions behave quite differently in several notable aspects from the English counterpart, which naturally leads one to believe that the resultative construction in Korean, be it transitive or intransitive, is different in structure from the English counterpart.

Below in section 3, I will critically review previous proposals in the literature to lay the groundwork for the present proposal.

3. Previous Proposals

The precise nature of the Korean resultative construction has been quite a controversy, witnessing a growing body of research. There have been two lines of reasoning advanced thus far, especially with regard to the syntactic nature of the result phrase. One approach is what we call the complementation approach as advanced by Kim (1999), among others, and the other adjunction approach by Shim and den Dikken (2007).

3.1 Complementation Approach

Kim (1999) suggests that the result phrase in the transitive resultative construction in Korean serves as a complement of the main verb, adopting the ternary branching analysis (Carrier and Randall, 1992), whereas the result phrase and the antecedent NP in the intransitive resultative construction together serves as the sole complement of the main verb in a way reminiscent of the small clause analysis as in Kayne (1985), Voorst (1986),

and Hoekstra (1988), among others (also see Kim and Maling, 1997; Wechsler and Noh, 2001 for different executions of the complementation approach).

Kim's (1999) analysis is problematic in two important aspects, however. One has to do with the argument structure. Kim (1999) posits the following ternary branching structure in (14a) for Korean transitive resultative construction above in (5a), and the binary branching structure in (14b) for Korean intransitive resultative construction in (5b), repeated below respectively as (15a) and (15b).

- (14) a. [S [VP NP AP V]]
 b. [S [VP [S NP AP] V]]

- (15) a. John-un **soy-lul** napcakha-key twutulyessta.
 John-TOP metal-ACC flat-COMP hammered
 'John hammered the metal flat.'
 b. John-un **mok-i** swi-key oychessta.
 John-TOP throat-NOM hoarse-COMP shouted
 'John shouted his throat hoarse.'

Consider (14a) for the transitive resultative construction, first. The structure violates the argument structure of the main verb, *twutulyessta* 'hammered,' since as shown below in (16), the main verb as a transitive verb takes only one argument, which is the object NP.

- (16) a. John-un soy-lul twutulyessta.
 John-TOP metal-ACC hammered
 'John hammered the metal.'
 b. *John-un napcakha-key twutulyessta.
 John-TOP flat-COMP hammered
 'John hammered the metal flat.'

The structure above in (14b) for the intransitive resultative construction also violates the argument structure of the main verb, *oychessta* 'shouted,' since the main verb is a *bona fide* intransitive as illustrated below in (17).

- (17) John-un oychessta.
 John-TOP shouted
 'John shouted.'

The other problem in Kim's (1999) analysis has to do with iteration of the result phrase in Korean resultative construction as above in (7), repeated below as (18).

- (18) a. John-un soy-lul **napcakh-key** **yalp-key** twutulyessta.
 John-TOP metal-ACC flat-COMP thin-COMP pounded
 *‘John pounded the metal flat thin.’
- b. John-un **mok-i** **swi-key** **kwi-ka** **mengha-key** oychyessta.
 John-TOP throat-NOM hoarse-COMP ear-NOM deaf-COMP shouted
 *‘John shouted his throat hoarse his ears deaf.’

Kim (1999) simply cannot explain why the result phrase in the transitive resultative construction above in (18a) can be repeated. It is because the result phrase in his system is a complement, which cannot be repeated without violating the argument structure of the main verb. Similarly, the iteration of the result phrase together with the antecedent NP in (18b) is equally puzzling, since the result phrase and the antecedent NP as a unit constitutes the sole complement of the main verb in his system.

