

**Some Notes on Resultativeness and Agent:
with Special Reference to the Resultative *-te aru* Construction^{*}**

Katsuo Ichinohe

1. Introduction

Japanese has several constructions that convey perfectivity. One of the most controversial cases is the *-te aru* construction. Consider the following:

- (1) a. Mado ga akete aru.
 window NOM. open be-PRES
 ‘The window has been opened.’
- b. (Tuma ga) mado o akete aru.¹
 (wife NOM) window ACC. open be-PRES
 ‘(My wife) has opened the window.’

In both examples, a transitive verb *akeru* in the active gerundive form with a suffix *-te* is followed by another verb *aru*. An obvious difference is the case marking of the semantic object of the gerundive verb *mado*: in (1a) it appears in nominative, whereas the same argument is marked with the accusative particle in (1b). In addition, (1b) allows the “agent” of the gerundive verb. I consider (1a) is a resultative construction in the sense of Nedjalkov and Jaxontov (1988).² In what follows, I will call (1a) and (1b) the resultative and the perfective *-te aru* construction (hereafter, RESL *-te aru* and PERF *-te aru* construction), respectively.³ This terminological distinction is motivated by the results of the discussion in section 3 and is substantial.

The sentences in (1) can refer to the same objectively observed situation, but how

^{*} I am grateful to Koichi Nishida, Yuji Tanaka, Koji Nabeya, and Keigo Yamada for their helpful comments and discussion. All remaining errors and inadequacies are of course my own.

¹ Some speakers find (1b) at best marginal without contexts. Adding a proper context will improve its acceptability, as illustrated in (i).

(i) Heya no kuuki o ire-kaeru tameni mado o akete ari-masu.
 room GEN air ACC change purpose window ACC open be-POLITE
 ‘(I) have opened the window in order to ventilate the room.’

Concerning the proper context for the use of the PERF *-te aru* construction, see Morita (1971) and Masuoka (1987) among others.

² The term “resultative construction” is intended to refer to the aspectual property of sentences such as (1a), rather than to so called resultative constructions like (i).

(i) John hammered the metal flat.

³ The RESL and PERF *-te aru* constructions correspond to the ‘object oriented’ and ‘action oriented’ uses of *-te aru* in Masuoka (1987), respectively. Masuoka further subdivides the action-oriented kind into two subclasses according to whether or not it is possible to replace the accusative marker on the logical object with a nominative marking, which is characteristic of the object-oriented kind.

it is described differs from one another. One of the main topics in this paper is the semantic differences between the constructions represented by the examples in (1). As a preliminary notice, I summarize their meanings as follows: (1a) depicts a result state of the window, associating the state to the preceding action which has brought it about; (1b) describes a perfective event (or action) in which an agent has acted on an entity and the entity has undergone the change of its state. I will be mainly concerned with the former, although I will often take up the latter for comparison.

The RESL *-te aru* construction has some intriguing properties. As already mentioned above, the semantic object of the gerundive verbs appears in nominative in spite of the absence of the passive morpheme on the gerundive verbs. Unlike passives, however, the agent of the gerundive verbs cannot be introduced by a postposition *ni yotte*, which corresponds to the English *by*-phrase, as illustrated in (2):

- (2) *Mado ga John ni-yotte akete aru.
 window NOM John by open be

In this respect, this construction is parallel to another result state expression consisting of a certain class of intransitive verbs and *iru*. Consider the following:

- (3) *Mado ga John ni-yotte aite iru.
 window NOM John by open_{intr} be

It appears that in the RESL *-te aru* construction, some operation is applied to the transitive verb in the gerundive form that intransitivizes it.

Semantically, however, the agent of the gerundive verb is implied. It is a well-known fact that the RESL *-te aru* construction freely collocates with purpose clauses, which require an agent that performs an action on purpose.

- (4) a. [Kuuki o ire-kaeru tameni] mado ga akete aru.
 air ACC take-change purpose mado NOM open_{tr} be
 'The window has been opened in order to freshen the air.'
 b. *[Kuuki o ire-kaeru tameni] mado ga aite iru.
 air ACC take-change purpose mado NOM open_{intr} be
 Lit. 'The window is open in order to freshen the air.'

The RESL *-te aru* construction also allows a certain class of "agent oriented" adverbs; e.g. *itotekini* 'intentionally', *wazato* 'purposely'.

- (5) a. Wazato mado ga akete aru.
 purposely window NOM open_{tr} be
 'The window has been opened purposely.'
 b. *Wazato mado ga aite iru.
 purposely window NOM open_{intr} be
 Lit. 'The window is open purposely.'

As shown in (5b), resultative *-te iru* with an intransitive verb does not allow the expressions in question. This contrast indicates that in the RESL *-te aru* construction, agent, the entity which can carry out an action volitionally or purposely, is implied.

