

## Case in 'ECM' Resultatives\*

**Myung-Kwan Park**  
(Dongguk University)

**Park, Myung-Kwan. 2011. Case in 'ECM' Resultatives.** *Linguistic Research* 28(1), 1-18. This paper investigates into the so-called fake or 'ECM' type of resultatives in Korean. We note that in English, an intransitive verb takes a *small clause* complement in the formation of the ECM type of resultatives, but this ECM type is entirely lacking in Korean. Rather, Korean employs an adjunct clause corresponding to the *small clause* complement for this ECM type of resultatives in English. We show that Case marking of the subject of the resultative clause provides reliable evidence for determining this ECM type of resultative clause in Korean, but neither the distribution of NPI nor cancellability of the proposition expressed by the resultative clause can. We suggest that Korean and English differ in the availability of fake resultatives, because only the latter language has a functional feature [RESULT] which enables the intransitive matrix verb to select a resultative small clause as its complement. (Dongguk University)

**Key Words** resultative, small clause, fake or ECM resultatives, Case, complement, adjunct, subordination, causative, predicate restriction

### 1. Introduction

This paper investigates the syntax of resultatives in Korean in comparison to that of those in English. At first sight, the two languages seem to enjoy the same types of resultatives as shown in (1)-(4):

- (1) a. swunhi-nun meli-lul nolah-key yemsaykhayssta  
-Top hair-Acc yellow-KEY dyed  
'Soonhee dyed her hair yellow.'  
b. chelswu-nun thakca-lul kkaykkusha-key takkassta  
-Top table-Acc clean-KEY wiped  
'Chelsoo wiped the table clean.'

---

\* This work was supported by the Dongguk University Research Fund of 2009/10. I am also grateful to the two anonymous reviewers of this journal for the comments and criticisms on this paper, which are of great help in preparing for the final version.

- (2) a. kang-i        tantanha-key    elessta  
          river-Nom solid-KEY        froze  
          'The river froze solid.'  
      b. mwul-i        ttukep-key    kkulhessta  
          water-Nom hot-KEY        boiled  
          'The water boiled hot.'
- (3) **Transitive resultatives:**  
      a. The gardner watered the tulips flat.  
      b. Tom had swept the room clean.
- (4) **Intransitive resultatives:**  
      a. The pond froze solid.  
      b. The toast burned black.

The Korean examples in (1) and (2) can be apparently analyzed on a par with their English counterpart ones in (3) and (4), respectively.

However, when we compare Korean with English in regard to so-called fake or 'ECM' resultatives, we note an interesting structural contrast between the two languages. The following examples make the point:

- (5) a. chelswu-ka    [mok-i/\*ul        swi-key]        oychiessta  
          -Nom    voice-Nom/\*Acc    hoarse-KEY    shouted  
          'Chelsoo shouted his voice hoarse.'  
      b. swuni-ka        [sinpal-i/\*ul        talh-key]        talyessta  
          -Nom    shoes-Nom/\*Acc    threadbare-KEY    ran  
          'Soonhee ran his shoes threadbare.'
- (6) a. The joggers ran [[their Nikes/them/\*they] threadbare].  
      b. He sneezed [[his two handkerchiefs/them/\*they] completely soggy].

The contrast we note from (5) and (6) is that the subject of the resultative phrase preceding the intransitive verb in Korean is not Accusative but Nominative Case-marked, whereas that in English is not Nominative but Accusative Case-marked. The question is why this contrast obtains between the two languages.