3.2 Adjunction Approach

Shim and den Dikken (2007) propose that the result phrase in the Korean resultative construction is an adjunct, diverging from the complementation approach (Kim and Maling, 1997; Kim 1999; Wechsler and Noh, 2001). They further go on to argue that the result phrase in Korean resultative construction projects a nonfinite TP with an unpronounced null pronominal subject across the board, which in turn is adjoined to a verbal projection of VP or vP as roughly represented below in (19).²⁾

- (19) a. [_{VP} [_{TP} pro result phrase-*key*] [_{VP} NP-ACC V]]]
 b. [_{vP} [_{TP} pro NP-NOM result phrase-*key*] [_{vP} NP-NOM [_{VP} V]]]

The adjunction approach by Shim and den Dikken (2007) can explain away the two major problems of the complement approach by Kim (1999) for Korean resultative construction: argument structure and iteration of the result phrase.

The result phrase in Korean resultative construction projects an adjunct clause in Shim and den Dikken’s (2007) system, hence not affecting the argument structure of the main verb. The result phrase as an adjunct clause also accounts for the iteration of the result phrase above in (18), since an adjunct, unlike a complement, can repeat without affecting the argument structure of the main verb.

Shim and den Dikken (2007) can also account for the obviation of the direct object restriction above in (9), repeated below as (20), another notable property of Korean resultative construction as distinct from English resultative construction, by relying on the interpretive possibility of the null pronominal, as schematically represented below in (21).

- (20) John-un kangaci-lul cichi-key kelyessta.
 John-TOP puppy-ACC tired-COMP walked
 ‘John walked the puppy tired.’

2) Shim and den Dikken (2007) do not specifically mention how to derive the surface word order from the proposed structure such that the antecedent NP precedes the result phrase in (19).

- (21) a. John_i-un kangaci-lul [pro_i cichi-key] kelyessta.
 John-TOP puppy-ACC tired-COMP walked
 ‘John walked the puppy tired.’
- b. John-un kangaci_j-lul [pro_j cichi-key] kelyessta.
 John-TOP puppy-ACC tired-COMP walked
 ‘John walked the puppy tired.’

However, Shim and den Dikken’s (2007) proposal for the result phrase in Korean resultative constructions projecting a nonfinite TP across the board is problematic, especially given that the two constructions exhibit several nontrivial differences.

One is that, as already mentioned above in (5) in section 1, the antecedent NP in the transitive resultative construction in Korean bears accusative case, whereas the one in the intransitive resultative construction bears nominative case, repeated below as (22).

- (22) a. John-un **soy-lul** napcakha-key twutulyessta.
 John-TOP metal-ACC flat-COMP hammered
 ‘John hammered the metal flat.’
- b. John-un **mok-i** swi-key oychessta.
 John-TOP throat-NOM hoarse-COMP shouted
 ‘John shouted his throat hoarse.’

Another has to do with the honorific morpheme *si*. Interestingly, the honorific morpheme cannot appear in the result phrase of the transitive resultative construction, quite unlike the intransitive resultative construction as shown below in (23-24), with HON standing for the honorific morpheme (Hong, 2002; Son, 2008, among others).

- (23) a. Emeni-ka meli-lul kkamah-key yemsaykha-si-ess-ta.
 mother-NOM hair-ACC black-COMP dye-HON-PAST-IND
 ‘Mother dyed her hair black.’
- b. *Emeni-ka meli-lul kkama-**si**-key yemsaykha-si-ess-ta.
 mother-NOM hair-ACC black-HON-COMP dye-HON-PAST-IND
 ‘Mother dyed her hair black.’
- (24) a. Sensayngnim-i mok-i swi-key oychi-si-ess-ta
 teacher-NOM throat-NOM hoarse-COMP shout-HON-PAST-IND
 ‘The teacher shouted his throat hoarse.’
- b. Sensayngnim-i mok-i swi-**si**-key oychi-si-ess-ta
 teacher-NOM throat-NOM hoarse-HON-COMP shout-HON-PAST-IND
 ‘The teacher shouted his throat hoarse.’

