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It is assumed in Chomsky's grammar that human beings are biologically endowed with an innate language faculty, which incorporates a set of universal principles which guide the child in acquiring a universal grammar. This language Faculty enables the child to develop a grammar of any natural language on the basis of suitable linguistic experience of the language. However, it cannot be the case that all aspects of the grammar of languages are universal. Although there are universal principles which determine the broad outlines of the grammar of natural languages, there seem to be language particular aspects of grammar children have to learn as part of the task of acquiring their native language. These language particular variations are called parameters of grammar. This leads to the view of language acquisition process that universal principles don't have to be learned, the child's syntactic learning task is limited to that of parameter-setting.

# Based on this Principles and Parameters Theory, this paper compares resultative constructions in English, Korean, Mongolian and Japanese and see how different in Case- iriarking of the subject of resultatives in these languages. In section 2, 1 will review two types of English resultatives and show how the subject of resultatives is Case-marked. In section 3. 1 will compare Korean and Japanese resultatives and see how different those languages are from English. Section 4 deals with Mongolian resultive constructions and shows that they behave like English in the Case-marking of the subject of resultative constructions. In section 5, I conclude this paper.

1. Two types of resultative in English

A typical property of resultative construction is the presence of a resultative phrase denoting a state as a result of the action denoted by its verb. In English resultative sentence,
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*John hammered the metal flal,* the resultative phrase *Ja/* describe the state resulting from the action denoted by the verb *hamniereJ.*

There are two types of resultative in English with redard to the Case-marking of the subjects of resultatives: Control resultative as in ( la) and Exceptional Case-

Marking(ECM) resultative as in ( I b).

* 1. a. The gardner watered [the tulips fiat].

b. The joggers ran [their Nikes threadbare].

These resultatives are classified as these two types because ( 1a) is exactly analogous to the Control construction of (2a) in which *Marf'* is governed and Case-marked by the matrix verb *persuaded* while (1 b) analogous to the ECM construction of (2b) where *Mark'* is ra ised to the governed position by the matrix verb *expect* and then Case-marked by the verb.

* 1. a. John persuaded Mary to sing.

b. John expected Mary to sing.

In the Control resultatives, the subject of resultative predicate is a semantic argument of the verb as *the lulips* is a semantic argument of *ivaier* in (1 a), while in the ECM resultati ves. it is not. The subj*eet thyir Nikes* is not an argument of *run* in (1 b).

* 1. Two types of resultative(Carrier and Randall, 1992)
1. Control resultative: resultative phrase whose predication subject is a semantic argument of the matrix verb.

'He wiped the table clean. —> He wiped the table,'

1. ECM resultative: resultative phrase whose predication subject is not a semantic argument of the matrix verb.

'The dog barked itself hoarse. => \*The dog barked itself.'

The Control resultative is also called a transitive resultative in that its predication subject is a semantic argument of the matrix verb the ECM resultative a intransitive resultative in that it predication subject is not a semantic argument of the matrix verb. Bowers(200 I ) assumes that the predication subjects of Control resultatives are in [Spec, VP] and that those of ECM resultatives are raised from [Spec, PrP] to [Spec. VP]. According to Bowers, the derivation of Control restiltaitves would be as follows:

* 1. Transitive resultative (Bowers 2001:327)
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