

1 Atsuhiko Kato

2 **5 Entailed and intended results in Japanese** 3 4 **and Burmese accomplishment verbs**

5 6 7 **1 Introduction**

8
9 Vendler (1967) categorized the meanings expressed by English verbs into the four
10 categories of activities, accomplishments, achievements, and states, depending on
11 their temporal characteristics. This categorization can be applied to a variety of
12 languages, but caution should be paid to the fact that semantically similar verbs in
13 different languages may belong to different categories. For example, the English verb
14 *know* is a state verb but the Japanese verb considered to correspond to it lexically,
15 *siru*, is an achievement verb meaning ‘get to know’ and must have *-te iru* showing
16 the result of change attached in order to express a current state. In the same way,
17 the meanings of verbs in different languages considered to belong to the same cate-
18 gory may show differing behaviors. For example, the English accomplishment verb
19 *kill* cannot be used in a sentence like (1).

20
21 (1) **I killed him, but he didn’t die.*

22 Since *kill* entails that a causative action by the agent causes the event of ‘dying’ on
23 the part of the patient, affirming the action of “killing” in the first conjunct and de-
24 nying the event of “dying” in the second conjunct is logically contradictory. How-
25 ever, according to Tai (1984), no semantic contradiction arises in the following sen-
26 tence in Chinese (notation follows Tai).

27
28 (2) *Zhangsan sha-le Lisi liangci, Lisi dou mei si.*
29 Lit. ‘Zhangsan killed Lisi twice, but he didn’t die.’

30
31 According to Tai (1984), since the Chinese verb *shā* ‘kill’ does not entail the result
32 “die”, (2) is not contradictory. As is apparent from a comparison of English *kill* and
33 Chinese *shā*, even verbs that lexically correspond across languages can show differing
34 semantic and syntactic behaviors. Based on examples like (2), Tai (1984) claims that
35 Chinese does not have accomplishment verbs, but Liu (2006: 14–17) argues to the
36 contrary that Chinese does have accomplishment verbs. This chapter will advance
37 its arguments on the premise that *shā* ‘kill’ is an accomplishment verb.

38 The same phenomenon as was seen in Chinese is also observed in Burmese.

39
40 (3) *tù mahlâ=gò tã?=tê. dâ=bêmê mahlâ mã-tê=bú.*
41 3sg PN=KO kill=REAL this=though PN NEG-die=NEG
42 ‘He killed Ma Hla. But Ma Hla didn’t die.’

DOI 10.1515/9781614514077-006

1 Example (3) is a single utterance from a single speaker and is composed of one
 2 clause meaning that ‘he killed Ma Hla’ and the second that ‘Ma Hla did not die’.
 3 The Burmese example in (3) resembles the English example in (1) syntactically, but,
 4 as with the Chinese example (2), semantically there is no logical contradiction.

5 Although not to the same extent as Chinese or Burmese, a similar phenomenon
 6 has been noted in Japanese language research. In particular, Ikegami (1981: 249–
 7 283) claims that, in contrast to English, which is a *suru*-type (DO-type) language
 8 with a strong goal orientation and does not allow expressions like (1), Japanese is a
 9 *naru*-type (BECOME-type) language with weak goal orientation and, because of this
 10 characteristic, forms sentences like (4) without semantic contradiction.

11
 12 (4) *Moyasi-ta keredo, moe-nakat-ta.*
 13 burn(vt)-PST although burn(vi)-NEG-PST
 14 ‘(I) burned (it), but (it) didn’t burn.’
 15

16 Example (4) is a single sentence from a single speaker and, while using the causa-
 17 tive transitive verb *moyasu* in the first clause, uses the negated form of the intransi-
 18 tive verb *moeru* in the second clause. As will be argued later, what is intended in this
 19 sentence is the description of a situation in which “I lit the target object (patient) on
 20 fire but it did not burn sufficiently (to the extent I intended).” In other words, some
 21 action was taken toward the patient and as a result a change in the patient did
 22 occur, but it did not reach the intended state. Tsujimura (2003) calls this phenomenon
 23 “event cancellation”, but since the event of igniting does take place, this terminology
 24 is misleading. A better term might be “result cancellation” or “result suspension”.
 25 This phenomenon does not, however, occur as freely as Ikegami (1981) supposes.
 26 As Miyajima (1985) pointed out, the acceptability varies considerably depending on
 27 the specific verb or context and by speaker.