The matrix verbs in (5) and (6) are unergative intransitives. It seems that the similar structural contrast between the two languages is also exhibited when matrix

verbs are transitive and have no thematic relation with the subjects of resultative phrases, as follows:

- (7) a. yenghi-ka      cip-ul      nolah-key      chilhayssta  
              -Nom house-Acc yellow-KEY painted  
              'Younghee painted the house yellow.'
- b. yenghi-ka      [bleswi-ka/\*lul      wancenhi      talh-key]  
              -Nom brush-Nom/Acc completely become worn out-KEY  
              chilhayssta  
              painted  
              'Younghee painted the brush worn out completely.'
- (8) a. Chelswu-ka      changmwun-ul      kkaykkusha-key      takkassta  
              -Nom window-Acc clean-KEY wiped  
              'Chelsoo wiped the window clean.'
- b. Chelswu-ka      [hengkep-i/\*ul      teleweci-key]      takkassta  
              -Nom cloth-Nom/Acc become dirty-KEY wiped  
              'Chelsoo wiped the cloth dirty.'
- (9) a. Johnathan painted the house red.  
       b. Beryl painted the brushes/them/\*they to pieces.
- (10) a. John hammered the metal flat.  
       b. John hammered holes/them/\*they through the wall.

In English, the matrix transitive verb can have Case relation with the subject of the resultative phrase when the former does not have thematic relation with the latter, as in (9b) and (10b). However, this does not hold in Korean, as in (7b) and (8b). Unlike in English, the subject of the resultative phrase is not Accusative but Nominative Case-marked in Korean. This contrast between the two languages also calls for an explanation.

Given this background, this paper probes into the structure of the ECM type of resultatives in English and Korean. In particular, this paper investigates why there is a contrast in the availability of the ECM type of resultatives: that is, the subject of the resultative phrase in English can be not Nominative but Accusative Case marked by the matrix transitive or intransitive verb that it has no thematic relation with, but the counterpart in Korean cannot be. In our investigation of this question, we take

up such issues as how we can define the structural role of the resultative phrase and how it affects the process of Case-marking the subject of the phrase. In passing, we also examine the predicate restriction on the resultative phrase.

## 2. Fake or 'ECM' Resultatives in English

Before investigating into the syntax of the resultatives in Korean which can be understood as counterparts to ECM resultatives in English, we first note that the latter in English have as the resultative phrase the *small clause complement* of the preceding verbs which are generally used as intransitives (Hoekstra (1988)). Its syntactic role as a complement has been argued for on the basis of the following examples involving extraction out of a *wh*-island, which are cited from Carrier and Randall (1992):

- (11) a. ?Which sneakers<sub>1</sub> do you wonder who ran t<sub>1</sub> threadbare?  
       b. ?Which sneakers<sub>1</sub> do you wonder whether to run t<sub>1</sub> threadbare?
- (12) a. ?How threadbare<sub>1</sub> do you wonder whether they should run their  
       sneakers t<sub>1</sub>?  
       b. ?How bald<sub>1</sub> do you wonder which tires to drive t<sub>1</sub>?  
       c. ?How hoarse<sub>1</sub> do you wonder whether they sang themselves t<sub>1</sub>?
- (13) a. ?Which boy<sub>1</sub> do you wonder whether to punish t<sub>1</sub>?  
       b. ?Which boys<sub>1</sub> do you wonder how to punish t<sub>1</sub>?
- (14) a. \*How angry<sub>1</sub> does Mary wonder [whether John left t<sub>1</sub>]?  
       b. \*How<sub>1</sub> do you wonder which boys to punish t<sub>1</sub>?

The examples in (11) and (12) show that either of the subject and predicate constituting the resultative small clause can be extracted out of the *wh*-island, just as the argument *wh*-phrase can be as in (13). If the resultative small clause were an adjunct, neither of them would be moved out of the *wh*-island, just like the adjunct *wh*-phrase in (14). Their extraction from the *wh*-island points to the fact that the resultative small clause is generated as a complement of the matrix verb.

In addition, the fact that ECM resultatives allow for passivization as in the following examples also cited from Carrier and Randall (1992) is taken to show that

the verbs which are used generally as intransitives change into transitive verbs when they occur in ECM resultative constructions:

(15) ***Passive resultatives***

- a. These soles have been danced thin by a professional hoofer.
- b. By the end of the marathon, his Nikes had been run threadbare.
- c. Every morning on the farm, the children are crowed awake (by the roosters).
- d. By the end of the lecture, the audience had been talked unconscious (by the boring professor).

