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In this research, we will propose a new analysis for English resultative constructions and empirically attest the validity of the analysis. Moreover, to verify that our analysis for the construction is not ad hoc, we will apply our analysis to other constructions, namely the control construction and the reflexive construction.

We will broadly classify English resultative constructions into two types with respect to whether transitive verbs or intransitive verbs are used, as shown in the following constructions (cf. Wechsler (1997)):

(1) a. John painted the wall blue. (transitive resultatives)
    b. I cried my eyes out. (intransitive resultatives)

Before presenting our analysis of the construction, let us introduce and critique two approaches: Saito’s (2001) movement approach and Ishikawa’s (2009) split lexical insertion approach.

Saito (2001) suggests the following derivations for English resultatives:

(2) a. John hammered the metal flat. (transitive resultatives)
    b. [\(v_p\) John hammer+\(v^*\) [\(v_p\) the metal \(t_v\) [\(A_P\) (the metal) flat]]]

(3) a. John drank himself sick. (intransitive resultatives)
    b. [\(v_p\) John drink+\(v^*\) [\(v_p\) \(t_v\) [\(A_P\) himself sick]]]

(4) Saito’s (2001) generalization
    An NP moves into internal theta role position, but not into external theta position.

Saito gives an account for English resultative constructions under a mechanism of \(\theta\)-role assignment to subjects and objects. In (2), first, the metal merges with flat and a \(\theta\)-role is assigned to it by the Adj. Next, the metal moves to [Spec, VP], receiving an internal \(\theta\)-role from hammer. Third, John merges in [Spec, \(v^*P\)] and is assigned an external \(\theta\)-role from hammer+\(v^*\). In the case of (3), first, himself merges with sick, which assigns a \(\theta\)-role to the NP. Next, John merges in [Spec, \(v^*P\)] and is assigned an external \(\theta\)-role from drink+\(v^*\). Apparently, his analysis gives a correct account for the derivation of English resultative constructions. However, in (2a), there is no other way to prevent the metal from moving to [Spec, \(v^*P\)] in order to get an external \(\theta\)-role from hammer+\(v^*\). Moreover, Saito’s analysis cannot explain the fact that the reflexive pronoun himself in (3a) must obligatorily occur.

Let us turn to Ishikawa’s (2009) analysis, based on Split Lexical Insertion
Hypothesis (cf. Agbayani and Ochi, (henceforth A&O) (2007)), as shown in (5):

(5) Split Lexical Insertion (SLI) Hypothesis
Separation of FF (formal features) and CAT (categorical features) takes place in the course of lexical insertion/External Merge as well.

(6) John hammered the metal flat.
   a. \[vp \text{CAT}_{the\text{metal}} \text{hammer} [\text{AP } \text{FF}_{the\text{metal}} \text{flat}]]
   b. \[vp \text{FF}_{the\text{metal}} \text{CAT}_{the\text{metal}} \text{hammer} [\text{AP } (\text{FF}_{the\text{metal}}) \text{flat}]]
   c. \[\text{v}^*p \text{John} \text{hammer}+\text{v}^* [vp \text{FF}_{the\text{metal}} \text{CAT}_{the\text{metal}} \text{hammer} [\text{AP } (\text{FF}_{the\text{metal}}) \text{flat}]]]

(7) John drank himself sick.
   \[vp \text{CAT}_{John} \text{drink}+v [vp \text{tv} [\text{AP } \text{FF}_{John} \text{sick}]]\]
   Insertion of \textit{himself}

In (6), according to (5), because \textit{the metal} is assigned \(\emptyset\)-roles by both \textit{flat} and \textit{hammer}, \text{FF}_{the\text{metal}} and \text{CAT}_{the\text{metal}} must be base-generated in \[\text{Spec, AP}\] and \[\text{Spec, VP}\], respectively. After the derivation proceeds to (6a), VP attracts the \text{FF}_{the\text{metal}} and triggers the movement of it to \[\text{Spec, VP}\], as seen in (6b). \textit{The metal} receives accusative Case from \(\text{v}^*\) in the place. In (7), by contrast, the \text{FF}_{John} and \text{CAT}_{John} must be base-generated in \[\text{Spec, AP}\] and \[\text{Spec, vP}\], respectively. However, this implies that (7) is incorrectly ruled out because of the violation of Derivational Lexical Integrity, which requires that insertion of FF and CAT of a single lexical item must be in a phase, as follows:

(8) Derivational Lexical Integrity
FF and CAT of a single lexical item must be inserted simultaneously (though, not necessarily in the same position), without any operations applying between the insertion of FF and the insertion of CAT.