Last but not least, the transitive and intransitive resultative constructions behave differently with respect to *tolok*, another result state marker in Korean resultative construction (Hong, 2011; Son, 2008, among others).³⁾

(25) a. John-un soy-lul napcakha-**{key/*tolok}** twutulyessta.
 John-TOP metal-ACC flat-COMP hammered
 ‘John hammered the metal flat.’

b. John-un chaykkkosi-lul nolah-**{key/*tolok}** chilhayssta.
 John-TOP bookshelf-ACC yellow-COMP painted
 ‘John painted the bookshelf yellow.’

(26) a. John-un mok-i swi-**{key/tolok}** oychessta.
 John-TOP throat-NOM hoarse-COMP shouted
 ‘John shouted his throat hoarse.’

b. John-un kwi-ka mengha-**{key/tolok}** oychessta.
 John-TOP throat-NOM deaf-COMP shouted
 ‘John shouted his ear deaf.’

As one can see above in (25-26), *tolok* cannot appear in the result phrase of the transitive resultative construction, quite unlike the intransitive resultative construction.⁴⁾

The important differences between the two resultative constructions regarding case on the antecedent NP, honorific morpheme, and *tolok* above in (22-26) are simply overlooked in Shim and den Dikken (2007).

Moreover, Shim and den Dikken (2007) crucially cannot account for the ungrammaticality of the following paradigm involving what I call argument projection:

3) Note that *tolok* has purpose construal as well. When it is so construed, the grammaticality of the sentences with *tolok* in (25) considerably improves.

4) An anonymous reviewer points out that *tolok* can combine with the passivized result phrase in Korean transitive resultative construction as well as shown below in (i).

(i) John-un soy-lul napcakhay-ci-tolok twutulyessta.
 John-TOP metal-ACC flat-PASS-COMP hammered
 (Lit) ‘John hammered the metal flattened.’

I agree with the reviewer’s intuition. At the same time note, however, that the construction above in (i) shows case alternation on the antecedent NP quite unlike the transitive resultative construction as shown below in (ii).

(ii) a. John-un soy-**{lul/ka}** napcakhay-ci-tolok twutulyessta.
 John-TOP metal-ACC/NOM flat-PASS-COMP hammered
 (Lit) ‘John hammered the metal flattened.’
 b. John-un soy-**{lul/*ka}** napcakha-key twutulyessta.
 John-TOP metal-ACC/NOM flat-COMP hammered
 ‘John hammered the metal flat.’

The case alternation fact crucially suggests that Korean transitive resultative construction with a passive result phrase in (iia) cannot be on a par with the Korean transitive resultative construction in (iib).

- (27) a. *John-un soy-lul [**ku kes-i** napcakha-key] twutulyessta.
 John-TOP metal-ACC that thing-NOM flat-COMP] hammered
 ‘John hammered the metal flat.’
- b. *John-un [**ku-ka** mok-i swi-key] oychessta.
 John-TOP he-NOM throat-NOM hoarse-COMP shouted
 ‘John shouted his throat hoarse.’

Note that the overt expressions *ku kes* ‘that thing’ in (27a) and *ku* ‘he’ in (27b) are the overt realization of the null pronominal *pro* in their system since the result phrase in both transitive and intransitive resultative constructions project an adjunct clause of a nonfinite TP with *pro* in the subject position as roughly represented below in (28).

- (28) a. John-un soy-lul [TP *pro* napcakha-key] twutulyessta.
 John-TOP metal-ACC flat-COMP] hammered
 ‘John hammered the metal flat.’
- b. John-un [TP *pro* mok-i swi-key] oychessta.
 John-TOP throat-NOM hoarse-COMP shouted
 ‘John shouted his throat hoarse.’