Though intransitive verbs change into transitive verbs in the formation of the ECM resultatives, the postverbal DP (i.e., the subject of the resultative small clause) is not internalized into the argument of the resulting transitive verb. This can be learned from the following examples involving middle verb, adjectival passive and nominal formation.

(16) No ***middle verb formation*** from resultatives

- a. \*Competition Nikes run threadbare (easily).
- b. \*Phys Ed majors talk into a stupor (easily).

(17) No ***adjectival passives*** from resultatives

- a. \*the *danced-thin* soles
- b. \*the *run-threadbare* Nikes

(18) No ***nominals*** from resultatives

- a. \**The talking of your confidant silly* is a bad idea.
- b. \*The jogging craze has resulted in *the running of a lot of pairs of Nikes threadbare*.

All these processes involved in (16)-(18) require thematic relation between the verb and the following postverbal DP. If the intransitive turned transitive took the postverbal DP as its new argument, all the examples in (16)-(18) would be acceptable. This points to the fact that the intransitive turned transitive verb takes as its complement a small clause consisting of a subject and predicate.

It is also to be noted that the pronominal subject of the resultative small clause,

which is underlined in (19), is not a strong pronoun but a weak one.

- (19) a. She laughed Ralph/him/\*he out of the room.
- b. Sue danced Patrick/him/\*he tired.
- c. Donna sneezed the napkin/it off the table.

Following Cardinaletti and Starke's (1999) classification of strong and weak pronouns, we expect that the weak pronoun subject in the ECM resultative construction displays the height effects; in other words, it raises to the matrix clause, just like the subject in the now well-known canonical 'ECM' construction as argued by Lasnik and Saito (1991). It seems that the expectation is achieved as the following examples show:

(20) **Bound variable**

- a. People ran every pair of shoes<sub>i</sub> threadbare during its<sub>i</sub> quality test.
- b. The roosters crowed every child<sub>i</sub> awake during his<sub>i</sub> annual summer camp.

(21) **Binding principle (C)**

- a. \*People ran them<sub>i</sub> threadbare during the quality tests of the shoes<sub>i</sub>.
- b. \*The roosters crowed him<sub>i</sub> awake during the annual summer camp  
Bob<sub>i</sub> participated in.

(22) **Negative polarity item**

- a. People ran no pair of shoes threadbare during any quality test.
- b. The roosters crowed no child awake during any annual summer camp.

These tests show that the subject of the resultative small clause also raises to the matrix clause.

We assume that what we said about the small clause selected by the intransitive turned transitive verb goes *mutatis mutandis* to that selected by the transitive verb as in (23)

- (23) a. Gerald drank the pub/it dry.
- b. Beryl painted the brush/it to pieces.
- c. John hammered a hole/it through the wall.

In (23), there is no thematic relation between the transitive verb and the postverbal DP. In this construction, the transitive verb can select a small clause in the formation of resultatives. The subject of the small clause is not a strong but a weak pronoun which raises to the matrix clause.

### 3. Resultatives in Korean

Corresponding to fake or ECM resultatives there are the following Korean counterpart examples in (5a-b), which are repeated as (24a-b):

- (24) a. chelswu-ka [mok-i/\*ul swi-key] oychiessta  
           -Nom voice-Nom/\*Acc hoarse-KEY shouted  
           'Chelsoo shouted [his voice hoarse].'  
       b. swuni-ka [sinpal-i/\*ul talh-key] talyessta  
           -Nom shoes-Nom/\*Acc threadbare-KEY ran  
           'Soonhee ran [his shoes threadbare].'

In these examples it is easy to find that the bracketed string of words forms a constituent, for the first DP is a Nominative-marked subject and the next word is its predicate: they together always form a unit.

It seems that what we call the resultative clause, the bracketed constituent in (24a-b), is a full clause. This behavior can be found when we put a negative polarity item in the subject position of this resultative clause:

- (25) a. \*kim sensayng-un amwuto col-key kanguyhaci anhassta  
           teacher-Top anyone sleepy-KEY lecture didn't  
           'Teacher Kim didn't lecture anyone sleepy.'  
       b. kim sensayng-un amwuto col-ci anh-key kanguyhayssta  
           teacher-Top anyone sleepy not do-KEY lectured  
           'Teacher Kim lectured no one sleepy.'  
       (26) a. \*chelsoo-nun amwuto nola-key solichici anhassta  
               -Top anyone surprised-KEY shout didn't  
               'Chelsoo didn't shout anyone surprised.'

