**On the Ambiguity between the Perfect and the Resultative:
Evidence from V-te ar- Constructions in Japanese**

Yoko Hasegawa
University of California, Berkeley

1. Introduction

V-*te ar-* constructions in Japanese have recently become a focus of attention (Sugioka 1984, Lee 1989, Miyagawa 1989, Matsumoto 1990a,b, Sells 1990).[*] In these constructions, the base verb, to which the verbal suffix -*te* is attached, and the verb *ar-* 'be located (inanimate)' together form a complex predicate. Syntactically, two V-*te ar-* patterns are recognized. In the first pattern, the valence of the base verb is maintained. For example, the object of the transitive verb *tome-* 'stop' is marked in the accusative in (la), as it is without *ar-,* (1b). The base verb can be intransitive in this pattern, e.g. (1c).

(1) Valence-Maintaining V-*te ar-* Construction
    a. zyoon ga   soto   ni   kuruma o   tomete   ar- u.
             NOM   outside LOC   car   ACC stop-TE   be NPST
    'Joan has parked the car outside.'

    b. zyoon ga   soto   ni   kuruma o   tome- ta.
      Joan   NOM   outside LOC   car   ACC stop   PST
    'Joan parked the car outside.'

    c. watasi wa   takusan nete   ar- u   wa   yo.
      I   TOP a-lot   sleep-TE be NPST PRT PRT
     'I've slept a lot.'

In the second pattern, the valence of the base verb is altered in such a way that its subject is suppressed and its object is marked in the nominative, e.g. (2).

(2) Valence-Changing V-*te ar-* Construction
    (*zyoon ga)   soto   ni   kuruma ga   tomete   ar- u.
             NOM   outside LOC   car   NOM stop-TE   be NPST
    'There is a car parked outside.'

Let us call these two types the *valence-maintaining V-te ar- construction* and the *valence-changing V-te ar- construction*, and abbreviate them as the *V-M construction* and the *V-C construction*, respectively.[1]
    The sentences involving the V-*te ar-* pattern have been uniformly analyzed as resultatives, and no question has been raised as to whether they are appropriately categorized as such. In the present study it is argued that the V-M construction exhibits properties of both the resultative and the (present) perfect,[2] and that the V-C construction is ambiguous with respect to the monovalent nonlocational resultative and the bivalent locational resultative. In order to contrast the perfect and the resultative, yet another construction in Japanese is introduced, viz. the V-

te i- construction, which is considered to express the perfect.[3]

2. The Perfect and the Resultative

It is generally understood that the perfect indicates the continuing present relevance of a past situation, and that the resultative, which indicates both a state and a preceding event (i.e. action or process) from which it has resulted, is the clearest manifestation of the perfect (Comrie 1976). With this definition, all resultatives are perfects, and the perfect and the resultative thusly form privative opposites.[4]

Surveying resultatives in world languages, Nedjalkov and Jaxontov (1988) provide the following characteristics of the perfect and the resultative.

(3) a. While the after-effects of the action expressed by the perfect are non-specific, the resultative expresses a resultant state of a specific partici-pant.

b. The perfect, unlike the resultative, can be derived from any verb, either transitive or intransitive, either telic or atelic, including those verbs that denote situations which involve no change of the state of any participant, e.g. the verbs corresponding to *sing* and *laugh.*

c. The perfect does not alter the valence of the base verb, whereas the resul-tative is predominantly intransitive.

d. If adverbials of duration co-occur with the perfect and/or the resultative, they denote duration of the event with the perfect, whereas they express duration of the resultant state with the resultative.

e. If adverbials of moment co-occur with the perfect and/or the resultative, they denote the moment at which the event takes place, whereas with the resultative, such adverbials denote only a moment at which the state is in existence.

f. The resultatives of verbs of motion can collocate with adverbials which do not occur with the base verb, whereas the perfect does not allow such a collocation.

According to (3a-e), the V-M construction is categorized as perfect, and the V-C construction as resultative. However, according to (3f), the V-M construction can be categorized as resultative.