28 To sum up the observations above, Japanese appears to be located somewhere
 29 between English and Chinese with regard to the phenomenon of “result cancellation
 30 (suspension)” of accomplishment verbs. The purpose of this chapter is to clarify the
 31 essential nature of this phenomenon in Japanese through comparison with Burmese.
 32 Section 2, after first outlining general characteristics of Burmese, will describe result
 33 cancellation with accomplishment verbs in Burmese. Next, Section 3 will review the
 34 important previous research on Japanese and Section 4 will consider in detail factors
 35 that make this phenomenon possible in Japanese. In Section 5 it will be argued that
 36 the result of an accomplishment verb in Burmese is an “intended result” and Section
 37 6 will suggest directions for further research on similar phenomena in the languages
 38 of East Asia, Southeast Asia, and South Asia.

39
 40
 41
 42

2 Result cancellation with accomplishment verbs in Burmese

Previous research describing the possibility of result cancellation with accomplishment verbs in Burmese is, to the best of my knowledge, limited to Thin Aye Aye Ko (2002) and Kato (2015). Thin Aye Aye Ko (2002) was the first to mention this phenomenon in Burmese, but stopped with simply indicating the existence of the phenomenon. Kato (2015) tested whether or not cancellation of attainment of a result was possible with a variety of verbs in Burmese and argued with regard to the use of volitional verbs in Burmese that reaching the end point of an event was not entailed. Kato (2015) also treats the phenomenon of denial of the realization of an action itself, as in ‘I stood. But I could not stand’, but, for the sake of comparison with Japanese, this chapter will deal only with sentences including accomplishment verbs.

Burmese is an analytic, SOV language belonging to the Tibeto-Burman group of the Sino-Tibetan language family. Following the verb at the end of the sentence is an obligatory particle that Okell (1969) calls a “verb-sentence marker” that expresses modality, including realis versus irrealis. The semantic/grammatical role of a noun in the sentence is also expressed by a following particle. As shown in (5) and (6), the subject of both transitive and intransitive sentences is marked by the particle =*kâ*/=*gâ* and the direct object of a transitive sentence is marked by the particle =*kò*/=*gò*.¹ On this point, Burmese can be said to be a nominative-accusative language. Since the particles on the subject and object are not obligatory, they are enclosed in parentheses.

(5) *ŋâ(=gâ) thàin=dè.*
1sg=KA sit.down=REAL
‘I sat down.’

(6) *ŋâ(=gâ) ʔédì t̃áyeʔt̃í(=gò) sá=dè.*
1sg=KA that mango=KO eat=REAL
‘I ate that mango.’

An important semantic factor in the classification of Burmese verbs is volitionality. Based on volitionality, all Burmese verbs can be classified as either volitional verbs or as non-volitional verbs (Kato 2010, 2015). Volitional verbs depict events accompanied by volition and non-volitional verbs those not accompanied by volition.

¹ With many of the Burmese particles that begin with a voiceless consonant, the first consonant (aside from consonants that follow a glottal stop) is replaced by its voiced counterpart. Particles =*kâ*/=*gâ* and =*kò*/=*gò* are such examples. In this chapter, whenever such particles are cited, both voiceless and voiced forms are shown before and after slashes respectively.