The aim of this paper is two fold: first, to elucidate general semantic characteristics of the RESL *-te aru* construction and the PERF *-te aru* construction; second, to illuminate a “universal” requirement that agent should be excluded from the resultative construction. The organization of this paper is as follows: in section 2, I survey some discussions on the intransitivity of the RESL *-te aru* constructions. In section 3, I examine the semantic nature of this construction through the comparison with the PERF *-te aru* construction, making crucial use of the criteria proposed in Nedjalkov and Jaxontov (1988) for specifying resultative and perfective expressions. Section 4 is devoted to the explanation for the incompatibility of agent and the RESL *-te aru* construction. The last section contains concluding remarks. This paper is descriptive in nature, but I hope it has some consequences for the study of the resultativeness.

2. The ‘Intransitivization’ Effect in the RESL *-te Aru* Construction

Several proposals have been made to account for the inexpressibility of agent in the RESL *-te aru* construction (Sugioka (1982), Miyagawa (1988), Abe (1990), among others). All of those studies agree in treating the *-te aru* sequence in the RESL *-te aru* as a lexical item and in postulating some lexical operation of ‘intransitivization’ to apply to the gerundive verb. For example, Sugioka (1984) treats the *-te aru* sequence as an intransitivizing suffix to transitive verbs, assuming that the *V-te aru* sequence is (re)analyzed as a lexical item.⁴ The position that Miyagawa (1988) (and, perhaps, Martin (1975) as well) seems to assume is that the nominative NP is the subject of the complex predicate *V-te aru*, which supposedly intransitivizes the *te*-suffixed gerundive verb. Miyagawa (1988:178) notes “the original object of the gerundive verb is externalized to the subject position of the entire *V-te aru* verb. This externalization of the object is similar to the passive, giving the intransitivizing resultative a passive-like interpretation.” Abe (1993) postulates a lexical process of ‘dethematization’, which stripes away the external argument (agent) from *te*-suffixed transitive verbs and adds the result role to the internal argument (“theme”).

The lexical operation approach seems to be problematic in some respects. Intuitively, it seems to be unsound to postulate the lexical process of intransitivization

⁴ Sugioka regards (*-te aru* in the PERF *-te aru* construction as an auxiliary that marks the perfective aspect.

to apply only to a *-te aru* sequence in the RESL *-te aru* construction, but not to the one in the PERF *-te aru* construction. Note that the *-te aru* sequence in both constructions does not differ morphologically at all; the remarkable difference is the case-marking of the object of the gerundive verb. In the remainder of this section, we will see there are empirical data in favor of this intuitive idea.

2.1 *The Non-lexical Status of the -te Aru Sequence*

Matsumoto (1990b) convincingly argues that the *-te aru* sequence is not a lexical item. The main point of his argument is that analyzing the sequence as a lexical item would go against the "Lexical Integrity Hypothesis," which states that no syntactic rule can operate into a lexical item (cf. Bresnan (1982), Di Sciullo and Williams (1987), etc.). In this subsection, let us review his arguments. For example, the *-te aru* sequence can be interrupted by contrastive and focusing particles (*toritate-si*), such as *wa*, *mo*, and *sae* (see Teramura (1984)). In (6), for example, a contrastive particle *wa* intervenes in the sequence.

- (6) Kuruma ga tomete wa aru.
 car NOM stop CONT be
 'The car has certainly been parked.'

The intervention of a particle *mo* allows the gerundive verb to be coordinated in *mo*-coordination.

- (7) Mado ga akete mo simete mo nakatta.
 window NOM open even close even be-NEG-PAST
 'The window was in the state of neither having been opened nor closed.'

These operations are applied at the syntactic component, not at the lexical component. No compounds can allow the intervention of contrastive and focusing particles.

Furthermore, *aru* can occur alone without the gerundive verb in the following contexts. In (8), the verb *aru* occurs alone in the answer to a question.

- (8) A: Mado ga simete ari-masu ka?
 window NOM close be-POLITE-PRES Q
 'Has been the window closed?' (Intended)
 B: Hai, ari-masu.
 Yes be-POLITE-PRES
 'Yes, it has.'

When a verb is repeated for emphasis, *aru* alone can be repeated without the gerundive verb, as in (9).

- (9) Un, simete aru aru.
 yes close be be
 'Yes, it *has* been closed.'

When *-te aru* forms are used in reduplicative in which a main verb is repeated, *aru* can be repeated without the gerundive verbs, as in (10).

- (10) Mado ga simete aru koto wa aru ga
 window NOM close be thing TOP be though
 ‘Though the window has been certainly closed, ...’

In summary, the *-te aru* sequence is not regarded as a lexical item, which means that it is untenable to postulate the intransitivizing operation that applies at the lexical level of grammar.⁵

2.2 Semantics of Aru in the RESL *-te Aru* Construction

To treat *aru* in the RESL *-te aru* construction as an intransitivizing suffix under the assumption that the *-te aru* sequence as a single lexical item is also semantically problematic: it is not a suffix but a word with semantic content.

