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1. Introduction (1/5)

- **Topic:** multiple interpretations of accomplishments

- **Issue:** how failed-attempt readings are possible in Korean, but not in English

- **Purpose:** to account for how different interpretations of accomplishments in Korean and English arise

- **I propose three related hypotheses for three things:**
  i) The Subject’s Intention Hypothesis (SIH)
  ii) The Subject Realization Hypothesis (SRH)
  iii) The Event Connection Hypothesis (ECH)
1. Introduction: data (2/5)

- **Basic data 1**: failed-attempt reading in Korean


Neg-Pst-Dec

(lit.) ‘He broke the window (#unintentionally/#by mistake/#accidently), but the window was not broken.’
1. Introduction: data (3/5)

- **Basic data 2**: actual-result (partial-result or complete-result) reading in Korean

(2) ku-ka uytohacianhkey/uytocekulo changmwun-ul
he-Nom unintentionally/intentionally window-Acc
kkay-ss-ta. kulayse changmwun-i cokum/wancenhi
break-Pst-Dec so window-Nom a.little/completely
kkay-ci-ess-ta.
break-Pass-Pst-Dec

‘He broke the window unintentionally/intentionally.
So the window was a little/completely broken.’
1. Introduction: interpretations in Korean (4/5)

- Interpretations of accomplishment predicates in Korean:

(3) intended-result actual-result

failed-attempt

partial-result complete-result
1. Introduction: interpretations in English (5/5)

- Interpretations of accomplishment predicates in **English**:

\[(4)\]

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{intended-result} & \text{actual-result} \\
\emptyset & \text{partial-result} & \text{complete-result}
\end{array}
\]
Desire for the outcome encoded by the verb is required for having an intention:

(5) ku-nun Tom-ul cwuk-i-l uyto-ka iss-ess-ta.
ku-Top Tom-Acc dead-Cau-Rel intention-Nom exist-Pst-Dec
#kulena ku-un Tom-i cwuk-ki-lul wenha-ci
but he-Top Tom-Nom dead-Nmz-Acc want-Comp
anh-ass-ta.
Neg-Pst-Dec
‘There was an intention in his mind to kill Tom. #But he didn’t want Tom to die.’
2. Notion of Intention: belief (2/3)

- **Belief** that the causing action will cause the result is required for having an intention:

(6) ku-nun Tom-ul tok-ulo cwuk-i-l uyto-ka he-Top Tom-Acc poison-Inst dead-Cau-Rel intention-Nom iss-ess-ta. #kulena ku-un tok-i Tom-ul exist-Pst-Dec but he-Nom poison-Acc Tom-to cwuk-i-l swu iss-ta-nun kes-ul moll-ass-ta. dead-Caus-Rel way exist-Dec-Rel thing-Acc not.know-Pst-Dec

‘There was an intention in his mind to kill Tom with the poison, #but he didn’t know that the poison could kill Tom.’
2. Notion of Intention: embedded intention (3/3)

- **Intention** to perform the causing action is required for having an intention:

```
(7) ku-nun Tom-ul tok-ul sayonghay-se cwuk-i-l
    he-Top Tom-Acc poison-Acc use-by dead-Cau-Rel
uyto-ka iss-ess-ta. #kulena ku-un ku tok-ul
intention-Nom exist-Pst-Dec but he-Nom the poison-Acc
Tom-eykey sayongha-l uyto-nun eps-ess-ta.
Tom-to use-Rel intention-Top Neg-Pst-Dec
‘There was an intention in his mind to kill Tom by using the
poison, #but there was no intention in his mind to use the poison
(to kill Tom).’
```
3. Intention-based Analysis (1/5)

- **Subject’s Intention Hypothesis (SIH):**

  Non-occurrence of an event requires the subject’s intention regarding the event.
3. Intention-based Analysis (2/5)

- Event structure of Korean accomplishments:

\[
[[x \text{ ACT}] \text{ CAUSE}_{\text{Korean}} [y \text{ BECOME } < \text{STATE}>]] \text{ is true iff }
\]

i) \([x \text{ ACT}] \text{ is true at } w_0\), and

ii) \([x \text{ ACT}] \text{ CAUSE}_{\text{English}} [y \text{ BECOME } <\text{STATE}>] \text{ is true at either}\)

(a) \(w_0\), or

(b) all worlds \(w'\) in \(x'\)'s intention set, which is the set of possible worlds that are compatible with \(x'\)'s intention.
3. Intention-based Analysis (3/5)

- When the subject is an *instrument*, only actual-result readings are available:

(8) ku opun-i ppang-ul kwu-ess-ta.
   the oven-Nom bread-Acc bake-Pst-Dec
   #haciman, ppang-i kwu-e ci-ci anh-ass-ta.
   but bread-Nom bake-Comp Pass-Comp Neg-Pst-Dec
   ‘The oven baked the bread. #But bread was not baked.’
3. Intention-based Analysis (4/5)

- The subject is **natural force** in (9) and a failed attempt reading is similarly ruled out.