1 This is a fundamental division of Burmese verbs. For example, since *mê* ‘forget’ is a
 2 non-volitional verb, the sentence *mê=dê* (forget=REAL) ‘(I) forgot (it)’ always shows
 3 non-volitional forgetting and cannot be used to express a situation of forgetting on
 4 purpose. In order to express forgetting on purpose, a speaker must use the auxiliary
 5 verb =*lai?*, which expresses intention, and say *mê=lai?=tê*. Conversely, the sentence
 6 *kâin=dê* (touch=REAL) ‘(I) touched (it)’ using the volitional verb *kâin* ‘touch, hold’
 7 can only be used to describe a situation in which the touching is intentional. In
 8 order to express a situation in which someone unconsciously touched something,
 9 an auxiliary verb expressing inadvertency, =*mî* is used, as in *kâin=mî=dê*.

10 According to Tsujimura (2003), the phenomenon of the cancellation of the mean-
 11 ing of a result that accomplishment verbs should have is archetypically observed in
 12 Japanese with transitive-intransitive verb pairs that are morphologically related, like
 13 the *moyasu-moeru* pair in (4). Japanese is rich in this kind of transitive-intransitive
 14 pairs, including such verbs as *oru – oreru* ‘break vt/vi’, *kiru – kureru* ‘cut/be cut’,
 15 *yaku – yakeru* ‘bake/be baked’, *otosu – ochiru* ‘drop/fall’, *tomeru – tomaru* ‘stop
 16 vt/vi’, *kesu – kieru* ‘extinguish/be extinguished’, *kowasu – kowareru* ‘crush/ be
 17 crushed’, *nagasu – nagareru* ‘wash away/flow’, *ireru – hairu* ‘insert/enter’ (Hayatsu
 18 1989; Kageyama and Jacobsen [eds.] 2017). As shown by Cornyn and McDavid (1943)
 19 and Okell (1969: 205-208), Burmese also has a considerable number of morphologi-
 20 cally related transitive-intransitive pairs. Cornyn and McDavid list over 70 such pairs.
 21 In the case of Burmese, since there are cases like *chau?* ‘frighten’ and *cau?* ‘fear’ in
 22 which both are transitive, rather than referring to the pairs as transitive-intransitive,
 23 it would be more accurate to call the opposition “causative” versus “non-causative”.
 24 Some representative examples are given in Table 1.

25
 26 **Table 1:** Morphological pairs of causative and non-causative verbs in Burmese

Causative	(transitive)	Non-causative	(intransitive)
<i>châ</i>	‘drop’	<i>câ</i>	‘drop’
<i>chau?</i>	‘frighten’	<i>cau?</i>	‘fear, to be afraid’
<i>che?</i>	‘cook’	<i>ce?</i>	‘get cooked’
<i>chô</i>	‘bend, break (as a stick)’	<i>cô</i>	‘get bent’
<i>hlê</i>	‘knock down’	<i>lê</i>	‘fall down’
<i>hmyîn</i>	‘elevate’	<i>myîn</i>	‘high’
<i>hnô</i>	‘awaken’	<i>nô</i>	‘wake up’
<i>ka?</i>	‘attach, stick’	<i>ka?</i>	‘get attached’
<i>khau?</i>	‘fold’	<i>kau?</i>	‘get crooked’
<i>pei?</i>	‘close’	<i>pei?</i>	‘close’
<i>phwîn</i>	‘open’	<i>pwîn</i>	‘open’
<i>phyε?</i>	‘break’	<i>pyε?</i>	‘get broken’

39
 40 As shown in Table 1, the causative versus non-causative verb opposition is com-
 41 monly expressed by aspiration or non-aspiration of the initial consonant (e.g. /ch/
 42

1 vs. /c/, /kh/ vs. /k/) or by non-voicing versus voicing of the initial consonant (e.g.
2 /hl/ vs. /l/, /hm/ vs. /m/). However, there are also cases of both verbs taking the
3 same form, as in *kaʔ* ‘attach; be attached’ and *peiʔ* ‘close; close by itself’. In addition,
4 there are cases like *ɔ̀* ‘burn’/ *l̥aUN* ‘get burnt’, *ʔaʔ* ‘kill’ / *t̥è* ‘die’, and *hl̥an*
5 ‘dry’/ *chauʔ* ‘get dry’ in which the semantically contrasting verbs are realized in
6 morphologically unrelated forms. In all cases, however, the causative verbs all share
7 the characteristic of being volitional verbs while the non-causative verbs are all non-
8 volitional verbs.