Masuoka (1987), pointing out such examples as in (11)-(12), argues that when combined with a placement verb, *aru* in this construction retains the existential sense of its main verb counterpart.

- (11) A: Sono heya ni wa donna mono ga ari-masita ka?
 that room LOC TOP what thing NOM be-POLITE-PAST Q
 ‘What was there in the room?’
 B: Huukeiga ga kazatte ari, piano ga oite ari, tooki ga narabete
 landscape NOM display be piano NOM put be china NOM arrange
 ari-masita.
 be-POLITE-PAST
 ‘A landscape had been displayed, a piano had been furnished, and some pieces of china had been arranged.’
- (12) a. Kabe ni wa insyooha no e ga kazar-arete atta
 wall LOC TOP impressionism GEN picture NOM display-PASS be-PAST
 ‘On the wall some impressionistic pictures have been displayed.’
 b. Heya no sumi ni wa ookina terebi ga sonae-tuke-rarete atta.
 room GEN corner LOC TOP large TV set NOM furnish-PASS be-PAST
 ‘On the corner of the room a large TV set has been furnished.’

As shown in (11), a RESL *-te aru* construction with a placement verb can be used to answer the question about the existence of an entity in some place. As for (12), note that the gerundive verbs contain the passive morpheme *-rare*; in principle, for gerundive verbs with the passive morpheme, *iru*, not *aru*, is used (Teramura (1984)).

⁵ Kageyama (1993) makes an intensive examination of many instances of a *-te* gerundive verb plus a supporting verb from the same point of view as Matsumoto (1990b), and he also reaches the same conclusion.

- (13) a. Doa ni kagi ga kake-rarete iru/*aru.
 door LOC key NOM turn-PASS be
 'The key is turned to the door.' (Intended)
- b. Takusan no eda ga or-arete ita/*atta.
 many GEN branch NOM break-PASS be
 'Many branches were broken (off).'

In addition, Ichinohe (1998a) points out that even when the gerundive verb is other than a placement verb, *aru* in this construction conveys the existential sense.⁶ Consider the following:

- (14) A: Teeburu no ue ni wa nani ga ari-masita ka?
 B: Tamago ga yudete ari-masita./Onigiri ga nigitte ari-masita.

Yuderu 'boil' involves a change of state and *nigiru* in this case, 'making rice ball', is a verb of creation. Comparing with (11), we should conclude that *aru* in these examples has the existential sense.

The sentences given below seem to support this position. The last example is cited from Morita (1973).

- (15) a. Teeburu no ue ni onigiri ga nigitte aru.
 table GEN ON LOC rice ball NOM grasp be
 'On the table some rice balls have been made.'
- b. Teeburu no ue ni sakana ga yaite aru.
 table GEN ON LOC fish NOM roast be
 'On the table a fish has been roasted'
- c. Senmenki ni hankati ga aratte aru.
 washbowl LOC handkerchief NOM wash be
 'In the washbowl a handkerchief has been washed.'

Note that the verbs in the gerundive form themselves cannot take a locative phrase, as illustrated in (16):

- (16) a. *Teeburu no ue ni onigiri o nigiru.
 table GEN ON LOC rice ball ACC grasp
- b. *Teeburu no ue ni sakana o yaku.
 table GEN ON LOC fish ACC roast
- c. *Senmenki ni hankati o arau.
 wash bowl LOC handkerchief ACC wash

From the contrast in acceptability between (15) and (16), it is clear that the locative phrases in (15) are selected by *aru*.

⁶ Hasagawa (1992) finds the same fact independently.

As a matter of fact, the existential sense does not depend upon the class of gerundive verb. (17) is cited from Hasegawa (1992).

- (17) Reezooko ni biiru ga katte atta.
 refrigerator LOC beer NOM buy be-PAST
 'Beer has been bought and is in the refrigerator.' (Intended)

Note that *kau* 'buy' belongs to neither of the classes discussed above.

What the discussion above shows is that *aru* in the RESL *-te aru* construction maintains the meaning of its main verb counterpart, that is, the existential sense, and that it selects its arguments (theme and locative) independently of gerundive verbs.

To conclude this section, it is untenable to postulate some lexical process to intransitivize transitive verbs in the gerundive form in the RESL *-te aru* construction; they remain as transitive verbs. Thus the explanation for the inexpressibility of agent in this construction should be sought in some different direction.

3. On the Resultative Nature of the RES *-te Aru* Construction

In this section, I will clarify the semantic difference between the RESL *-te aru* and the PERF *-te aru* construction through the application of the criteria for distinguishing resultative and perfect constructions proposed in Nedjalkov and Jaxontov (1988).