It is thus of no surprise that the sentences above (27) are predicted to be grammatical contrary to the fact, since the null pronominal *pro* with the feature specification of [+pronominal] and [-anaphor] can have its overt counterpart (Chomsky, 1981, 1986, 1995).⁵⁾

Below in section 4, I will make an alternative proposal for Korean resultative construction, based on the differences between the transitive and intransitive resultative constructions as discussed above in (22-26) with respect to the honorific morpheme, case on the antecedent NP, and the result state marker *tolok*. I will show that the present proposal can address the various properties of Korean resultative construction in their entirety as compared with the previous proposals as reviewed so far.

5) Building on Shim and den Dikken (2007), Ko (2015) suggests that the result phrase in Korean resultative construction is an adjunct, projecting a small clause across the board with a null pronominal subject. The proposal, however, is problematic. It is known that small clause does not allow sentential negation. However, the result phrase in Korean resultative construction allows sentential negation, namely, long form negation, as shown below in (i).

- (i) a. John-un soy-lul napcakhaci anh-key twutulyessta.
 John-TOP metal-ACC flat NOT-COMP hammered
 (Lit) ‘John hammered the metal not flat.’
- b. John-un mok-i swici anh-key oychessta.
 John-TOP throat-NOM hoarse NOT-COMP shouted
 (Lit) ‘John shouted his throat not hoarse.’

Moreover, the sentences above in (27), according to Ko (2015), are predicted to be grammatical, with *ku kes* ‘that thing’ and *ku* ‘he’ being the overt realization of the null pronominal subject, which is not, however.

4. Structure of Korean Resultative Construction

Now, let us go back to the transitive and intransitive resultative constructions in Korean above in (5=(22)), repeated below as (29).

- (29) a. John-un **soy-lul** napcakha-key twutulyessta.
 John-TOP metal-ACC flat-COMP hammered
 ‘John hammered the metal flat.’
- b. John-un **mok-i** swi-key oychessta.
 John-TOP throat-NOM hoarse-COMP shouted
 ‘John shouted his throat hoarse.’

Recall that Shim and den Dikken (2007) propose that the result phrase in Korean resultative construction projects an adjunct clause of a nonfinite TP. I also propose in agreement with them that the result phrase in Korean resultative construction projects an adjunct clause. At the same time, diverging from them, I propose that the result phrase in the transitive resultative construction projects a finite clause whereas the one in the intransitive resultative construction projects a nonfinite clause, based on the differences between the two constructions above in (22-26) with respect to case on the antecedent NP, honorific morpheme, and the result state marker *tolok*.

At this point, it is in good order to remind the reader that the honorific morpheme *si* cannot appear in the result phrase in the transitive construction, quite unlike intransitive construction as shown above in (23-24), repeated below as (30-31).

- (30) a. Emeni-ka meli-lul kkamah-key yemsaykha-si-ess-ta.
 mother-NOM hair-ACC black-COMP dye-HON-PAST-IND
 ‘Mother dyed her hair black.’
- b. *Emeni-ka meli-lul kkama-**si**-key yemsaykha-si-ess-ta.
 mother-NOM hair-ACC black-HON-COMP dye-HON-PAST-IND
 ‘Mother dyed her hair black.’
- (31) a. Sensayngnim-i mok-i swi-key oychi-si-ess-ta
 teacher-NOM throat-NOM hoarse-COMP shout-HON-PAST-IND
 ‘The teacher shouted his throat hoarse.’
- b. Sensayngnim-i mok-i swi-**si**-key oychi-si-ess-ta
 teacher-NOM throat-NOM hoarse-HON-COMP shout-HON-PAST-IND
 ‘The teacher shouted his throat hoarse.’

What is of interest regarding the distribution of the honorific morpheme *si* is that it cannot appear in the ECM clause in Korean as below in (32), which is a finite clause, whereas it can in a nonfinite clause as in (33), as observed by Hong (2002).