9 It is possible to freely form sentences like (7) through (14) using the causative
10 and non-causative verbs pairs in Burmese. In the first clause of each of these exam-
11 ples, the causative verb indicates some specific action while the non-causative verb
12 of the second clause, uttered by the same speaker, denies achievement of the result-
13 ing state that the semantic structure of the causative verb should contain.² This
14 pattern is possible with no problems even in cases like *kaʔ* ‘attach, get attached’
15 where the causative and non-causative verbs share the same form.

16
17 (7) *mí ɔ̀=dè. d̥à=bèmê m̥ă-l̥aUN=bú.*
18 fire burn(vt)=REAL this=though NEG-burn(vi)=NEG
19 ‘(I) burnt (it), but (it) didn’t burn.’

20
21 (8) *t̥û=gò ʔaʔ=tè. d̥à=bèmê m̥ă-t̥è=bú.*
22 3sg=KO kill=REAL this=though NEG-die=NEG
23 ‘(I) killed him, but (he) didn’t die.’

24
25 (9) *ch̥â=dè. d̥à=bèmê m̥ă-c̥â=bú.*
26 drop(vt)=REAL this=though NEG-drop(vi)=NEG
27 ‘(I) dropped (the cup), but (it) didn’t drop.’

28
29 (10) *chó=dè. d̥à=bèmê m̥ă-có=bú.*
30 bend(vt)=REAL this=though NEG-bend(vi)=NEG
31 ‘(I) bent (a stick), but (it) didn’t bend.’

32
33 (11) *hl̥é=dè. d̥à=bèmê m̥ă-l̥é=bú.*
34 knock.down=REAL this=though NEG-fall.down=NEG
35 ‘(I) knocked down (the tree), but (it) didn’t fall down.’

36
37 (12) *phw̥in=dè. d̥à=bèmê m̥ă-phw̥in=bú.*
38 open(vt)=REAL this=though NEG-open(vi)=NEG
39 ‘(I) opened (the window), but (it) didn’t open.’

40
41 ² In Burmese, when the main clause verb is negated, the verb will be prefixed with *m̥ă-* and be
42 followed by the clitic *=phú/=bú*.

1 (13) *phyεʔ=tê. dâ=bêmê mǎ-pyεʔ=phú.*
 2 destroy=REAL this=though NEG-break(vi)=NEG
 3 ‘(I) destroyed (the machine), but (it) didn’t get destroyed.’

4
 5 (14) *kaʔ=tê. dâ=bêmê mǎ-kaʔ=phú.*
 6 attach=REAL this=though NEG-attached=NEG
 7 ‘(I) attached (the sticker), but (it) didn’t get attached.’

8
 9 What should be noted here is that this sort of statement negating achievement of a
 10 resulting state is indisputably acceptable for any speaker. This contrasts with the
 11 case of the relevant phenomenon in Japanese, to be described in the next section,
 12 for which the degree of acceptability varies depending both on the speaker and on
 13 the particular verb. On this point, Japanese and Burmese differ greatly.

3 Result cancellation in Japanese

14
 15
 16
 17
 18 The phenomenon of cancellation of the resulting state of accomplishment verbs
 19 in Japanese was pointed out by Ikegami (1981, 1985) and has also been discussed
 20 by Miyajima (1985), Kageyama (1996), Alam Sasaki (2001)³, Tsujimura (2003). Sato
 21 (2005), Ezure (2006), and Aoki and Nakatani (2013a, b), among others.