3.1 *Perfect vs. Resultative*

On a typological survey of resultatives in the world languages, Nedjalkov and Jaxontov (1988:15f) specify the following general characteristics of perfect and resultative constructions:

- (18) a. The after-effects of the action expressed by the perfect are non-specific, and they are not attributed to any particular participant of the situation.
 b. The perfect form, unlike the resultative, can be derived from any verb, whether transitive or intransitive, telic or atelic, including those verbs that denote situations which involve no change in the state of any participant, e.g. *sing* and *laugh*.
 c. The perfect does not change the valence of the base verb, whereas the resultative is predominantly intransitive.
 d. If adverbials of duration (such as *for two hours*, *since morning*, *all the day*,) co-occur with the perfect, they denote duration of the event; if they co-occur with resultative, they express duration of the result state.
 e. If adverbials of moment co-occur with the perfect, they denote the moment at which the event takes place, whereas with the resultative, they denote only the moment at which the state is existence.

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

It will be instructive to apply these criteria to the RESL and PERF *-te aru* constructions. In the next section, we will see, according to (18a-e), the RESL *-te aru* construction is to be categorized as resultative. As for (18f), I have not found relevant examples, so I leave it open.

3.2 Applications of the Criteria

3.2.1 After-effect

Regarding (18a), first of all, the after-effects expressed in the RESL *-te aru* construction are indeed more specific than that in the PERF *-te aru* construction. For example, (19b) can be a statement either about John's past action or about the present state of the window, while (19a) can only be a statement about the window. This difference in specificity of after-effects is due to (18c): by suppressing the agent, the RESL *-te aru* construction constrains the after-effect to apply specifically to the undergoer of the action (that is, the object).

- (19) a. Heya no kanki no tameni, mado ga akete aru.
 room GEN ventilation GEN purpose window NOM open be
 'The window has been opened on purpose to ventilate the room.'
- b. ?Heya no kanki no tameni, mado o akete aru.
 room GEN ventilation GEN purpose window ACC open be
 '(I) have opened the window on purpose to ventilate the room.'

However, there is a difference in the after-effects between the RESL and the PERF *-te aru* constructions. In the former, the after-effect of an entity has to obtain at the reference time, whereas it does not have to in the latter. Consider the following:

- (20) a. *Heya no kanki no tameni, sakki mado ga akete aru.
 room GEN ventilation GEN purpose a little while ago window NOM open be
 Lit. 'The window has been opened a little while ago on purpose to
 ventilate the room.'
- b. ?Heya no kanki no tameni, sakki mado o akete aru.
 room GEN ventilation GEN purpose a little while ago window ACC open be
 '(I) have opened the window a little while ago on purpose to ventilate
 the room.' (Intended)

In (20b) the window may be in the state of being closed at the speech time.⁷

⁷ Although my informants judge (20b) basically acceptable, some speakers do not agree with the

Therefore, in the RESL *-te aru* construction, the result state of an entity is described, whereas in the PERF *-te aru* construction, the result state is only (strongly) implicated, not asserted.

We can find similar cases in present perfect sentences in English. It is widely assumed that an English present perfect sentence such as (21a) entails (21b), which describes the result state of the object of the verb in present perfect form in (21a).

- (21) a. I have opened the window.
b. The window is open.

Declerck (1991) observes that such an entailment does not necessary hold, even if the same verb is used.

- (22) a. We can get in through this door. I have unlocked it. - How strange. It is locked again now.
b. These books have belonged to my father, they have been mine, and now they are yours.

(Declerck 1991: 102f)

To settle the matter of whether the resultativeness of an English present perfect sentence is an entailment or an implicature is beyond the scope of this paper (for detailed discussion, see Depraetere (1998) and references cited there). The point I would like to emphasize here is that after-effects of perfective expressions in English and Japanese do not have to obtain at the reference time (at least in the actual world). On the other side, resultatives assert the after-effect.

3.2.2 Base Verbs

With regard to the potential base verb (18b), it has often been mentioned that the PERF *-te aru* construction allows not only transitive verbs but also intransitives, if the verb denotes such an action as an actor can perform purposely (see Morita (1971), Matsumoto (1990a)).⁸ This fact indicates this construction is perfective.

- (23) (Watasi wa) kyoo zyuubun nete aru
'Today (I)'ve slept enough.'

The RESL *-te aru* construction, on the other hand, basically permits only transitive base verbs which can refer to action whose result can be reflected on the object in some overtly observable way. Matsumoto (1990a) observes an important fact with

judgment of the acceptability. I cannot think of the reason for this disagreement now, except dialect variations.

⁸ Jacobsen (1992) analyzes the intransitive verbs denoting the action that can be performed intentionally and purposefully as underlyingly transitive verbs, in which the action by an agent is reflexively directed to the agent himself. Under his analysis intransitive verbs such as *tatu* 'stand up', *kagamu* 'bend over', and *neru* 'sleep' are all categorized as transitive verbs. Jacobsen reaches the conclusion that the verb occurring in the *-te aru* construction is inherently transitive.

respect to this point. Consider the following:

- (24) a. *Doa ga tataite aru.
 door NOM knock be
 Lit. 'The door has been knocked.'
- b. Doa ga hekomu-hodo tataite aru.
 door NOM be-dented-DEG knock be
 'The door has been knocked on until dented.'