Regarding (3a), the after-effects expressed by the V-M construction are nonspecific, whereas those expressed by the V-C construction are specific. For example, (la) can be a statement about Joan's past action or about the present state of the car, while (2) must be a statement about the car. The difference in specificity of after-effects between the perfect and the resultative is partly due to (3c), i.e. the resultative is typically intransitive, whereas the perfect need not be.

With regard to the potential base verbs, (3b), it has already been mentioned that the V-M construction accommodates not only transitive verbs but also

intransitives, e.g. (lc).[5]   The V-C construction, on the other hand, permits only transitive verbs expressing some event which can result in a visible state of the object.[6] Sentence (4) is anomalous because knocking on a door usually does not leave any marks.

(4) #doa   ga   tataite aru.   (Matsumoto 1990a)
       door   NOM   beat-TE   be-NPST
    'The door is in the state of having been knocked upon.'   (Intended)

When adverbials of duration co-occur with the V-*te ar*- pattern, they denote the duration of the event with the V-M construction, e.g. (5a), and the duration of the resultant state with the V-C construction, e.g. (5b).   (5c) is anomalous because it involves the V-M construction, and therefore *san-zikan* 'three hours' is understood to denote the duration of the event, even though *tome*- 'stop' is not a durative verb.

(5) a. watasi wa   zyuugo-zikan nete   aru/#iru.   (V-M construction)
       I   TOP 15-hours   sleep-TE   be-NPST
       'I've slept 15 hours.'

    b. kuruma ga   san-zikan tomete   aru.   (V-C construction)
       car   NOM 3-hours   stop-TE   be-NPST
       'The car has been parked for 3 hours.'

    c. #kuruma o   san-zikan tomete   aru.   (V-M construction)
        car   ACC 3-hours   stop-TE   be-NPST
        '(I)'ve parked the car for 3 hours.' (Intended)

When adverbials of moment co-occur with the V-*te ar*- pattern, they denote the time at which the event took place with the V-M construction, e.g. (6a), and the time at which the resultant state is in existence with the V-C construction, e.g. (6b).[7]   Notice that the tense is in accordance with the adverbial *kinoo* 'yesterday' in (6b), whereas the tense is in the nonpast in (6a).

(6) a. watasi wa   kinoo   kippu o   katte   aru/#iru.
       I   TOP yesterday ticket ACC buy-TE be-NPST
       '(I) bought a ticket yesterday (and this fact is relevant to the current
       discourse).'   (V-M construction)

    b. kippu ga   kinoo   katte   atta/*aru.   (V-C construction)
       ticket NOM   yesterday buy-TE   be-PST/be-NPST
       Lit. 'Yesterday there was a ticket bought.'

It has so far been demonstrated that, according to Nedjalkov and Jaxontov's criteria (3a-e), the V-M construction is more appropriately categorized as perfect than as resultative. As a digression, I shall point out one of the differences between the V-M construction and the perfect V-*te i*- construction observable in (5a) and (6a). The V-M construction describes situations subjectively, whereas the V-*te i*- does so objectively.[8]   The V-M construction with the third-person subject, therefore, implies that the speaker considers the referent of the subject to be an

insider, i.e. the speaker considers it appropriate to state the referent person's action subjectively. *Sono otoko* 'that man' is not used to refer to an insider, and thus (7a) with *ar-* is anomalous, whereas (7b) with *i-* is anomalous on most occasions because subjective description is the default when the speaker describes his/her own past action.[9]

(7) a. sono otoko wa   tanaka ni   wairo o   watasite #aru/iru.
     that man   TOP   LOC bribe ACC give-TE be-NPST
     'The man has given a bribe to Tanaka.'

   b. watasi wa   tanaka ni   wairo o   watasite aru/#iru.
     I   TOP   LOC bribe ACC give-TE be-NPST
     'I've given a bribe to Tanaka.'