In order to explain the grammaticality of (7), Ishikawa argues that in the case of prohibition of SLI, a resumptive pronoun must be inserted as last resort, mutatis mutandis, as shown in (7). It is apparently an adequate explanation for the construction in terms of SLI, but there are nevertheless two theoretical problems in Ishikawa’s analysis. First, considering Chomsky’s (2008) ‘no-tampering condition,’ a feature movement theory entertained by A&O (2007) is not conceptually allowed. Second, the insertion of reflexive pronoun \textit{himself} in (7) is a counter-cyclic operation.

In this research, we propose alternative derivations for transitive resultatives and intransitive resultatives, as illustrated in (9) and (10), respectively:
In (9), after the metal with an uninterpretable feature ([uF]) merges with flat, they enter into an Agree relation (cf. Chomsky (2000, 2001)) and then, the Adj assigns a θ-role to the NP. Merging with SC, V enters into an Agree relation with the NP being still active and assigns a θ-role to the NP. Subsequent to merging the phase head v* with VP, Feature Inheritance (FI) occurs (cf. Chomsky (2008)), i.e. V inherits a φ-feature from v*, entering into an Agree relation with the metal, which remains active, and the NP receives accusative Case from V. At the next stage, they with [uF] is base-generated at [Spec, v*] and at the same time when the NP is assigned an external θ-role from v*, the EPP on v* is satisfied. After T merges with v*P, VP is transferred (cf. Pesetsky and Torrego (2001) and Richards (2007)) and then, when the derivation proceeds to the CP domain, FI occurs again. T with the φ-feature and the Tense feature assigned from C enters into an Agree relation with the active element they, assigning nominative Case to the NP. All [uF]s that have to be checked for convergence are deleted. In (10), when the derivation proceeds to the TP domain, VP is transferred because v* is a phase head as observed in (9). In this derivation, the copy of John within SC must be realized as himself. We propose that copies in A-chain are realized as reflexive pronouns/resumptive pronouns at the place where Case is assigned. To implement this, we have to revise binding condition A in terms of Minimalism as follows: Anaphors must be c-commanded within Spell-out domain of CP phase. By this definition, the reason why the lower copy in (10) must be realized as himself is clear since the copy in SC is in CP domain and also c-commanded by John. Moreover, the copy receives accusative Case from V in the VP domain. Therefore, it is realized as himself.

The analysis proposed in this research can also give an account for the fact that the control construction cannot be passivized, unlike Hornstein (1999) and furthermore, for the distinction of distribution between reflexive/resumptive pronouns. First, let us explain the former one:

(11) a. * John was attempted to leave.
b. John was believed to have left.

Hornstein’s (1999) movement approach cannot explain the difference of grammaticality between the two sentences in (11) because in his analysis, John moves to matrix [Spec, TP] via [Spec, TP] in embedded clause, so that there is no distinction. However, in our analysis, (11a) is correctly ruled out because the movement of John in the derivation is improper movement given that [Spec, CP] is generally considered as A'-position without θ-marking, as shown in (12) (cf. Funakoshi (2009)). The reason why (11b) is grammatical is because there is no improper movement.

Next, let us move on to the distribution of reflexive/resumptive pronouns:

(13) John$_i$ likes himself$_i$
(14) John$_i$ thinks that he$_i$ likes Mary.
(15) [VP V [CP John$_{[uCase]}$ C-(that)$_{[EPP]}$ [TP John$_{[uCase]}$ T$_{[EPP]}$ [v$_*P$ John$_{[uCase]}$ likes Mary $]]$]]

The revised binding condition A can give a correct account for the derivation of (13). However, how about the case in which a resumptive pronoun is used, as shown in (14)? As soon as C is merged with the embedded TP, FI occurs in order to give the φ-feature and the Tense feature on C to T. At the next stage, T and John within the embedded v*P enters into an Agree relation with each other, and nominative Case is assigned to the NP from T. After the assignment of the Case, John cyclically moves to [Spec, CP] in the embedded clause in order to satisfy the requirement of EPP on C via [Spec, TP]. To account for why the copy of John in [Spec, v*P] is realized as he, we have to redefine condition B in terms of Minimalism as is the same case with Condition A: Pronouns must not be c-commanded within Spell-out domain of CP phase. According to the new definition, the copy of John in the embedded v*P is not c-commanded by John, so that the copy with nominative Case is realized as he.

In conclusion, we proposed the new analysis of the English resultatives under the assumption that θ-roles are features to be checked. Additionally, we redefine binding condition A and B from the standpoint of Minimalism. Moreover, we showed that our analysis can account for the reason why there is no passivization in control constructions and the difference in distribution of reflexive/resumptive pronouns.