

Japanese V-V Compounds as Strong Resultatives: The Interaction between Macroparametric and Microparametric Requirement

1. Introduction According to Washio's (1997) classification, the following resultative constructions illustrate strong resultatives:

(1) a. Hanako pounded the metal flat. (Hasegawa (1999: 178))

b. * Hanako-ga kinzoku-o taira-ni tatai-ta.

Hanako-Nom metal-Acc flat pound-Past

'Hanako pounded the metal flat.' (Kageyama (1996: 209), with slight modifications)

Strong resultatives are characterized by involving activity verbs (e.g. *to pound*), the lexical semantics of which is completely independent of the meaning of resultative predicates (e.g. *flat*). Washio (1997) observes that there is typological difference as to whether a given language allows strong resultatives or not. For example, it has been assumed that they are unattested in Japanese, as shown in the ungrammaticality of (1b), which literally translates (1a) into Japanese. This talk aims to challenge this assumption to show that strong resultatives are attested in Japanese. Adopting Competition Theory (Ackema and Neeleman (2004)), we claim that Japanese has strong resultatives in the form of V-V compounds, which result from the interaction between macroparametric and microparametric requirement.

2. Competition Theory Competition Theory is a macroparametric approach to cross-linguistic variations. Its core assumption is that morphology and syntax compete for structural realization, which results in cross-linguistic variations. On this assumption, languages are classified by a macroparameter into morphology-preferring and syntax-preferring ones. The former prefer to morphologically realize an underlying structure, whereas the latter prefer syntactic realization of the same structure. Observing that phrases in English correspond to compounds in Japanese, Nishimaki (2018) analyzes English as syntax-preferring and Japanese as morphology-preferring, respectively. Thus, nominal modification by adjectives is realized syntactically as a nominal phrase (e.g. *old friend* 'intended reading: long-standing friend') in English but morphologically as an A-N compound (e.g. *kyuu-yuu* 'old friend') in Japanese.

3. Compound Forms: Macroparametric Requirement It has been observed in Kageyama (1996), Washio (1997), and Hasegawa (1999), among others, that V-V compounds like (2), which we refer to as Resultative V-V Compounds (RVVCs), are used in Japanese instead of phrasal strong resultatives like (1b).

(2) Hanako-ga kinzoku-o (taira-ni) tataki-nobasi-ta.

Hanako-Nom metal-Acc (flat) pound-spread-Past

'Hanako pounded the metal flat.' (Hasegawa (1999: 184), with slight modifications)

But the reason has been unclear, remaining to be explained. It naturally follows from Competition Theory, which dictates that the structure underlying strong resultatives be morphologically realized as

compounds in Japanese because it is a morphology-preferring language. Competition-theoretically, strong resultatives are attested even in Japanese as long as they are represented in compound forms, as required by its macroparametric value. The present analysis proves valid because RVVCs are parallel in some crucial properties with English strong resultatives, regardless of their different forms, i.e. compound and phrasal forms. For instance, resultative predicates and right-hand verbs are parallel in that their presence may introduce arguments:

- (3) a. Sylvester cried his eyes *(out). (Levin and Rappaport Hovav (1995: 36-37))
 b. me-o naki-harasu ‘to cry one’s eyes out’ (cf. * me-o naku ‘lit. to cry one’s eyes’)
 (Kageyama (1996: 213))

In (3a), the intransitive verb *to cry* tolerates the object *eyes* only when the resultative predicate *out* takes place. The same is true of (3b), where the intransitive *naku* ‘to cry’ can be followed by the object *me* ‘eye(s)’ only when it is compounded with the verb *harasu* ‘to swell.’ Another parallelism is that resultative predicates and right-hand verbs determine the telicity of an entire sentence:

- (4) a. John hammered the metal {*in an hour/ flat in an hour}. (Wechsler (2005: 259))
 b. John-ga kinzoku-o {*iti-zikan-de tataita /iti-zikan-de tataki-nobasita}
 John-Nom metal-Acc an-hour-in hammer /an-hour-in hammer-spread

In (4), the resultative predicate *flat* and the right-hand verb *nobasu* ‘to spread’ make sentences telic, as seen from the occurrence of the completive adverbials *in an hour* in (4a) and *iti-zikan-de* ‘in an hour’ in (4b). Given these parallelisms, we can safely assume that RVVCs have the status as strong resultatives. According to Competition Theory, RVVCs are morphologically-realized forms of strong resultatives.

4. Verbal Resultative Predicates: Microparametric Requirement Our macroparametric analysis means that in RVVCs right-hand verbs function as resultative predicates. If so, one might wonder why Japanese selects verbs as resultative predicates unlike English, which has adjectival ones. Answering this question, we assume that this selection is due to microparametric requirement. Baker (2003: 226-230) observes that resultative predicates can be realized as different categories depending on the details of morphosyntax of a given language. It is plausible that these morphosyntactic details are determined by microparameters. Thus, Baker points out that West African Languages also take verbs as resultative predicates, which demonstrates that, cross-linguistically, verbal resultative predicates are not so unusual. The present analysis tells us that the form of RVVCs is required by a microparameter whereas their verbal resultative predicates come from microparametric requirement.

References: Ackema, P. and A. Neeleman (2004) *Beyond Morphology*, OUP. / Baker, M. C. (2003) *Lexical Categories*, CUP. / Hasegawa, N. (1999) “The Syntax of Resultatives,” *Linguistics: In Search of the Human Mind*, 178-208, Kaitakusha. / Kageyama, T. (1996) *Verb Semantics*, Kurosio. / Levin, B. and M. Rappaport Hovav (1995) *Unaccusativity*, MIT Press. / Nishimaki, K. (2018) *A Study on Cross-Linguistic Variations*, Kaitakusha. / Washio, R. (1997) “Resultatives, Compositionality, and Language Variation,” *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 6, 1-49. / Wechsler, S. (2005) “Resultatives under the ‘Event-Argument Homomorphism’ Model of Telicity,” *The Syntax of Aspect*, 255–273, OUP.