- (32) a. Mary-ka [CP emeni-lul yepwu-key] yekinta.
 Mary-NOM mother-ACC beautiful-COMP consider
 ‘Mary considers her mother beautiful.’
- b. *Mary-ka [CP emeni-lul yepwu-si-key] yekinta.
 Mary-NOM mother-ACC beautiful-HON-COMP consider
 ‘Mary considers her mother beautiful.’
- (33) a. Mary-ka [CP emeni-ka yepwu-ta-ko] sayngkakhanta.
 Mary-NOM mother-NOM beautiful-COMP think
 ‘Mary thinks that her mother is beautiful.’
- b. Mary-ka [CP emeni-ka yepwu-si-ta-ko] sayngkakhanta.
 Mary-NOM mother-NOM beautiful-HON-COMP think
 ‘Mary thinks that her mother is beautiful.’

Put together, the paradigm above in (30-33) regarding the honorific morpheme *si* crucially suggests that the result phrase in Korean transitive resultative construction above in (30) is finite exactly like the ECM construction in (32), whereas the result phrase in the intransitive resultative construction in (31) is nonfinite just like the nonfinite clause in (33).

Also, the difference in the result state marker *tolok* above in (25-26), repeated below as (34-35), lends further support to the distinction of finite vs. nonfinite result phrase in Korean resultative constructions.

- (34) a. John-un soy-lul napcakha-**{key/*tolok}** twutulyessta.
 John-TOP metal-ACC flat-COMP hammered
 ‘John hammered the metal flat.’
- b. John-un chaykkkosi-lul nolah-**{key/*tolok}** chilhayssta.
 John-TOP bookshelf-ACC yellow-COMP painted
 ‘John painted the bookshelf yellow.’
- (35) a. John-un mok-i swi-**{key/tolok}** oychessta.
 John-TOP throat-NOM hoarse-COMP shouted
 ‘John shouted his throat hoarse.’
- b. John-un kwi-ka mengha-**{key/tolok}** oychessta.
 John-TOP throat-NOM deaf-COMP shouted
 ‘John shouted his ear deaf.’

Again, recall that the result phrase in the transitive resultative construction is introduced only by *key*, contrasting sharply with the result phrase in the intransitive resultative construction which can be introduced by *tolok* as well. I speculate that this state of affairs further suggests that the result phrase in the transitive resultative construction is finite,

thus being introduced only by *key*, unlike the result phrase in the intransitive resultative construction which can be introduced by *tolok* as well. Note that in English as well finite clause is introduced only by *for*, whereas nonfinite clause is introduced by several different complementizers including *if*, *whether* and *that* as shown below in (36-37).

- (36) a. I wonder **if/whether** John will come to class in time.
 b. I think **that** John will come to class in time.

(37) I tried **for** John to submit the manuscript in time.

Last but not least, I suggest that case on the antecedent NP in Korean resultative construction above in (29=(22)), repeated below as (38) further supports the distinction of finite vs. nonfinite result phrase in Korean resultative constructions.

- (38) a. John-un **soy-lul** napcakha-key twutulyessta.
 John-TOP metal-ACC flat-COMP hammered
 ‘John hammered the metal flat.’
 b. John-un **mok-i** swi-key oychessta.
 John-TOP throat-NOM hoarse-COMP shouted
 ‘John shouted his throat hoarse.’

Recall that the antecedent NP in the transitive resultative construction bears accusative case, whereas the one in the intransitive resultative construction bears nominative case. This state of affairs certainly suggests that the result phrase in the former is finite and the one in the latter is nonfinite, given the standard assumption in the literature that the tense in the nonfinite clause is responsible for the nominative case (Chomsky, 1981, 1986, 1995, among others).

Now, based on our discussion on the differences regarding case on the antecedent NP, the honorific morpheme, and *tolok* in Korean resultative constructions, I suggest that the result phrase in the transitive resultative construction projects a finite CP, whereas the result phrase in the intransitive resultative construction projects a nonfinite CP as below in (39), also assuming that *key* in Korean is a complementizer that projects CP (Kim and Maling, 1998; Kang, 2001; Sohn, 1996, 1999, among others).⁶⁾

- (39) Result phrase in Korean transitive resultative construction projects a finite clause of CP, whereas it projects a nonfinite clause of CP in Korean intransitive resultative construction.