(9) *chentwung*-i *changmwun-ul* *kkay*-ss-ta.
    thunder-Nom window-Acc break-Pst-Dec

    #*haciman*, *changmwun-i* *kkay-ci-ci* anh-ass-ta.
    but window-Nom break-Pass-Comp Neg-Pst-Dec

    ‘The thunder broke the window. #But the window didn’t break.’
3. Intention-based Analysis (5/5)

- The agent (Julia) in (10) is a sentient being, but the subject DP refers to a kind of action (negligence or mistake).

(10) Julia-uy pwucwuuy-/silswu-ka pwul-ul kke-ss-ta.
Julia-Gen negligence-/mistake-Nom light-Acc turn.off-Pst-Dec
#kulena pwul-i kke ci-ci anh-ass-ta.
but light-Nom turn.off.Comp Pass-Comp Neg-Pst-Dec
‘Julia’s negligence/mistake turned off the light. #But it was not turned off.’
4. Subject Realization Hypothesis (SRH) (1/4)

- Only actual-result readings are possible for passives:

\[(11) \text{Minji-eyuyhay } pwul-i \quad \text{khi-e } \quad \text{ci-ess-ta.} \]
\[
\text{Minji-by light-Nom turn.on-Comp Pass-Pst-Dec} \\
\text{#haciman, pwul-i } \quad \text{kutaylo } \quad \text{kke-ci-e} \\
\text{but light-Nom same turn.off-Pass-Comp} \\
\text{iss-ta.} \\
\text{exist-Pst-Dec} \\
\text{‘The light was turned on by Minji. #But the light is same being turned off.’} \]
• **Subject Realization Hypothesis (SRH):**

  In the event structure of a sentence, the event directly related to the subject of the sentence must occur.

• “the event directly related to the subject” is defined as the subevent that includes the subject as the argument or the subevent that corresponds to the subject.
4. Subject Realization Hypothesis (SRH) (3/4)

• In Korean **active** accomplishment construction, the subject is directly related to the causing subevent, \([x \text{ ACT}]\).

• Then due to the Subject Realization Hypothesis (SRH), the causing subevent, \([x \text{ ACT}]\), must occur.

• The realization of \([x \text{ ACT}]\) does not require the occurrence of the caused subevent.

• If the caused event in the accomplishment event structure does not actually occur, the subject’s intention regarding the caused event is required due to SIH.
4. Subject Realization Hypothesis (SRH) (4/4)

- In Korean **passive** accomplishment construction, the subject is directly related to the caused subevent, [y BECOME <STATE>].

- Then according to the Subject Realization Hypothesis (SRH), the caused subevent, [y BECOME <STATE>], must occur.

- The realization of the caused subevent requires the occurrence of the causing subevent due to real world knowledge.
5. *Ha*-constructions (1/6)

- The **SIH** and **SRH** are applied to some kinds of *ha*-constructions:
  
  i) VN-*ha* constructions
  ii) Qualia-*ha* constructions
  iii) Causative-*ha* constructions
  iv) Qualia-causative-*ha* constructions

- These constructions are important, since the applications of the hypotheses show that non-culmination is about more than just lexical accomplishments, i.e. a certain class of verbs, but it’s about a class of expressions that are called "accomplishments", whether lexical or derived.
5. **Ha-constructions: VN-ha (2/6)**

- Failed-attempt readings are possible for VN-ha constructions:

(12) ku-ka kenmwul-ul phakwoy-hay-ss-ta.
    he-Nom building-Acc destroying-do-Pst-Dec

**kulena** kenmwul-i cenye phakwoy-toy-ci
but building-Nom at.all destroying-Pass-Comp

**anh**-ass-ta.
Neg-Pst-Dec

(lit.) ‘He did destroying the building, but it was not destroyed at all.’

= ‘He tried to destroy the building, but it was not destroyed at all.’
5. **Ha-constructions: qualia-ha (3/6)**

- The light verb in (13) is interpreted as the agentive role, which is an accomplishment.

(13) ku-ka **pap-ul** hay-ss-ta. **kulena** pap-i toyi-ci
he-Nom rice-Acc do-Pst-Dec but rice-Nom do.Pass-Comp
**anh**-ass-ta.
Neg-Pst-Dec
(lit.) ‘He cooked the rice, but the rice was not cooked.’