Sentence (24a) is anomalous because knocking on a door usually does not leave any visible trace. In contrast, as illustrated in (24b), the addition of an adverbial denoting the result state of an action such as *hekomu hodo* 'until dented' improves (24a). Therefore, what is crucial is not only the properties of base verbs in themselves but also the whole situation described by the gerundive form of base verbs, their argument, and certain kinds of modifier.

3.2.3 Adverbials of Duration

We next turn to (18d). According to Nedjalkov and Jaxontov, adverbials meaning 'still' freely collocate with the resultative expressing temporary states but as a rule they do not co-occur with the perfect. This seems to hold true of Japanese. For example:

- (25) a. Mada sentaku-mono ga hosite aru.
 still washing NOM hang-out-to-dry be
 'The washing has been still hang-out to dry.'
- b. ?*Mada sentaku-mono o hosite aru.
 still washing ACC hang-out-to-dry be
 '(Someone) has still hang out the washing to dry.'

Hasegawa (1992) has the discussion relevant to this issue. She concludes that when adverbials of duration co-occur with a PERF *-te aru* construction, they denote the duration of the event, and they are combined with the RESL *-te aru* construction to denote the duration of the result state, as illustrated in (26a) and (26b), respectively. (26c) is awkward because it involves the PERF *-te aru* construction, and therefore *san zikan* '3 hours' is construed as the duration of the event irrespective of the punctual nature of *tukeru* 'turn on'.

- (26) a. Watasi wa zyuu-zikan nete aru.
 I TOP 10 hours sleep be-PRES
 'I have slept 10 hours.'
- b. Denki ga san-zikan tukete aru.
 light NOM 3 hours turn-on be-PRES
 'The light has been turned on for 3 hours.'

- c. ?Denki o san-zikan tukete aru.
 light ACC 3 hours turn-on be-PRES
 '(Someone) has turned on the light 3 hours.'

The fact is more complicated, however. Yuji Tanaka (p.c.) suggested to me that this phenomenon should be ascribed to "Aktionsart" or "aspectuality" of base verbs, pointing out such examples as the following:

- (27) a. Ninzin ga iti-zikan nite aru.
 carrot NOM 1 hour boil be
 'The carrot has been boiled for an hour.'
- b. Ninzin o iti-zikan nite aru.
 carrot ACC 1 hour boil be
 '(I) have boiled the carrot for an hour.'

In (27a), as well as in (27b), the adverb of duration *iti-zikan* denotes the duration of event, not that of the result state. The difference between (26a) and (27a) seems to be attributed to the aspectuality of the verbs: *tukeru* 'turn on' denotes a punctual action, which is incompatible with adverbials of duration, and implies an apparent result state is brought about, which is fitted for the modification by the adverb in this case. On the other hand, *niru* 'boil' denotes an action that by nature requires duration.

In addition, some speakers find (26c) is perfectly acceptable as a statement about the present state of the light; that is, the light is turned on. On that reading, the adverbial of duration denotes the duration of the result state. If we recall the examples in (19) and the discussion about after-effects of *-te aru* constructions in 3.2.1., this must be expected.

3.2.4 Adverbials of Moment

As stated in (18e), when adverbials of moment co-occur with the PERF *-te aru* construction, they denote the time at which the event took place, whereas with the RESL *-te aru* construction, they refer to the time at which the result state is in existence. (28a) means that buying a ticket occurred yesterday; in (28b) it is reported that there was a ticket bought yesterday. Notice that the past tense is in accordance with the adverbial *kinoo* 'yesterday' in (28b), whereas the tense is present in (28a).

- (28) a. Watasi wa kinoo kippu o katte aru.
 I TOP yesterday ticket ACC buy be-PRES
 'I have bought a ticket yesterday.' (Intended)
- b. Kippu ga kinoo katte atta/*aru.
 ticket NOM yesterday buy be-PAST/be-PRES
 'Yesterday there was a ticket bought.' (Intended)

From this fact, we can conclude that in the RESL *-te aru* construction the event

preceding to the result state is only implied, not asserted, whereas in the PERF *-te aru* construction, the event is described.

In summary, according to Nedjalkov and Jaxontov's criteria (18a), (18b), (18c), and (18e), then, the PERF *-te aru* construction is categorized as perfect and the RESL *-te aru* construction as resultative. In the next section, I will suggest a possible account of the inexpressibility of agent on the basis of the result in this section

4. An Explanation for the Inexpressibility of Agent

Now I turn to the biggest problem remaining unsolved: why agent does not appear in the RESL *-te aru* construction, in spite of its presence at the semantic level. We have already seen that it is untenable to postulate some lexical process of 'intransitivization' to apply to a *-te aru* sequence in the RESL *-te aru* construction, but not to the one in the PERF *-te aru* construction. This means that transitive verbs in the gerundive form in the RESL *-te aru* construction remain as they are.