Also, given that the result phrase in Korean transitive resultative construction is finite, quite unlike the result phrase in

6) One may still wonder whether the result phrase in the intransitive resultative construction projects a nonfinite clause, especially given that the result phrase does not have the overt tense morpheme. I suggest that the lack of the overt tense on the verb in the result phrase in the intransitive resultative construction may be attributed to a morphological co-occurrence restriction imposed by the complementizer *key* on the verb.

the intransitive resultative construction, it is only natural to posit PRO as the subject of the finite CP. We thus posit the following structural representation below in (40) respectively for the transitive and intransitive resultative constructions in Korean as above in (38a) and (38b), where the result phrase serves as a VP adjunct: 7)

- (40) a. [IP NP-TOP [VP [CP PRO VP] [VP NP-ACC V]]]
 b. [IP NP-TOP [VP [CP NP-NOM VP] [VP V]]]

It then follows that Korean resultative constructions above in (38) correspond to the adjunct resultative construction in English as below in (41).

- (41) a. John hammered the metal until it got flat.
 b. John shouted until his throat got hoarse.

From the present proposal, various properties of the resultative construction in Korean as discussed in section 1 follow in a straightforward manner.

First, case on the antecedent NP follows naturally, given that the accusative case of the antecedent NP in the transitive resultative construction is assigned by the main verb and the nominative case of the antecedent NP in the intransitive resultative construction is assigned by the tense in the adjunct clause (Chomsky, 1981, 1986, 1995).

Secondly, the obviation of the direct object restriction (Kratzer, 2005; Levin and Rappaport, 1995; Simpson, 1983) as above in (9), repeated below as (42), also follows.

- (42) John-i kangaci-lul cichi-key kelyessta.
 John-NOM puppy-ACC tired-COMP walked
 ‘John walked the puppy tired.’

The sentence above in (42), under the present system, will have the following structural representation with PRO in the subject position of the result phrase:

- (43) John-i kangaci-lul [CP PRO cichi-key] kelyessta.
 John-NOM puppy-ACC tired-COMP walked
 ‘John walked the puppy tired.’

The obviation of the direct object restriction in Korean transitive resultative construction above in (42) naturally follows from PRO as either subject or object control, which is its attested properties as shown below in (44).

- (44) a. John persuaded Bill [CP PRO to go]
 b. John promised Bill [CP PRO to go]

7) I assume the object NP in (40a) undergoes clause internal scrambling to the front of the result phrase to yield the surface word order.

Under the present system, the overt argument *ku kes* ‘that thing’ in (46a) is impossible since the same position is occupied by PRO, which is not compatible with an overt expression. Similarly, the overt expression *ku* ‘he’ in (46b) cannot appear, either, since there is simply no position available for the overt argument.

5. Telicity as Potential Argument against Adjunction Analysis

We thus far argued that result phrase in Korean resultative construction projects an adjunct clause, à la Shim and den Dikken (2007). At the same time, based on the differences between the two resultative constructions, I proposed that the result phrase in the transitive resultative construction projects a finite CP, whereas the one in the intransitive resultative construction projects a nonfinite CP, crucially diverging from Shim and den Dikken (2007).

In the meantime, Son (2008) suggests that the result phrase in the transitive resultative construction is a complement of the main verb, whereas the one in the intransitive resultative construction is an adjunct, quite against the present proposal. Son’s (2008) claim is based on the observation that telicity of the main verb is affected by the choice of the complement (Folli, 2001), as shown below in (48).

- (48) a. John wrote a novel in a year.
 b. John wrote novels for a year.