- b. chelsoo-nun amwuto nola-ci anh-key solichiessta  
 -Top anyone surprised do not-KEY shouted  
 'Chelsoo shouted noone surprised.'

As shown by (25b) and (26b), the NPI subject of the resultative clause can be licensed by the negation in the same clause, whose occurrence in the resultative clause means that it is selected by tense (Zanuttini (1991)). In this sense the resultative clause is not a small but a full clause which contains tense.

Furthermore, as shown by (25a) and (26a), the NPI subject of the resultative clause cannot be licensed by the matrix negation.<sup>1</sup> Apparently the unacceptability of (25a) and (26a) seems to have something to do with that of the following examples (cf. Shi (1998)):

- (27) \*chelswu-nun [amwuto pap-ul mekesstako] malha/mitci anhassta  
 Chelsoo-Top anyone food-Acc ate say/believe did not  
 'Chelsoo did not say/believe that anyone had food.'
- (28) \*chelswu-nun [amwuto us-nun-kes-ul] poci moshayssta  
 -Top anyone laugh-Asp-Comp-Acc see can't  
 'Chelsoo couldn't see anyone laugh.'

The unacceptability of (27) and (28)<sup>2</sup> can be attributed to a violation of the clausemate condition on NPIs, which says the NPI and negation occur in the same clause (Choe (1988); Sohn (1995)). The fact that the NPI in (27) and (28) occurs in the embedded clause while the negation occurs in the matrix clause can be learned by the following examples:

- (29) chelswu-nun [yenghi-ka/\*lul pap-ul mekesstako]  
 Chelsoo-Top Younghee-Nom/\*Acc food-Acc ate  
 malha/mitci nhassta  
 say/believe did not  
 'Chelsoo did not say/believe that anyone had had food.'

<sup>1</sup> We are grateful to Prof. Ki-Yong Choi, Prof. Jeoung-hoon Lee, Prof. Yoo-Ki Lee and Prof. Keun-Won Sohn for their help with the judgment reported here.

<sup>2</sup> We have found that some of the Korean speakers we consulted claimed (27) and (28) are not bad. This judgment, though opposite to the judgment reported in the text, is still in consonance with what we are going to say below about ECM resultatives in Korean.



- (30) chelswu-nun [yenghi-ka/\*lul us-nun-kes-ul]  
 -Top Younghee-Nom/Acc laugh-Asp-Comp-Acc  
 poci moshayssta  
 see can't  
 'Chelsoo couldn't see Younghee laugh.'

The examples in (29) and (30) show that when we replace the NPI in (27) and (28) with the usual DP, the latter is not Accusative but Nominative Case marked. In other words, since the embedded subject is Nominative Case-marked and does not raise to the matrix clause,<sup>3</sup> the resulting sentence is ruled out as the Nominative Case-mark embedded subject is realized as an NPI.

Given this background on NPIs, as we return to (25a) and (26a), their unacceptability is now clear. The subject of the resultative clause at issue cannot be Accusative but Nominative Case-marked, which can be confirmed when it is realized with the usual DP. Thus when the NPI occurs in this subject position, it cannot meet the clausemate requirement on NPIs.

Though we have tried to account for (25a) and (26a) on a par with (27) and (28), assuming that the resultative clause in Korean is a complement clause, the question to be addressed is whether the resultative clause in Korean which is a counterpart to the ECM resultative small clause in English is a complement or adjunct clause. As the following examples show, the subject NPI of the adjunct clause cannot be licensed by the matrix negation, either:

- (29) \*chelswu-nun [amwuto wa-se] hwanaci anhassta  
 Chelsoo-Top anyone come-Acc get angry did not  
 'Chelsoo did get angry because somebody showed up.'  
 (30) \*chelswu-nun [amwuto tochakha-myen] ttenaci anh-ul-kesita  
 -Top anyone show up-if leave not-do  
 'Chelsoo will not leave if someone shows up.'