= ‘He tried to cook the rice, but the rice was not cooked
(probably because the cooker was malfunctioning).’

- Failed-attempt readings are possible for **qualia-ha constructions:**
5. *Ha*-constructions: causative-*ha* (4/6)

- In the causative-*ha* construction (14), the XP with *key* (result) and the light verb (causal event) constitutes an accomplishment event structure.

(14) Tom-i ku os-ul malu-key hay-ss-ta.
    Tom-Nom the clothes-Acc dry-Key do-Pst-Dec
    *kulena* os-i malu-ci anh-ass-ta.
    but clothes-Nom dry-Comp Neg-Pst-Dec
(lit.) ‘Tom did the clothes dry, but they were not dry.’
    = ‘Tom tried to make the clothes dry, but they were not dry.’

- Failed-attempt readings are possible for the causative-*ha* constructions:
• In the first sentence in (15), the light verb is interpreted as *brewed* and the XP with *key* is another result related to brewing.

(15) Jane-i **khephi-lul ttukep-key hay-ss-ta.**
    Jane-Nom coffee-Acc hot-Key do-Pst-Dec
    **kulena khephi-ka mantul-e ci-ci anh-ass-ta.**
    but coffee-Nom make-Comp Pass-Comp Neg-Pst-Dec
(lit.) ‘Jane brewed a coffee hot, but a coffee was not made.’

• Failed-attempt readings are possible for the *qualia-causative-ha* construction. A coffee was not made in (15).
5. *Ha*-constructions: *qualia-causative-ha* (6/6)

- In the *qualia-causative-ha* construction in (16), the coffee was not hot.

(16) Jane-i ḫephī-lul ttukēp-key ḥay-ss-ta.
    Jane-Nom coffee-Acc hot-Key do-Pst-Dec
kulena khephi-ka ttukēp-ci anh-ass-ta.
    but coffee-Nom hot-Comp Neg-Pst-Dec
(lit.) ‘Jane brewed a coffee hot, but a coffee was not hot.’

- In the accomplishment event structure of (16), the root is complex. This is interesting, since it seems that this complex root in phrasal level has not been attested.
6. Serial Verb Constructions (1/11)

• I apply the hypotheses to more complex constructions (i.e., serial verb constructions) in Korean.

• SVCs are interesting, since while the larger accomplishment denoted by the SVC have failed-attempt interpretation, V1 event does not allow failed-attempt reading.

• In order to account for this constraint, I propose another hypothesis, the Event **Connection** Hypothesis (ECH).
6. Serial Verb Constructions (2/11)

• Two types of SVCs

i) *bake-eat*-type SVC (V1 and V2 events are sequential):

    Jane-Nom meat-Acc bake-Comp eat-Pst-but
    ‘Jane baked the meat, and then ate it.’

ii) *hit-break*-type SVC (V1 event is embedded in V2 event):

(18) Jane-i mwun-ul ttayli-e pwuswu-ess-ta.
    Jane-Nom door-Acc hit-Comp break-Pst-but
    ‘Jane broke the door by hitting it.’
V1 is not cancellable in *bake-eat*-type SVC:

\[(19) \text{Jane-i khong-ul cip-e mek-ess-ciman,} \]
\[\text{Jane-Nom bean-Acc pick.up-Comp eat-Pst-but} \]
\[\text{#khong-i cip-e ci-ci anh-ass-ta.} \]
\[\text{bean-Nom pick.up-Comp Pass-Comp Neg-Pst-Dec} \]
\[\text{‘Jane picked up the bean, and then ate it. #But the bean was not} \]
\[\text{picked up.’} \]

- $V_1$ is not cancellable in $hit$-$break$-type SVC:

(20) Ryan-i ku mwun-ul ttayli-e pwuswu-ess-ciman, Ryan-Nom the door-Acc hit-Comp break-Pst-but #pisnaka-ss-ta. miss-Pst-Dec ‘Ryan broke the door by hitting it, #but he missed it.’
6. Serial Verb Constructions (5/11)

- Event Connection Hypothesis (ECH):
  In the event structure of a complex predicate sentence, connecting event must occur.