Resuming consideration of the characteristics of the perfect and the resultative proposed by Nedjalkov and Jaxontov, the V-C construction can collocate a *ni*-marked locative which is not permitted by the base verb, whereas such a collocation is not possible with the perfect. As shown in (8a), *ni*-locatives, e.g. *reezooko no naka ni* 'in the refrigerator', cannot collocate with *kaw-* 'buy', but they can collocate when *kaw-* is the base verb of the V-C construction, cf. (8b).[10]

(8) a. *reezooko   no   naka ni   gyuunyuu o   katta.
     refrigerator GEN inside LOC milk   ACC bought
     (Uninterpretable)

   b. reezooko   no   naka ni   gyuunyuu ga   katte   am.
     refrigerator GEN inside LOC milk   NOM buy-TE be-NPST
     Lit. 'Milk is bought in the refrigerator.'
     'Milk has been bought and is in the refrigerator.'

As has been discussed, the V-M construction exhibits characteristics of the perfect rather than of the resultative. However, although not as natural as in the V-C construction, the V-M construction can also collocate with *ni*-locatives — which is not permitted by the perfect V-*te i-*, as shown in (9).[11]

(9) reezooko   no   naka ni   gyuunyuu o   katte   aru/*iru.
   refrigerator GEN inside LOC milk   ACC buy-TE be-NPST
   '(I) bought milk, and it is in the refrigerator.'

The fact that when adverbials of moment co-occur with the V-M construction, they denote the time at which the event took place, e.g. (l0a), has been discussed here. Such adverbials cannot co-occur with the V-M construction when there is a *ni*-locative which is not in the base verb's valence.

(10) a. kinoo   gyuunyuu o   katte   aru   kara   kyoo wa
      yesterday milk   ACC buy-TE be-NPST because today PRT
      kawanaide.
      buy-NEG-TE
      '(I) bought milk yesterday, so don't buy (any) today.'

b. *reezooko   no   naka   ni   kinoo   gyuunyuu o   katte
   refrigerator GEN   inside LOC yesterday   milk   ACC buy-TE
   aru   kara   kyoo   wa   kawanaide.
   be-NPST   because today PRT   buy-NEG-TE
   '(I) bought milk yesterday, and it is in the refrigerator, so ...'   (Intended)

Non-valence-bound *ni*-locatives can appear only when the V-M construction is understood to be resultative (stative), which does not co-occur with a moment adverbial denoting the event time. If, on the other hand, the construction is understood to be perfect, it can co-occur with a moment adverbial denoting the event time, but it cannot with a *ni*-locative. These facts indicate that the V-M construction is ambiguous with respect to the perfect-resultative distinction.[12]   In the next section, the significance of *ni*-locatives to the notion of resultative will be discussed.

3. Monovalent vs. Bivalent Locational Resultative

Nedjalkov and Jaxontov recognize two semantic types of resultatives: specific resultative and general resultative.   In the specific resultative, the visual state of an entity allows the observer to deduce the particular event that has brought it about, e.g. *tied, cooked.*   In the general resultative, the state of an entity is described through the event the speaker has witnessed or deduced indirectly, *killed, stolen.*[13]   There are two kinds of specific resultatives: monovalent, i.e. X has a visible property P (e.g. *cooked, broken),* and bivalent locational, i.e. X is located in a specific way with respect to Y (e.g. *attached to, enclosed in*).

An implicational universal is general resultative > monovalent resultative > bivalent locational resultative.   That is, if the general resultative is found in the language in question, so too is the specific resultative; if the monovalent resultative is found, so too, the bivalent locational.   Kozinskij (1988) claims that this preference for the specific resultative is a reflection of observability: states such as being dead, broken, etc. are more observable than some other states, e.g. being killed or stolen.

If one considers that location is merely another of the visible properties, then the bivalent locational appears to be more complex, and less observable, than the monovalent nonlocational.   Therefore, the implicational universal is expected to be general resultative > bivalent locational resultative > monovalent resultative. Kozinskij, however, claims that the bivalent locational is more observable than the monovalent nonlocational.   He argues that both the figure and the ground (in the sense of Talmy 1978), and often their spatial arrangement as well, are normally immediately observable.   In the case of *The stamp is glued to the envelope,* for example, no previous state needs to be inferred, presupposed, or guessed.

On the other hand, in the monovalent nonlocational, e.g. *The window is broken,* an alternative state is necessary for comparison. In such a case, the ground is played by an alternative state of the same or similar entity, which is called the

norm (Chafe 1976). The ground here is outside the field of direct perception, and thus cannot be observed. Therefore, Kozinskij maintains, the more observable the situation, the higher the probability of the use of the resultative.