With a singular NP, the verb *write* is telic in (48a), whereas it is atelic with the choice of a plural NP in (48b). One way to determine the telicity of a verb (phrase) is whether a temporal PP *in an hour* in the sense of *within an hour* can apply to a verb phrase. If so, it is telic. Meanwhile a verb (phrase) is atelic when a temporal PP *for an hour* can apply to it, as originally observed by Vendler (1957). (also see Dowty, 1978; Higginbotham, 2009, among others).

Now, consider the following transitive resultative construction with *twutulita* ‘hammer’ as the main verb, which is atelic verb as shown by the contrast in grammaticality below in (49).

- (49) a. *John-un soy-lul opwun-maney twutulyessta.
 John-TOP metal-ACC five minute-in hammered
 ‘John hammered the metal in five minutes.’
 b. John-un soy-lul opwun-tongan twutulyessta.
 John-TOP metal-ACC five minute-for hammered
 ‘John hammered the metal for five minutes.’

The grammaticality of the sentences above in (49) is reversed with the choice of the result phrase below in (50) making the main verb telic, which in turn makes it incompatible with atelic PP *for five minutes*.⁸⁾

8) An anonymous reviewer observes that (50b) is grammatical. It is true that the grammaticality of (50b) improves when the result phrase is construed as denoting purpose.

- (50) a. John-un soy-lul opwun-maney napcakha-key twutulyessta.
 John-TOP metal-ACC five minute-in flat-COMP hammered
 ‘John hammered the metal flat in five minutes.’
- b. *John-un soy-lul opwun-tongan napcakha-key twutulyessta.
 John-TOP metal-ACC five minute-for flat-COMP hammered
 ‘John hammered the metal flat for five minutes.’

Based on the paradigm above in (49-50), Son (2008) thus argues that the result phrase in the transitive resultative construction is a complement of the main verb, not the adjunct. The argument is not convincing, however, since the following examples clearly show that the telicity of the verb is also affected by the choice of an adjunct:

- (51) a. *John walked in five minutes.
 b. John walked to the post office in five minutes.

Walk is an atelic verb since it cannot take the PP *in five minutes*. However, with the choice of the adjunct PP *to the post office*, the verb became a telic verb, taking the PP *in five minutes*.

6. Conclusion

I claimed that the result phrase in Korean resultative construction is an adjunct, not a complement, following Shim and den Dikken (2007). At the same time, crucially diverging from them, I argued that the result phrase in the transitive resultative construction projects a finite CP, with PRO in the subject position, whereas the result phrase in the intransitive resultative construction projects a nonfinite CP, based on important differences between the two resultative constructions. I showed that the present proposal can neatly account for the various properties of Korean resultative construction in their entirety including case on the antecedent NP, iteration of the result phrase, and obviation of the direct object restriction. The present proposal can also deal with what I call the argument projection as well, which poses an important problem to Shim and den Dikken (2007). I also showed that telicity cannot be an argument against the present proposal. If the present proposal is on the right track, it lends further support to the cross-linguistic variation in the syntactic representation of the resultative construction: the result phrase in Korean is an adjunct, whereas it is a complement in English (Hoekstra, 1988; Kayne, 1985; Voorst, 1986 and others).

References

- Carrier, J. and Randall, J. 1992. The Argument Structure and Syntactic Structure of Resultatives. *Linguistic Inquiry* 23.2, 173-234.
- Choi, Y.-S. 2019. Adjectives in Korean are NOT. *The Linguistic Association of Korea Journal* 27.1, 122-141.