Alternatively, I propose that this problem is attributable to the general semantic nature of this construction, that is, its resultativeness. We saw in 3.2.2 that the event which is compatible with the RESL *-te aru* construction is such an action as carried out by an agent and leaves some mark on the object of the action (i.e., a result state). We saw in 3.2.1 and 3.2.3 that the RESL *-te aru* construction describes the result state of the object of an action, and the preceding action is only implied, not asserted. It follows that when we use this construction, it is the result state of an entity that unfolds before us and we infer from it the preceding action that has brought about the state.

For this reason, this construction can express only those aspects of an action that are reflected in, or inferred from, the result state of the object.

- (29) a. Syoohin ga seizen-to narabete aru.
 goods NOM in order arrange be
 b. *Syoohin ga subaya-ku narabete aru.
 goods NOM quickly arrange be
 c. Syoohin ga teinei-ni narabete aru.
 goods NOM carefully arrange be
 'The goods have been arranged in order/*quickly/carefully.'

Result adverbs such as *seizen-to* in (29a) refer to the result of an action which is reflected on the object of the action: arranging goods in order entails that as a result, the goods are in order. Thus they collocate with the RESL *-te aru* construction. On the other hand, "manner" adverbs, such as *subaya-ku* 'quickly', *yooi-ni* 'easily', and so on, basically modify a particular aspect of an action per se and their properties are not reflected in the result; so they are incompatible with the construction in question. It

should be noticed that some manner adverbs are compatible with this construction, as illustrated in (29c). They are such adverbs as are expected to be reflected in the result of an action; *teinei-ni* 'carefully' specifies the degree of care exercised in carrying out some action, and the degree may refer to the result state of the object of the action; for example, the state of being carefully arranged.⁹ The agent of the action denoted by the gerundive verb can not be reflected in the result state, and therefore it is excluded from this construction.

From the discussion above, it may be reasonable to assume that describing a result state brought about by an action is inherently incompatible with identifying the agent of the action. This assumption is evidenced by plenty of empirical evidence, and it seems to be a fairly universal restriction on the resultative construction in natural languages. First, Bolinger (1972) points out that the adjectival passive in English (or the passive of result in his term) also has a similar condition. According to his observation, when preceding the past participle, *much* tends to intensify a result state. He argues that passives with a pre-modifier *much* are adjectival and refer to a result of an action. What is important here is that the "true" agent, which can carry out an action volitionally or purposely, does not occur in adjectival passive sentences. Consider the following:

(30) a. *The rod was much bent by the athlete.

b. The rod was much bent by the blow. (Bolinger 1972: 198)

As the unacceptability of (30a) shows, the true agent is not allowed in the passive of result. Although (30b) contains a *by*-phrase, it is not true agent: Bolinger notes that (30b) is almost synonymous with such a sentence as *The rod was much bent as a result of the blow*, which means that the rod was in a bent condition.

Second, we can also find a similar phenomenon in Chinese. In Chinese, the imperfective, non-progressive aspect marker *zhe* makes available for the locative inversion sentence the so-called placement verb; e.g. *fang* 'put', *xie* 'write', and *ke* 'curve'. Importantly, the agent phrase, which is to be selected by those verbs, cannot occur in the locative inversion sentence, as illustrated in the following examples (see,

⁹ It should be noticed that *teinei-ni*, is not a result adverb: it does not only refer to a result state but modifies the manner of a transitive action, contrary to result adverbs.

(i) a. *Syoohin ga teinei ni narande iru
goods NOM carefully be-arranged be

Lit. 'The goods are arranged carefully.'

b. Syoohin ga seizen-to narande iru.

goods NOM in-order arrange be

'The goods have been arranged in order.'

Narabu, the intransitive counterpart of *naraberu*, can be a spontaneous event and *narande iru* only refers to the result state and do not involve the manner of arranging.

Smith (1992), Pan (1996)):

- (31) Men shang xie-zhe si ge zi.
 door on write-*zhe* 4 CL character
 'Four characters are written on the door.'
- (32) a. Zhuozishang fang -zhe yi ben shu.
 table-on put-*zhe* on CL book
 'There is a book put on the table.'
- b. *Zhuozishang John fang -zhe yi ben shu.
 table-on John put-*zhe* on CL book

(Pan 1996: 410)

Smith (1992) argues that such examples as exemplified in (31) and (32) are the resultative expressions and *zhe* in those cases is a resultative aspect marker. She observes that *zhe* is basically combined with a predicate which involves a change of state and it refers to the state after the change. Pan (1996:416) also emphasizes that *zhe* focuses on the state after the finishing point of the event and conveys the idea that the state holds for a period of time. Notice that *zhe* itself is not incompatible with agent; they do not co-occur in a sentence only when it is resultative: *zhe* appears in sentences expressing the duration of an action and in such cases it is compatible with agent, as shown in (33).¹⁰

- (33) a. Quan shijie de ertong dou wan-zhe tong yang de youxi.
 whole world DE child all play-*zhe* same kind DE game
 'All the children in the world are playing the same games.'
- b. Qi-zhe ma zhao ma.
 ride-*zhe* horse seek horse
 'Look for a horse while riding a horse.'