Both the V-C and the V-M construction can be bivalent locational resultative. While the V-M construction permits general resultative interpretations, the V-C construction permits only specific resultative interpretations. That is, the V-C construction is utilized only when the visual state of an entity allows the speaker to deduce the particular event that has brought it about.

The V-C construction is still ambiguous between the monovalent nonlocational and bivalent locational opposition which is illustrated in (11).[14]

(11) a. ningyoo no   kubi ga   nuite   aru.
      doll   GEN head NOM pull-out-TE be-NPST
      'A doll's head has been pulled out (of its socket).'
      'There is a doll's head which was pulled out (of its socket).'

    b. konpyuutaa no   moodemu ga   hazusite   aru.
      computer   GEN modem   NOM detach-TE be-NPST
      'The modem has been detached from the computer.'
      'There is a modem which was detached from the computer.'

The sentence is ambiguous when the subject contains a genitive NP, and the base verb indicates detachment of some sort. For example, (11a) can be used to describe either the state in which a headless doll is present (monovalent nonlocational; the speaker describes the state with respect to the norm), or the state in which a lone head of a doll is present (bivalent locational, even though the locative NP is not overtly present).

The *ni*-locative may appear only with the bivalent locational resultative, as shown in (12). That is, when the locative NP is overtly present, the statement is about only the doll's head or the modem — not about the headless doll or the computer without a modem.

(12) a. teeburu no   ue   ni   ningyoo no   kubi ga   nuite
      table   GEN top LOC doll   GEN head NOM pull-out-TE
      aru.
      be-NPST
      'There on the table is a doll's head which was pulled out (of its socket).'

    b. teeburu no   ue   ni   konpyuutaa no   moodemu ga
      table   GEN top LOC computer   GEN modem   NOM
      hazusite   aru.
      detach-TE   be-NPST
      'There on the table is a modem which was detached from the computer.'

4. Assertion vs. Implication of the Past Event

The perfect and the specific resultatives are distinct in a crucial way. The perfect is equivalent to the simple past in terms of truth condition, whereas the specific resultative is a stative in which the preceding event is mentioned but its actual occurrence is not asserted.[15] The truth-conditional equivalence of the simple past and the perfect is shown in (13a,b). If Tanaka's alibi is being discussed, (13b) is more appropriate than (13a).

(13) a. (tanaka/ watasi} wa san-zi ni yamada o tazuneta.
            I TOP 3 o'clock LOC ACC visited
    'Tanaka/I visited Yamada at 3 o'clock.'

    b. tanaka wa san-zi ni yamada o tazunete iru.
            TOP 3 o'clock LOC ACC visit-TE be-NPST
      'Tanaka visited Yamada at 3 o'clock (and this fact is relevant to the current discourse).'

    c. watasi wa san-zi ni yamada o tazunete aru.
         I TOP 3 o'clock LOC ACC visit-TE be-NPST
      'I visited Yamada at 3 o'clock (and this fact is relevant to the current discourse).' (V-M construction)

    The perfect involves the notion of modality, i.e. the speaker's mental attitude toward the proposition at the time of utterance as it is defined as the speaker's instantaneous present (Nakau 1979). The speaker considers that the past event is relevant to the current discourse, but how it is relevant is not specified. The modality part of the sentence cannot be challenged by the addressee(s) because only the speaker has the right to express her/his own attitude toward what s/he says. While the addressee(s) can deny the proposition part by uttering *sore wa tigau* 'That's not true', s/he cannot deny the relevance of the proposition to the current discourse by simply denying the previous utterance as a whole.

    The perfect frequently implicates a state resulting from the event referred to by the base verb. But such a resultative reading is an implicature, which can be cancelled without yielding a contradiction.

(14) a. tanaka wa ni-nen mae ni sono uti o katte iru.
           TOP 2-years ago LOC that house ACC buy-TE be-NPST
     'Tanaka bought that house 2 years ago (and this fact is relevant).'

    b. sikasi kare wa saikin kyuu-ni yamada ni uriharatta.
      however he TOP recently suddenly LOC sold
     'However, recently he suddenly sold (it) to Yamada.'