- Chomsky, N. 1981. *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Chomsky, N. 1986. *Barriers*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, N. 1995. *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Dowty, D. 1978. Governed Transformations as Lexical Rules in a Montague Grammar. *Linguistic Inquiry* 9.3, 393-426.
- Folli, R. 2001. Deriving Telicity in English and Italian. Doctoral dissertation, Oxford University, Oxford.
- Hamann, C. 1991. Adjectives. In A. von Stechow & D. Wunderlich (eds.), *Semantik: Ein Internationales Handbuch der Zeitgenössischen Forschung*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 657-673.
- Higginbotham, J. 2009. *Tense, Aspect, Indexicality*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hoekstra, T. 1988. Small Clause Results. *Lingua* 74, 101-139.
- Hong, S. 2002. Raising to Object in Small Clauses. *Studies in Modern Grammar* 30, 89-108.
- Hong, K.-S. 2011. English Resultative Construction and Korean *key* Construction. *Korean Journal of Linguistics* 36.4, 1143-1169.
- Kang, E.-Y. 2001. The *key* Constructions in Korean Predicate: Head or a Complementizer. *Harvard studies in Korean linguistics* 9, 433-442.
- Kayne, R. 1985. Principles of Particle Constructions. In J. Gueron, H. Obenauer, and J.-Y. Pollock. (eds.), *Grammatical Representation*. Dordrecht: Foris, 101-140.
- Kim, J.-B. 1999. Constraints on the Formation of Korean and English Resultative Constructions. *Proceedings of the North East Linguistic Society* 29, 137-151.
- Kim, M.-J. 2002. Does Korean Have Adjectives? *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 43, 71-89.
- Kim, S. and Maling, J. 1997. A Cross-linguistic Perspective on Resultative Formation. In B. Ralph, and M. Moosally (eds.), *Texas Linguistic Forum* 38, University of Texas Department of Linguistics, Austin, Texas, 189-204.
- Kim, S. and Maling, J. 1998. Resultatives: English vs. Korean. *Journal of Korean Linguistics* 7, 363-379.
- Kim, S., Ko, H., and Yang, H.-K. 2020. Telicity and Mode of Merge in L2 Acquisition of Resultatives. *Language Acquisition* 27.2, 117-159.
- Ko, H. 2015. On the Typology of Small Clauses: Null Subject and Mode of Merge in Resultatives. *Studies in Generative Grammar* 25.2, 347-375.
- Kratzer, A. 2005. Building Resultatives. In C. Maienborn and A. Wöllstein (eds.), *Event Arguments: Foundations and Applications*, Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 177-212.
- Levin, B. and Rappaport, M. 1995. *Unaccusativity: At the Syntax-lexical Semantics Interface*. Cambridge, MA.: The MIT Press.
- Rothstein, S. 1983. The Syntactic Forms of Predication. Doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Schein, B. 1982. *Small Clauses and Predication*. Unpublished manuscript, MIT.
- Shim, J. and den Dikken, M. 2007. The Tense of Resultatives: The Case of Korean. *Proceedings of the North East Linguistic Society* 38, 337-350.
- Simpson, J. 1983. Resultatives. In B. Levin, M. Rappaport Hovav, and A. Zaenen (eds.), *Papers in Lexical-Functional Grammar*, Bloomington: Indiana University Linguistics Club, 143-157.
- Sohn, H.-M. 1996. *Korean Grammar*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Sohn, H.-M. 1999. *The Korean Language*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Son, M. 2008. Resultatives in Korean Revisited: Complementation versus Adjunction. *Tromsø Working Papers on Language and Linguistics* 35.1, 89-113.
- Song, H. 2005. Causatives and Resultatives in Korean. Doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Vendler, Z. 1957. Verbs and Times. *Philosophical Review* 66.2, 143-160.

Voorst, J. 1986. Event Structure. Doctoral dissertation, University of Ottawa, Ontario.

Wechsler, S. and Noh, B. 2001. On Resultative Predicates and Clauses: Parallels between Korean and English. *Language Sciences* 23.4-5, 391-423.

Choi, YoungSik, Professor

22 Soonchunhyang Street, Asan, Chungnam 31538, Republic of Korea

Department of English Language and Literature, Soonchunhyang University

E-mail: youngsic@sch.ac.kr