- **bake-eat**
  \[ [[[x \text{ ACT}] \text{ CAUSE} \ [y \text{ BECOME} <\text{baked}>]] + [[[x \text{ ACT}] \text{ CAUSE} \ [y \text{ BECOME} <\text{eaten}>]]]]

- **hit-break**
  \[ [[[x \text{ ACT}] \text{ CAUSE} \ [y \text{ BECOME} <\text{hit}>]] \text{ CAUSE} \ [y \text{ BECOME} <\text{broken}>]] \]
V2 is cancellable in *bake-eat-type* SVC:

    Jane-Nom fish-Acc bake-Comp eat-Pst-Dec
    kulena nemwu ttukewe-se mek-ul swu-ka eps-ess-ta.
    but too hot-since eat-Rel way-Nom not.exist-Pst-Dec
    (lit.) ‘Jane baked the fish, and then ate it. But she couldn’t eat it, since it was too hot.’
    = ‘Jane baked the fish, and then tried to eat it. But she couldn’t eat it, since it was too hot.’
6. Serial Verb Constructions (7/11)

- **V2** is cancellable in *hit-break*-type SVC:

\[(22) \text{Ryan-i mwun-ul ttayli-e pwuswu-ess-ta.} \]

\[
\text{Ryan-Nom door-Acc hit-Comp break-Pst-Dec}
\]

\[
\text{kulena mwun-i tantanhay-se pwuswu-e ci-ci}
\]

\[
\text{but door-Nom solid-since break-Comp Pass-Comp}
\]

\[
\text{anh-ass-ta.}
\]

\[
\text{Neg-Pst-Dec}
\]

(lit.) ‘Ryan broke the door by hitting it. But it was not broken, since it was solid.’

= ‘Ryan hit the door, intending to break it. But it was not broken, since it was solid.’
6. Serial Verb Constructions (8/11)

- The combination of causative and SVC, namely causative SVC, also behave in much the same way.

- **V1-XP** is not cancellable in **causative** *bake-eat-type* SVC:

\[(23) \text{Mary-ka khephi-lul chakap-key hay masi-ess-ta.} \]
\[
\text{Mary-Nom coffee-Acc cold-Key do.Comp drink-Pst-Dec}
\]
\[
\text{#kulena khephi-ka chakap-ci anh-ass-ta.}
\]
\[
\text{but coffee-Nom cold-Comp Neg-Pst-Dec}
\]
\[
\text{‘Mary made the coffee cold and then drank it. #But the coffee was not cold.’}
\]
6. Serial Verb Constructions (9/11)

- V1-XP is not cancellable in causative hit-break-type SVC:

(24) Mary-ka mwul-lul chakap-key hay elli-ess-ta.
    Mary-Nom water-Acc cold-Key do.Comp freeze-Pst-Dec
    #kulena mwul-i chakap-ci anh-ass-ta.
    but water-Nom cold-Comp Neg-Pst-Dec
    ‘Mary froze the water by making it cold. #But the water was not cold.’
6. Serial Verb Constructions (10/11)

- V2 is cancellable in causative *bake-eat*-type SVC:

(25) Mary-ka khephi-lul chakap-key hay masi-ess-ta.
Mary-Nom coffee-Acc cold-Key do.Comp drink-Pst-Dec
kulena nemwu chakawe-se masi-l swu eps-ess-ta.
but too cold-since drink-Rel way not.exist-Pst-Dec
(lit.) ‘Mary made the coffee cold and then drank it.
But she could not drink it, since it was so cold.’
6. Serial Verb Constructions (11/11)

- V2 is cancellable in causative *hit-break*-type SVC:

(26) Mary-ka mwul-lul chakap-key hay elli-ess-ta.
    Mary-Nom water-Acc cold-Key do.Comp freeze-Pst-Dec

    kulena mwul-i el-ci anh-ass-ta.
    but water-Nom freeze-Comp Neg-Pst-Dec

(lit.) ‘Mary froze the water by making it cold. But the water was not frozen.’
7. Conclusion (1/1)

• I proposed three hypotheses for Korean accomplishments:

  i) Subject Realization Hypothesis (SRH)

  ii) Subject’s Intention Hypothesis (SIH)

  iii) Event Connection Hypothesis (ECH)

• These hypotheses can account for multiple interpretations (intended-result or actual-result) of accomplishments, lexical or derived.
8. Future Research: activity predicates (1/2)

- Some Korean activities seem to allow failed-attempt readings:

    Marcus-Nom jump-Pst-Dec
    i) ‘Marcus jumped.’ (actual-result)
    ii) ‘Marcus tried to jump, but he could not jump.’ (failed-attempt)

(28) ku-ka latio-lul tul-ess-ta.
    he-Nom radio-Acc listen-Pst-Dec
    i) ‘He listened to the radio.’ (actual-result)
    ii) ‘He tried to listen to the radio, but nothing was heard (maybe since people were talking loudly in the room).’ (failed-attempt)
8. Future Research: other languages (2/2)

- Many other languages (e.g., Japanese, Chinese, Tamil, Hindi, Russian) allow failed-attempt readings.

- Investigating whether the intention-based analysis (involving the SRH, SIH, and ECH) can be applied to those languages.