If only (14a) is heard, the natural interpretation is that Tanaka owned the house at the time of utterance, i.e. the resultative state is implicated. However, this implicature can readily be cancelled by (14b).

In contrast, with the specific resultative, the resultant state is asserted, but the previous event is not. The speaker describes the current state of an entity as being similar to the resultant state of some event *if* such an event has actually occurred on the entity.

(15) a. #biiru ga   katte   aru.   sikasi nonde   simatta kara
         beer   NOM   buy-TE be-NPST but   drink-TE finished because
         moo   na-   i.
         any-longer be-NEG NPST
         Lit. 'There's some beer bought. But because (I) drank it, there's no more.'

    b. biiru   ga   katte   aru.   moratta   no   ka mo   sirenai
       beer   NOM   buy-TE be-NPST received NMLZ   Q   PRT can't-know
       keredo.
       though
       Lit. 'There's some beer bought. It may be a gift, though.'

In (15a), the second sentence denies the resultant state, i.e. there is some beer — which yields a contradiction. In (15b), on the other hand, the second sentence cancels the implicature that someone bought the beer. (15b) is not perceived as contradictory.[16]

According to the criterion of truth condition, the V-M construction shows a distinct characteristic from the V-C or the V-*te i*- construction in that both the event and the resultant state are asserted.

(16) a. #zyoon ga   biiru o   katte   aru.   sikasi nonde   simatta
                NOM   beer   ACC buy-TE be-NPST but   drink-TE finished
         kara   moo   na-   i.
         because any-longer be-NEG NPST
         'Joan has bought beer. But because (I/she) drank it, there isn't any more.'

    b. #zyoon ga   biiru o   katte   aru.   moratta   no   ka mo
                NOM beer   ACC buy-TE be-NPST received NMLZ   Q   PRT
       sirenai   keredo.
       can't-know though
       'Joan has bought some beer. She might have been given it, though.'

The anomaly of (16b) is due to the subjective nature of the V-M construction. In order to utter (16b) felicitously, the speaker must know that Joan has bought the beer. On the other hand, (16a) demonstrates that the V-M construction asserts the resultant state.

What is peculiar to the V-M construction is that although both the event and the resultant state are asserted, only one of them can be focused by further modification. Examining (9), it was pointed out that an adverbial of moment, which denotes the time at which the event took place, cannot co-occur with a non-valence-bound *ni*-locative, which denotes the location of an entity. If *reezooko no naka ni* 'in the refrigerator' is absent, the V-M construction can

accommodate *kinoo* 'yesterday'. This restriction suggests that the construction is ambiguous with respect to the perfect-resultative opposition. On the other hand, the cancellability test suggests that the construction is both perfect and resultative.

5. Conclusions

The V-C and the V-M construction have been examined with respect to the perfect-resultative opposition. The V-C construction shows all characteristics of the (specific) resultative found in world languages, whereas the V-M construction exhibits some characteristics of both the perfect and the resultative. The V-M construction deviates from the perfect V-*te i-* construction in that (i) the V-M permits *ni*-locatives which are not in the valence of the base verb and (ii) it asserts, not implicates, the state which is resulted from the event referred to by the base verb.

Notes

1 Martin (1975) refers to the V-M construction as the *possessive resultative*, and to the V-C construction as the *intransitivizing resultative*.

2 In this study, the term *perfect* is used to refer solely to the present perfect. The future perfect and the pluperfect exhibit different characteristics from the present perfect.

3 The V-*te i-* construction also permits pure resultative readings. See Hasegawa (in prep) for further discussion.

4 Zwicky and Sadock (1975) define privative opposites as, '[Two understandings] U_1 and U_2 are privative opposites with respect to [some semantic feature] F if U_1 can be represented as being identical to U_2 except that U_1 includes some specification for F that is lacking in U_2,' e.g. *dog* 'male canine' and *dog* 'canine'. With privative opposition, the more specific understanding implies the more general understanding.