(Smith 1992: 360f)

Thus, these facts are also supporting evidence for the incompatibility of the resultative construction with agent. (31) should be translated as (34) in Japanese, which is a RESL -*te aru* construction.

- (34) Doa ni zi ga yottu kaite aru.
 door LOC character NOM 4 write be

Furthermore, concerning the incompatibility between resultativeness and agent, Mihara's (1997) observations about *-rarete iru* (the gerundive form of a passivized verb plus *be*) will lend further support for the assumption. According to Mihara, *V -rarete iru* can convey either the duration of an action or that of the result. Because

¹⁰ DE is the abbreviation for possessive/modifier marker.

of this, (35) is ambiguous between the reading on which the execution of criminals is ongoing and that on which the dead bodies of criminals are lying before the speaker.

- (35) Hanzaisya ga syokei s-arete iru.
 criminal NOM execution do-PASS be
 'Criminals has been punished by death.'

Mihara (1997: 139) observes that this example is disambiguated by adding either the particle referring to the location of an event *de* or the locative marker for the existence of thing *ni* as illustrated in (36):

- (36) a. Me no mae de hanzaisya ga syokei s-arete iru.
 eye GEN before LOC criminal NOM execution do-PASS be
 'Criminals has been being punished by death before me.' (Intended)
- b. Me no mae ni hanzaisya ga syokei s-arete iru.
 eye GEN before LOC criminal NOM execution do-PASS be
 'Criminals is in the state of being punished by death before me.'

(36a) has the reading of the duration of an action, and (36b) that of the duration of the result.

Mihara points out further that *-rarete iru* on the duration of result reading does not allow an agent or a purpose clause.¹¹

- (37) a. *Gun ni-yotte hiroba ni hanzaisya ga syokei s-arete iru.
 army by square LOC criminal NOM execution do-PASS be
 'Criminals is in the state of being punished by death by the army at the square.' (Intended)
- b. *Misesime no tameni hiroba ni hanzaisya ga syokei s-arete iru.
 warning GEN purpose square LOC criminal NOM execution do-PASS be
 'As a warning to others, criminals is in the state of being punished by death at the square.' (Intended)

These data also confirm the incompatibility between the resultative construction and agent.

An important question remains to be explained: why is describing a result state brought about by an action incompatible with identifying of the agent of the action? The answer should be ultimately found in human cognitive abilities: we cannot usually determine cause solely from effect; agent is the initiator and the cause of an action and the result state is the effect of an action; thus we cannot identify the agent

¹¹ Mihara reaches the conclusion that while in (36a) the existence of the agent is implied but syntactically implicit, in (36b) the agent is dethematized, which is a similar idea to the intransitivization operation postulated in the studies of the RESL *-te aru* construction mentioned section 2.

of an action by the result of the action. This account is a matter of speculation. I will leave the full explanation for future research.

Before concluding this section, let us point out an important fact. One decisive factor in determining whether a given *-te aru* sentence is resultative or perfective is the case-marking of the object of the gerundive verb: when an object of the gerundive verb appears in nominative in a *-te aru* sentence, that sentence is a RESL *-te aru* construction, in which agent cannot appear. When the same argument appears in accusative, the sentence is a PERF *-te aru* construction and agent can appear.

Of course, this is merely a descriptive generalization, but it is not only true of the construction in question in Japanese. According to Nedjalkov and Jaxontov (1988), there are some languages in which the objective resultative construction differs from the perfect of transitive verbs only in the absence of the agent of base verbs. They cite examples of Hindi. In Hindi, the resultative construction has two alternative forms, with a simple and a complex participle. The former form, italicized in (38), is homonymous with perfect, but the resultative is easy to distinguish from the perfect due to the lack of the agent.¹²

- (38) a. Us ne lifafe par us ka nam aur hostel ka pata
 She ERG envelope on her ATTR name and hostel ATTR address
likka hai. (perfect)
 write-PF.PART be-PRES-SG.

'She has written her name and the address of the hostel on the envelope.'

- b. Lifafe par us ka nam aur hostel ka pata *likka*
 envelope on her ATTR name and hostel ATTR address write-PF.PART
hai. (resultative)
 be-PRES-SG.

'On the envelope are written her name and the address of the hostel.'