---

<sup>3</sup> However, when it is Accusative Case-marked and raises to the matrix clause, the resulting sentence is ruled in, as follows:

- (i) chelswu-nun amwuto cengcikhatako mitci anhassta  
 Chelsoo-Top anyone honest believe did not  
 'Chelsoo didn't believe anyone to be honest.'

In other words, it is still not clear whether the unacceptability of (25a) and (26a) relates to (27) and (28) with the NPI in the subject position of the complement clause, or (29) and (30) with the NPI in the subject position of the adjunct clause.

Though it is not easy to decide on the structural identity of the resultative clause in Korean, it seems to be right to say that it is an adjunct. This view gains support when we compare the resultative clause with the apparently similar complement clause of the periphrastic causative construction in (31):

- (31) a. *khun soli-lo nolay-lul pwulun kes-i*  
           loud sound-with song-Acc chant what-Nom  
           (chelsoo-uy) *mok-i/-ul swi-key/tolok hayessta*  
           Chelsoo-Gen neck-Nom/Acc hoarse-KEY/TOLOK did/made  
           'Singing a song loudly made Chelsoo's voice hoarse.'
- b. *cangkeli kyengcwu-ka (swuni-uy) sinpal-i/ul*  
           long-distance running-Nom Sooni-Gen shoes-Nom/Acc  
           *talh-key/tolok hayessta.*  
           worn-out-KEY/TOLOK did/made  
           'Long-distance running made Sooni's shoes worn out.'

In the causative construction, the verb of the complement clause is morphologically closed by the morpheme *-key* or *-tolok*, which is exactly identical to the one at the end of the verb in the resultative clause. Despite this structural parallelism, the complement clause of the causative construction is in stark contrast with the resultative clause, in that only the former allows its subject to be Accusative Case-marked. This means that the subject can be Case-marked by a verb in the higher clause. Recall, however, that this is not possible in the resultative clause: the subject of this clause cannot be. It is right to point out that this contrast lies in the structural status of the two clauses: the embedded clause of the causative construction is a complement clause, but the resultative clause is an adjunct clause. The adjunct status of the resultative clause blocks its subject from being under the domain of an outside Case governor/assigner.

The absence of an external Case assigner for the subject of the resultative clause is closely associated with the inability of the clause to have a stative adjective as its predicate (cf. Song (2005)). The sentence (32), where the matrix verb is transitive

and the adjective *kanul-* 'thin' in the resultative clause is purely stative, is not acceptable, but when the adjective is affixed with the *-e-ci-* 'become' verbalizer, the sentence improves as in (33):

- (32) \*yenghi-nun [bleswi-ka kanul-key] chilhayssta  
 -Top brush-Nom thin-KEY painted  
 'Younghee painted the brush thin.'
- (33) yenghi-nun [bleswi-ka kanul-e-ci-key] chilhayssta

Likewise, the adjectives such as *ppalkah-* 'red' and *kwulk-* 'thick' cannot occur in the resultative clauses,<sup>4</sup> as in the following sentences where the matrix verb is intransitive. However, again added with the *-e-ci-* verbalizer, the sentences also improve as in (35):

- (34) a. ?\*chelswu-ka nwun-i ppalkah-key wulessta  
 Chelsoo-Nom nwu-Nom red-KEY cried  
 b. ?\*kunwuk-i kwulk-key wundonghayssta  
 muscle-Nom thick-KEY worked out  
 '(I) worked out his muscles think.'
- (35) a. chelswu-ka nwun-i ppalkah-e-ci-key wulessta  
 b. kunwuk-i kwulk-e-ci-key wundonghayssta

It is worthy of noting that the complement clause of the causative construction behaves in parallel fashion in this regard when its subject is Nominative Case-marked, as follows:

- (36) ??John-i Mary-ka yeppu/kippu-key hayessta  
 -Nom -Nom pretty/happy-KEY did/made  
 'John made Mary pretty/happy.'