22 Besides *moyasu* ‘burn (vt)’ – *moeru* ‘burn (vi)’ in example (4) above, Ikegami
 23 (1981: 266) also gave examples using verbs like *wakasu* ‘boil (vt)’ – *waku* ‘boil (vi)’,
 24 and *ukaberu* ‘float (vt)’ – *ukabu* ‘float (vi)’.

25
 26 (15) *Wakasi-ta keredo, wak-anakat-ta.*
 27 boil (vt)-PST although boil (vi)-NEG-PST
 28 ‘(I) boiled (it), but (it) didn’t boil.’

29
 30 (16) *Hune o ukabe-ta keredo, ukab-anakat-ta.*
 31 boat ACC float (vt)-PST although float (vi)-NEG-PST
 32 ‘(I) floated the boat, but (it) didn’t float.’

33
 34 As Ikegami (1981:266) points out, the English equivalents to these sentences are
 35 unacceptable.

36
 37
 38 ³ Alam Sasaki (2001) discussed the negatability of the result using sentences including the pattern
 39 *~te mo ... ~nakatta* [~GER even ... ~NEG.PST] ‘Even though (I) ~ed, (it) didn’t ~’ as in, for example,
 40 *Moyasite mo moenakatta* ‘Even though (I) burned (it), (it) didn’t burn.’ Since the inflectional ending
 41 *-te* (the so-called “conjunctive form”) does not necessarily entail the completion of an event, the
 42 pattern *~te mo ... ~nakatta* should not be used as a test of negatability of the result.

- 1 (17) a. *I burned it, but it didn't burn.
 2 b. *I boiled it, but it didn't boil.
 3 c. *I floated the boat, but it didn't float.
 4

5 Ikegami also provides (18) with *korosu* 'kill' as an example in which cancellation of a
 6 result is not acceptable. It was already shown in (1) in the introduction that the
 7 English equivalent is also unacceptable.
 8

- 9 (18) **Kare o korosi-ta keredo, sin-anakat-ta.*
 10 he ACC kill-PST although die-NEG-PST
 11 Lit. '(I) killed him, but (he) didn't die.'
 12

13 According to the observations in Ikegami (1981), the possibility of result cancellation
 14 being acceptable is generally higher in Japanese compared to English.
 15

16 A variety of theoretical analyses have been presented regarding the reasons this
 17 kind of result cancellation is possible in Japanese and conditions under which it
 18 occurs. Kageyama (1996: 275–291) explains the phenomenon by means of the Lexical
 19 Conceptual Structure of accomplishment verbs. Accomplishment verbs like *korosu*
 20 'kill' or *moyasu* 'burn (vt)', can be represented with the LCS shown in (19). Here,
 21 ACT ON corresponds to the causing activity part. CAUSE shows that the event on
 22 the right is brought about by that activity. BE AT shows the final state.
 23

- 24 (19) ACTIVITY —————> CHANGE ———> RESULT
 25 [x ACT ON y] CAUSE [y BECOME [y BE AT-z]]
 26

27 Presenting the figure in (20) Kageyama proposed to account for the differences
 28 between English, Japanese, and Chinese as follows: In English, the vantage point is
 29 at the ACT ON, that is, at the activity. In Japanese, the vantage point is at the
 30 BECOME and in Chinese it is placed at the BE AT. In the figure, the “•” shows the
 31 positioning of the vantage point.
 32

- 33 (20) Viewpoints and language types (Kageyama 1996)
 34 [x ACT ON y] CAUSE [y BECOME [y BE AT-z]]
 35 English • —————>
 36 Japanese <————— • —————>
 37 Chinese <————— •

38 According to Kageyama (1996), the reason why denying a result is difficult in English
 39 but possible in Japanese is due to the difference in vantage point. In a language like
 40 English that places the vantage point with the activity, the result is visible from the
 41 activity and negation of the result is impossible. On the other hand, in Japanese,
 42

1 since the view point is placed on the resulting event, the result is not visible from
 2 the activity. This he claims, is why the phenomenon is possible. In Chinese, since
 3 the vantage point is further to the right than in Japanese, negation of the result is
 4 easier than in Japanese.