(Nedjalkov and Jaxontov 1988: 38)

In Hindi, the presence/absence of agent determines whether a sentence with a perfective form of a transitive verb is construed as a perfect sentence or a resultative sentence.

This observation is of great significance to our interest. Elsewhere (Ichinohe 1998), I have suggested that *aru* in both the *-te aru* constructions takes as its complement the verb phrase consisting of the gerundive verb and its constellations, and that both constructions are identical with all relevant respects except the case marking of the semantic object of the gerundive verb: when the object is marked by

¹² ATTR and PF.PART are the abbreviations for attribute and perfective participle, respectively.

the nominative particle and licensed as subject in a given *-te aru* sentence, agent is suppressed by the syntactic mechanism of case marking in Japanese, and as a result, the sentence is interpreted as resultative. On the other hand, when the object appears in accusative, the sentence is construed as perfective. The Hindi's data given in (38) seem to suggest the promising prospect of this approach.

5. Concluding Remarks

I have so far discussed semantic properties of two types of *-te aru* construction and the relation between resultativeness and agent. I argued that intransitivity of the RESL *-te aru* construction does not come from the lexical process of intransitivization but from the resultative nature of this construction. From the data on the resultative construction in Japanese, English, Chinese, and Hindi, I concluded that the resultative construction is inherently incompatible with agent. However, I have neither provided the sufficient explanation for this incompatibility nor dealt with the question of how the two types of *-te aru* construction are to be analyzed syntactically. I leave these issues for future research.

REFERENCES

- Abe, Y. (1993) "Dethematized Subjects and Property Ascription in Japanese," in *Language, Information and Computation*, Seoul.
- Bresnan, J. (1982) "The Passive in Lexical Theory," in J. Bresnan ed., *The Mental Representation of Grammatical Relations*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Bolinger, D. (1972) *Degree Words*. Mouton, The Hague.
- Declerck, R. (1991) *A Comprehensive Descriptive Grammar of English*. Kaitakusya, Tokyo.
- Depraetre, I. (1998) "On the Resultative Character of Present Perfect Sentences", in *Journal of Pragmatics* 29, 597-613.
- Di Sciullo, A.M. and E. Williams (1987) *On the Definition of Word*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Hasegawa, Y. (1992) *Syntax, Semantics, and Pragmatics of TE-linkage in Japanese*. Doctoral Dissertation, University of California at Berkeley.
- Ichinohe, K. (1998) "*-te aru Bun no Imi to Toogo Koozoo*," ms. University of Tsukuba.
- Kageyama, T. (1993) *Bunpoo to Gokeisei*. Hituzi Syoboo, Tokyo.
- _____ (1996) *Doosi Imiron: Gengo to Ninti no Setten*. Kurosio Publishers, Tokyo.
- Kuno, S. (1973) *The Structure of the Japanese Language*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Martin, J. (1975) *A Reference Grammar of the Japanese Language*. Yale University. New Haven and London.

- Masuoka, T. (1987) *Meidai no Bunpoo: Nihongo Bunpoo Zyosetu*. Kurosio Publishers, Tokyo.
- Matsumoto, Y. (1990a) "Constraints on the 'Intransitivizing' Resultative *-te aru* Construction in Japanese," in H. Hoji ed. *Proceedings of First Conference of Japanese and Korean Linguistics*, 269-283.
- _____ (1990b) "On the Syntax of Japanese 'Intransitivizing' *-te aru* Construction: Non-lexical Functional Changing," in *CLS* 26, 277-291.
- Mihara, K. (1997) "Doosi no Asupekuto Koozoo," in R. Washio and K. Mihara (1997), *Voisu to Asupekuto*. Kenkyuusya Syuppan, Tokyo.
- Miyagawa, Y (1988) "Predication and Numeral Quantifier," in W. Poser ed. *Papers from the Second International Workshop on Japanese Syntax*. Stanford: CSLI
- Morita, K. (1971) "Hon ga Oite Aru to Hon o Oite Aru" in K. Morioka ed. *Kooza: Tadasii Nihongo*. vol.5,174-188. Meiji Shoin, Tokyo.
- Nedjalkov, V. P. and Jaxontov (1988) "The Typology of Resultative Constructions," in Nedjalkov, V. P., ed. *Typology of Resultative Constructions*. Amsterdam John Benjamins.
- Pan, H. (1996) "Imperfect Aspect *zhe*, Agent Deletion, and Locative Inversion in Mandarin Chinese," in *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 14, 409-432.
- Sugioka, Y. (1984) *Interaction of Derivational Morphology and Syntax in Japanese and English*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago.
- Smith, C. S. (1992) *The Parameter of Aspect*, Kluwer, Dordrecht.
- Teramura, H. (1984) *Nihongo no Sintakusu to Imi* II. Kurosio Publishers, Tokyo.

Doctoral Program in Literature and Linguistics
University of Tsukuba