5 Unlike the V-*te i-* construction, the V-M construction does not freely accommodate intransitives; e.g., it is extremely difficult to construct sentences with *nak-* 'cry' or *waraw-* 'laugh'. The constraints on the base verbs in the V-M construction are not discussed in this study, however.

6 Miyagawa (1989) claims that the V-C construction provides an independent and objective test for themehood, however it is defined, i.e. only those verbs which can appear in this construction assign the theme role to their object NPs. However, such a claim is untenable. As Matsumoto (1990a) convincingly argues, the acceptability of sentences with the V-C construction depends on pragmatics

rather than a particular semantic role that the base verb assigns to its object.

[7] The HAVE -EN pattern in English can collocate with cyclic moment adverbials, e.g. *Tuesday*, only when it is construed as the so-called experiential perfect: it cannot collocate with moment adverbials which denote a single event time (McCawley 1971, Michaelis 1991).

[8] Prototypical examples of objective description are those concerning natural events, e.g. earthquake, typhoon, and change of season. The most salient examples of subjective description occur when the speaker describes his/her own actions, where the speaker knows the actor intends to perform the described action. However, knowledge of the actor's intention is not a sufficient condition for the speaker to describe the action subjectively. The speaker must consider the actor an insider, and thus the speaker considers himself/herself entitled to make a subjective description. See Wetzel (1985) and Tokunaga (1986) for the insider-outsider distinction in Japanese.

[9] Two kinds of subjectivity are involved in the perfect constructions in Japanese. As will be mentioned in §4, whether or not the past event is relevant to the current discourse is a subjective judgment, which applies to both the V-M and the V-*te i-* construction. The point being discussed here concerns the way to describe the event itself. The event is described subjectively with the V-M construction, whereas it is described objectively with the V-*te i-* construction.

[10] This demonstration (8b) was suggested by Minoru Nakau.

[11] Both *ar-* and *i-* as main predicates have a *ni*-locative in their valence descriptions. The fact that the V-M and the V-C constructions can, but the V-*te i-* construction cannot, accommodate an extra *ni*-locative suggests that they are in distinct linkage types. The V-*te* and *ar-* jointly specify the arguments, whereas the V-*te* solely determines the arguments in the V-*te i-* construction. See Hasegawa (in prep) for analysis of these linkage types in Role and Reference Grammar.

[12] According to Zwicky and Sadock, one of the few ambiguity tests which can provide real evidence for privative ambiguities, although only in fortuitous circumstances, is the use of *co-occurrence restrictions* (CRs). Some CRs are in part arbitrary (i.e. the CRs are not explicable on semantic grounds alone) and in part dependent on the presence of a particular element of semantic representation. For example, *You bet it's cold* is ambiguous, and the obligatory absence of *that* is applicable only to the one which expresses the speaker's agreement, not to the report of a wager. Similarly, the CR of *ni*-locatives can be said to be sensitive to stativity in semantic representation.

[13] I consider it to be an instance of the perfect if the speaker asserts the occurrence of the event based on witnessing it. If the construction in question permits general resultative interpretations, then uncertainty emerges as to whether the speaker 'knows' or has inferred the occurrence of the event. This seems to be the key to the apprehension of the link between the resultative and the perfect, both

of which are expressed by the use of a single syntactic pattern in many languages. It has been suggested that the perfect is developed from the resultative diachronically (Jespersen 1924, Kuryłowicz 1964, Maslov 1988) as well as synchronically (Slobin and Aksu 1982).

14 Katsuya Kinjoo brought to my attention some similarities between the distinction discussed here and the two Turkish past-tense morphemes, *-di* (direct experience) and *-mis* (indirect experience). One of the uses of *-di* can be characterized as perfect, and one of the uses of *-mis* resultative as they are defined in the present study. See Slobin and Aksu (1982) for details.

15 In order to simplify the discussion, I labeled the first interpretations 'monovalent nonlocational resultative', which involves a comparison between the current state of an entity and the norm, and the second 'bivalent locational resultative', which does not require such a comparison. Strictly speaking, however, the second interpretations also indicate that the speaker has either witnessed the previous state or inferred one. The point being discussed here is that each subject NP (containing two nouns) as a whole refers to a single entity, as it usually does, in the bivalent locational interpretations, whereas the genitive NP alone has a referring function in the monovalent nonlocational interpretations.