---

<sup>4</sup> More exactly speaking, stative adjectives are not allowed in the resultative clause, but adjectives describing a change of state are in fact allowed, as follows:

- (i) Chelswu-ka pal-i aphu-key/tolok taliessta  
 -Nom foot-Nom sore-KEY/TOLOK ran  
 'Chelsoo ran his feet sore.'

Importantly, this sentence can be improved by replacing the Nominative Case of the embedded subject with the Accusative Case, as follows:

(37) John-i Mary-lul yeppu/kippu-key hayessta

The contrast between (32), (34a-b) and (36) on the one hand, and (37) on the other, clearly points to the fact that in Korean, there is a difference in structural make-up between the clause whose subject is Nominative Case-marked and the clause whose subject is Exceptionally Case-marked. We suggest that the distinguishing factor is the presence or absence of Tense in the embedded clause. Furthermore, following Park (1994) we assume the following line of analysis of predicate restriction:

- (38) (i) An adjective has an [e]-argument.
- (ii) T binds an [e]-argument and determines the situation type of a certain clause.
- (iii) The *resultative* clause describes either an [eventual] or [change-of-state] situation.
- (iv) The *effect* clause as a complement clause of the causative construction describes an [eventual] situation.

The thrust of this analysis is that when the embedded clause is Nominative Case-marked, it has a T element that can bind the [e](vent)-argument of a stative adjective. This process of T-binding results in determining the type of the clause, producing a stative situation. This stative situation, however, cannot function as a resultative clause, let alone as an embedded clause of the causative construction. However, when the embedded clause has its subject Accusative Case-marked in the causative construction, it lacks a T element (relevant features) for binding the [e]-argument of a stative adjective, thereby triggering the formation of a complex predicate by combining the matrix causative verb with the embedded adjective. This complex verb formation converts the situation type of the latter from stative to eventual by virtue of the eventual type of the matrix verb, meeting the requirement for denoting the right type of situation. Note that all this account hinges on the role of T in binding the [e]-argument of a predicate. As T is also important in

distinguishing the Nominative embedded subject from the ECMed Accusative one, we suggest that T is responsible for assigning Nominative Case to the subject of a clause in Korean.

Before closing this section, we briefly examine the difference between Korean and English in regard to cancellability of the proposition expressed by the resultative clause. Oh (2010) notes that the two languages diverge in the following sentences:

- (39) a. ku-ka        soi-lul        phyengphyenghakey   twutuli-ko   issta  
          he-Nom    metal-Acc   flat     hammering is  
          'He is hammering the metal flat.'
- b. ??He is hammering the metal flat.

The matrix clause is imperfective, but the situation described by the resultative clause in (39b) is required to be completed. The mismatch in event structure between the two clauses is to blame for the acceptability of (39b). However, this restriction does not hold in Korean, accounting for the acceptability of (39a).

Oh continues on to show that in contrast to English, the proposition expressed by the resultative clause in Korean can be cancelled by the ensuing *una* 'but' clause, as follows:

- (40) a. ku-ka        soi-lul        phyengphyengkhakey   twutuliessuna  
         he-Nom   metal-Acc flat                                  hammered  
         soi-nun        pyhengpyenghaci   anhassta<sup>5</sup>  
         metal-Top   flat    didn't  
         'He hammered the metal flat, but it was not flat.'  
     b. ??He hammered the metal flat, but the metal was not flat.  
         Rothstein (2004: 60)

<sup>5</sup> One of the reviewers in this journal claims that unlike Oh (2010), (40a) is unacceptable; rather, when the adjective *phyengphyenghakey* is replaced with the inchoative verb *phyengphyengha-e-ci-key*, the proposition cancellation in the resulting sentence as follows is possible.

- (i) (?) ku-ka            soi-lul            phyengphyenghakey    twutuliessuna  
          he-Nom        metal-Acc    flat                                    hammered  
          soi-nun        phyengphyenghaci    anhassta  
          metal-Top    flat                                    didn't  
          'He hammered the metal flat, but it was not flat.'

On the basis of these distinctions, Oh argues that, as shown up to now in this paper, the Korean resultative clause is an adjunct, whereas the English counterpart is a complement.

