I. INTRO: Linguistic variation across languages is often taken to arise due to a particular choice of parameter settings that determine language specific structural properties during acquisition. Cross-linguistic variation in resultatives (wipe the table clean) has also been handled by the same application; it has been argued that there is a parameter that distinguishes languages with resultatives (e.g., English) and those without (e.g., Spanish) (e.g., Snyder 2001). This paper, however, shows, that the previous parameter approaches is too coarse-grained as further fragmentation of the parameter is needed; variation in resultatives is not just a matter of whether a language allows them or not. Rather, the parameter breaks down into subcases, as resultatives can be divided into three different types, strong, weak and spurious-resultatives (e.g., 2). Washio argues that English allows all three (e.g., 4) but Japanese allows only weak and spurious type (e.g., 3). In this paper, I first argue that Korean is similar to English in allowing both strong and weak (e.g., 5) (cf. Shim and Den Dikken 2007). Second, I propose, building on Son and Svenonius (2008), that the right degree of variation in resultatives attested across languages is better explained by differences in the properties of individual lexical items, following a micro-parametric trend (e.g., Borer 1984). Third, I show how the proposed micro-parametric analysis captures differences among Korean, English and Japanese (as well as Spanish).

II. VARIATION IN RESULTATIVES AND PARAMETER: A number of researchers have analyzed the typological distinction in resultatives as a parameter. Snyder (1995), for example, argues that variation in resultatives is driven by the Compounding Parameter and Complex Predicate Constraints stated in (1); if a language is marked for (1a), it allows both N-N compounding and resultatives among various other complex predicates (e.g., English), while languages unmarked for (1a) disallow both (e.g., Spanish). Thus, his approach predicts that there is a tight correlation between compounding and resultatives (as well as other types of complex predicates). However, it has been noted (Son and Svenonius 2008) that the correlation does not necessarily hold when a broader range of cross-linguistic data is considered; Indonesian and Hebrew have compounding and other types of complex predicates (directed manner of motion, run to the store) but lack resultatives. Thus, the pervious macro-parametric approach to variation in resultatives is not appropriate to capture the actual patterns we observe. Instead, I argue, focusing on Korean, Japanese and English, that cross-linguistic variation in resultatives are better explained by a micro-parametric analysis, according to which variation among languages is restricted to properties of individual lexical items.

III. ANALYSIS: The analysis is based on the ‘constructivist’ assumption that the meaning components that determine Aktionsart and argument structure are independent of conceptual structure (e.g., Ramchand 2008). Specifically, I assume, following Son and Svenonius (2008), that there is a universal syntactico-semantic structure that includes four structurally represented components in a resultative construction, as in (6). Each must be ‘lexicalized,’ i.e. licensed by lexical insertion. At the top, there is a processual component, lexicalized by a verb. At the bottom, there is the end state, lexicalized by an AP. In between, there are two functional projections, one of which is an optional lower component of verbal meaning (Ramchand’s RES for ‘result’), and the other is an uppermost predicative layer for the state, PRED. All languages have process verbs and adjectives, so variation in the availability of resultative must reside in the availability of material to lexicalize RES and PRED. I argue that Japanese has a functional element that can lexicalize PRED (e.g., -ni), but not RES (e.g., 6b) and allows resultatives only with verbs that entail result states, thus independently lexicalize RES, i.e., weak. Korean has a functional material to lexicalize both RES and PRED, -key, as in (6a), and thus allows verbs that do not entail result states to occur in resultatives, i.e., strong. English also has a (phonologically empty) functional material that lexicalizes RES allowing strong resultatives (I assume that PRED is lexicalized by adjectives in English, unlike Korean). I further show that resultative predicates occurring in a proposed structure in (6) must be state-denoting predicates. Thus, the seeming limitation on Korean resultatives, compared to English, is due to the fact that Korean often lacks stative-predicate counterparts of English adjectives. For example, Korean lacks an adjective counterpart of ‘bloody’ in (4b). The closest translation of (4b) in Korean is (7), where ‘bloody’ is expressed in a clausal form, ‘the blood comes out’. I analyze secondary (clausal) predicates such as phi-ka na-key as a degree adjunct, rather than true resultatives based on a few syntactic and semantic facts. I also analyze examples such as (8) with a nominative-marked subject of a lower predicate as a modifier of the VP, rather than a complement, in agreement with Shim and Den Dikken (2007).
(1) a. Compounding Parameter (Snyder 1995): The grammar disallows*, allows formation of endocentric compounds during the syntactic derivation *[unmarked value].
b. Complex Predicate Constraint: Two syntactically independent expressions can jointly characterize the event-type of a single event-argument, only if they constitute a single word (endocentric compound) at the point of semantic interpretation.

(2) Washio (1997) (cf. Levinson 2006 on spurious resultatives)
Finer-grained categorization of resultatives: strong, weak and pseudo resultatives
- Strong resultatives (e.g., beat the man bloody, pound the metal flat)
- Weak resultatives (e.g., paint the wall red, wipe the table clean)
- Spurious resultatives (e.g., tie the shoelaces tight/loose)

Taro-NOM floor-ACC clean-NI sweep.PST Taro-NOM metal-ACC thin-KU pound.PST
‘Taro swept the floor clean.’ ‘Taro pounded the metal thin.’

(4) a. John pounded the metal flat. b. John beat the man bloody.

Mary-NOM table-ACC clean-KEY wipe-PST-DC
‘Mary wiped the table clean.’
b. Inho-ka kumsok-ul napcakha-key twutulki-ess-ta.
Inho-NOM metal-ACC flat-KEY pound-PST-DC
‘Inho pounded the metal flat.’

(6) a. Korean
   Inho
   kumsok pred 'iron' res
   napcakha-key 'flat'
   twutulki-pred 'pound'
   AP pred 'sweep'
   res 'floor'

b. Japanese
   Taro
   pred yuka-pred 'floor'
   res hai- pred 'sweep'
   kirei-key 'clean'

(c. English
   Mary
   proc pound res pred 'the metal'
   flat
   A

   John-TOP the man-ACC blood-NOM come-KEY beat-PST-DC
   ‘John beat the man bloody.’

(8) Inho-ka sinpal-i talh-key ttwi-ess-ta.
   Inho-NOM shoes-NOM threadbare-KEY run-PST-DC
   ‘Inho ran his shoes threadbare.’
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