16 Matsumoto (1990a) claims that one condition on the V-C construction is such that an agent must have purposefully produced the situation being described by the V-C construction. I maintain that neither the actual occurrence of the event nor the purposefulness of the agent need not be asserted.

References

Chafe, Wallace. 1976. Givenness, contrastiveness, definiteness, subjects, topics, and point of view. In C. Li (ed.), *Subject and Topic,* 25-55. New York: Academic Press.

Comrie, Bernard. 1976. *Aspect.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hasegawa, Yoko. In prep. Syntax, semantics, and pragmatics of TE-linkage in Japanese. Ph.D. dissertation. University of California, Berkeley.

Jespersen, Otto. 1924. *The Philosophy of Grammar.* New York: Norton.

Kozinskij, Isaak S. 1988. Resultatives: results and discussion. In V.P. Nedjalkov (ed.), *Typology of Resultative Constructions,* 497-525. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kuryłowicz, Jerzy. 1964. *The Inflectional Categories of Indo-European.* Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitatsverlag.

Lee, Nagiko I. 1989. Complementation in Japanese: a lexicase analysis. Ph.D. dissertation. University of Hawaii.

Martin, Samuel E. 1975. A *Reference Grammar of Japanese.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Maslov, Jurij S. 1988. Resultative, perfect, and aspect. In V.P. Nedjalkov (ed.), *Typology of Resultative Constructions,* 63-85. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Matsumoto, Yo. 1990a. Constraints on the 'intransitivizing' resultative *-te aru* construction in Japanese. In H. Hoji (ed.), *Proceedings of the First Conference of Japanese and Korean Linguistics,* 269-83. Stanford: CSU.

Matsumoto, Yo. 1990b. On the syntax of Japanese "intransitivizing" *-te aru* construction: apparent non-lexical function changing. *Papers from the 26th Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistics Society.*

McCawley, James. 1971. Tense and time reference in English. In C.J. Fillmore and D.T. Langendoen (eds.), *Studies in Linguistic Semantics.* New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Michaelis, Laura A. 1991. The semantic structure of the English perfect. MS. Department of Linguistics, University of California, Berkeley.

Miyagawa, Shigeru. 1989. *Structure and Case Marking in Japanese.* San Diego: Academic Press.

Nakau, Minoru. 1979. Modarityii to meedai. In *Eego to Nihongo to: Hayashi Eiichi Kyooju Kanreki Kinen Ronbunshuu,* 223-50. Tokyo: Kuroshio Shuppan.

Nedjalkov, Vladimir P. and Sergey Je. Jaxontov. 1988. The typology of resultative constructions. In V.P. Nedjalkov (ed.), *Typology of Resultative Constructions,* 3-62. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Sells, Peter. 1990. VP in Japanese: evidence from *-te* complements. In H. Hoji (ed.), *Proceedings of the First Conference of Japanese and Korean Linguistics,* 319-333. Stanford: CSLI.

Slobin, Dan I. and Ayhan A. Aksu. Tense, aspect, and modality in the use of the Turkish evidential. In P. Hopper (ed.), *Tense-Aspect: Between Semantics and Pragmatics,* 185-200. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Sugioka, Yoko. 1984. Interaction of derivational morphology and syntax in Japanese and English. Ph.D. dissertation. University of Chicago.

Talmy, Leonard. 1978. Figure and ground in complex sentences. In J.H. Greenberg (ed.), *Universals of Human Language. Vol. 4: Syntax,* 625-49. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Tokunaga, Misato. 1986. Affective deixis in Japanese: a case study of directional verbs. Ph.D. dissertation. University of Michigan.

Wetzel, Patricia J. 1985. In-group/out-group deixis: situational variation in the verbs of giving and receiving in Japanese. In J.P. Forgas (ed.), *Language and Social Situations,* 141-58. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Zwicky, Arnold M. and Jen-old M. Sadock. 1975. Ambiguity tests and how to fail them. In J.P. Kimball (ed.), *Syntax and Semantics* 4, 1-36. New York: Academic Press.