However, this test of cancellability seems not to work perfectly. As the following examples show, some of the resultative clauses cannot be cancelled:

- (41) a. ?\*ku-nun kunywuk-i kwulecikey taliessuna,  
           he-Top muscles-Nom get-thick-KEY ran  
           kunywuk-un kwulkeci-ci anhassta  
           muscles-Top get-thick didn't  
           'He ran (his) muscles thick, but they didn't get thick.'
- b. ?\*ku-nun nwun-i ppalkaycikey wulessuna,  
           -Top eyes-Nom get-red-KEY cried  
           nwun-i ppalkayci-ci anhassta  
           eyes-Top get-red didn't  
           'He cried (his) eyes red, but they didn't get red.'

This clearly shows that the test of cancellability does not provide any help to determine whether the resultative clause is an adjunct or complement.

This line of argument can be reinforced by taking into account the following pair of causative sentences:

- (42) Mary-nun John-i/ul chayk-ul ilk-key hayciman  
       Mary-Top -Nom/Acc book-Acc read-KEY did  
       John-un chayk-ul ilk-ci anhassta  
       -Top book-Acc read didn't  
       'Mary caused John to read a book, but he didn't do so.'
- (43) ?\*ku kyengki-nun John-uy pal-i/ul aph-key hayssciman  
       the game-Top John-Gen foot-Nom/Acc sick-KEY did  
       John-uy pal-un aphuci anhassta  
       John-Gen foot-Top sick didn't  
       'The game caused John's feet to be sore, but they weren't so.'

Recall that the subject of the causative clause is either Nominative or Accusative Case-marked. Recall that the latter possibility is a clear indication that the embedded

clause of the causative construction is a complement. Note that, as shown in (42) and (43), the cancellability of the embedded clause of the causative construction does not hinge on the type of clause, that is, whether it is an adjunct or complement. Rather, the types of predicate in the embedded clause influence the cancellability of its proposition in the causative construction.

In short, the resultative clause is not a complement but an adjunct. The most telling evidence for it is that unlike the subject of the embedded clause in the causative construction, that of the resultative clause cannot be Accusative Case-marked.

#### 4. Subordinate Resultative Clause in Korean

The embedded clause of the causative construction and the resultative clause in Korean are similar, in that they take the identical element *-key* and *-tolok* as their complementizer. However, importantly they are distinguished, in that the former clause is a complement, but the latter is an adjunct.

When we compare Korean and English in regard to the resultative clause, only the latter allows the resultative small clause that functions as a complement. However, the resultative clause in Korean cannot be a complement. When its subject in this language is overtly realized, the resultative clause has to be a finite clause.

How do we account for the intra-lingual contrast between the causative and the resultative constructions in Korean as well as the inter-lingual contrast between Korean and English in the syntactic status of the resultative clause? It seems that these two contrasts are attributed to the availability of transitivity on the part of the matrix verb.

First, the causative verb in Korean and the matrix verb selecting the resultative clause in English are both transitive and can select a small clause as their complement. How can this transitivity be introduced? Recall that in fake or ECM resultatives of English, apparently intransitive verbs can take a complement resultative clause. The following examples are repeated from (6):

- (44) a. The joggers ran [their Nikes/them/\*they threadbare].  
       b. He sneezed [his two handkerchiefs/them/\*they completely soggy].

We suggest that the unergative verbs are supplied with the functional feature [RESULT]/[CAUSE], which makes the former take a small clause as its complement. In this regard, the functional feature [RESULT]/[CAUSE] is compared to the little *v* which has a function of verbalizing or transitivity the verb it attaches with (Chomsky (1995); and see also Travis (1992), Sveninoinis (2002) and Kratzer (2005)).

However, this [RESULT] feature is entirely lacking in Korean. Without this feature, it is impossible to select the resultative complement small clause, which accounts for Korean and English in regard to fake or ECM resultatives. In a nutshell, we submit that the difference between Korean and English in this ECM type type of resultatives is due to the presence or absence of the functional category (cf. Chomsky (1995); Borer (1984)).

It is instructive to note that Korean employs two different types of embedded clause for the causative and resultative constructions. Especially in light of the thesis advanced by Givon (1980) that complementation grows out of subordination, the embedded clause of the causative construction has developed into a complement, but the resultative clause has not. It is yet to be seen how the resultative clause turns out to be in the future.

## 5. Conclusion

When we compare one language with another language, we find it interesting that the two language are quite similar in syntactic aspects. However, still interesting are the differences the two languages exhibit.

In this paper we investigated one of the aspects in which Korean diverges from English. The latter language enjoys fake or ECM resultatives, but the former does not. To be more specific, in English an intransitive verb takes as its complement a small clause in forming this ECM type of resultatives. In contrast, Korean employs not a complement small clause but an adjunct full clause in the formation of resultatives corresponding to fake resultatives in English. We showed that Case marking of the subject of this type of resultatives is a reliable index for identifying the type of resultative clause, but tests such as distribution of NPI and proposition cancellability are not.

We suggested that this parametric difference between Korean and English in



regard to ECM resultatives is attributed to the presence and absence of a feature [RESULT] that is added to an intransitive unergative verb. When the intransitive unergative verb is supplied with the [RESULT] feature in English, it gets transitivized, thereby taking as its complement a resultative small clause. However, Korean lacks this feature. Without this feature, the unergative intransitive verb cannot select a resultative complement small clause. Instead the language uses an adverbial clause in place of the resultative complement small clause as in English.

## References

- Borer, Hagit. 1984. *Parametric syntax: Case studies in Semitic and Romance languages*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Cardinaletti, Anna and Michal Starke. 1999. The typology of structural deficiency: A case study of the three classes of pronouns. In *Clitics in the Languages of Europe*, ed. Henk van Riemsdijk, 145-233. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Carrier, Jill and Janet Randall. 1992. The argument structure and syntactic structure of resultatives. *Linguistic Inquiry* 23:173-234.
- Choe, Hyun-Sook. 1988. *Restructuring parameter and complex predicates: A transformational approach*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1995 *The Minimalist program*. MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Hoekstra, Teun. 1988. Small clause results. *Lingua* 74:101-139.
- Kratzer, Angelika. 2005. Building resultatives. In *Event arguments: foundations and applications*, ed. by C. Maienborn and A. Waollstein-Leisten, 177-212. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Lasnik, Howard and Mamoru Saito. 1991. On the subject of infinitives. In *Papers from the 27th Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, ed by L. Dobrin, L. Nichols, and R. Rodriguez, pp. 324-343. Chicago Linguistic Society, Chicago University, Chicago.
- Oh, Choong Yeun. 2010. A study on the category of Korean resultatives (In Korean). *The Journal of Studies in Language* 26.3:595-619.
- Park, Myung-Kwan. 1994. *A Morphosyntactic Approach to Korean Verbal Inflections*. Doctoral dissertation, UConn, Storrs.
- Rothstein, Susan. 2004. *Structuring events: A study in the semantics of lexical aspect*. Blackwell: Oxford.
- Shi, Chung Kon. 1998. Types of NPIs in Korean and their licensing condition (in Korean). *Linguistics* 22:217-243.
- Sohn, Keun-Won. 1995. *Negative polarity items, scope, and economy*. Doctoral dissertation,

- University of Connecticut.
- Song, Hong Kyu. 2005. *Causatives and resultatives in Korean*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison.
- Svenonius, Peter. 2002. Icelandic case and the structure of events. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 6:197-225.
- Travis, Lisa. 1992. Inner aspect and the structure of VP. *Cahiers Linguistique de l'UQAM* 1:130-146.
- Zanuttini, Raffaella. 1991. *Syntactic properties of sentential negation: A comparative study of Romance languages*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

**Myung-Kwan Park**

English, Dongguk University  
26, 3-ga, Pil-dong, Chung-gu  
Seoul, 100-715  
E-mail: parkmk@dgu.edu

Received: 2011. 04. 04

Revised: 2011. 04. 20

Accepted: 2011. 04. 22