5 Tsujimura (2003) argued that Japanese lexical causative verbs were under-
 6 specified for telicity and that the telic interpretation arises through conversational
 7 implicature. According to her, since the result realization is an implicature, the
 8 result can be denied.

9 Sato (2005:99–113) argued that when a verb that includes both an activity and
 10 a result in semantic structure expresses only the activity through the operation of
 11 metonymy, this phenomenon becomes possible. Ezure (2006) claims that this phenom-
 12 enon becomes possible when the activity part of an accomplishment undergoes a
 13 focusing operation. Furthermore, Aoki and Nakatani (2013a, b) reject Tsujimura's
 14 theory that Japanese lexical causative verbs are underspecified for telicity and claim
 15 that the strength of the process component in the semantics of the verb increases the
 16 acceptability of result cancellation.

17 Whatever the reason this phenomenon is possible in Japanese may be, there is
 18 one important thing to keep in mind. That is the fact that the acceptability of cancel-
 19 lation of the result of an accomplishment verb varies greatly by depending on the
 20 speaker. This problem is taken up in the next section.

23 **4 Various factors making result cancellation** 24 **possible**

25 This section will attempt to clarify the character of the phenomenon by which
 26 the result of an accomplishment verb can be cancelled by comparing Japanese and
 27 Burmese.
 28
 29

31 **4.1 Speakers who do not allow result cancellation**

32 In contrast to Burmese, in which result cancellation is possible with no problem, as
 33 shown in (7) through (14), there are many speakers who do not allow result cancella-
 34 tion in Japanese. Miyajima (1985) conducted an extremely important survey regarding
 35 this phenomenon. He presented 19 sentences including result cancellation to speakers
 36 and had them rate the acceptability of the sentences on a three-point scale: “Natural”,
 37 “Somewhat unnatural but usable”, and “Completely unnatural”. Below are two of
 38 the sentences used in Miyajima's survey.
 39
 40
 41
 42

1 (21) *Kinoeda o moyasi-ta keredo, moe-nakat-ta.*
 2 branch ACC burn(vt)-PST although burn(vi)-NEG-PST
 3 ‘(I) burned a branch, but (it) didn’t burn.’

5 (22) *Taroo wa Ziroo o korosi-ta keredo, Ziroo wa sin-anakat-ta.*
 6 Taro TOP Jiro ACC kill-PST although Jiro TOP die-NEG-PST
 7 ‘Taro killed Jiro, but Jiro didn’t die.’

9 According to Miyajima (1985), of the 100 people in his Group A, 30 rated (21) as
 10 “Natural”, 48 as “Somewhat unnatural but usable”, and 22 rated it as “Completely
 11 unnatural”. On the other hand, (22) was rated “Natural” by 7 people, “Somewhat
 12 unnatural but usable” by 18 people and “Completely unnatural” by 75 people. That
 13 is, regarding sentence (21), which is similar to the example (4) that Ikegami (1985)
 14 considered acceptable, 70 people out of 100 felt the sentence to be unnatural to a
 15 greater or lesser degree. Conversely, sentence (22), which is similar to the unaccept-
 16 able (18), was judged to be “usable” by 25 out of 100 people.

17 That is to say, whether this phenomenon is acceptable or not varies greatly
 18 by speaker. Moreover, there are always some speakers who consider the sentence
 19 to be unacceptable no matter what verb is used. The sentence judged “Completely
 20 unacceptable” by the most speakers was (22). Even the sentence that had the fewest
 21 “Completely unacceptable” ratings, given as (23) below, and which was rated
 22 “Natural” by 65 people and “Somewhat unnatural but usable” by 24 people, still
 23 had 11 people rate it as “Completely unnatural”.

25 (23) *Suika o hiyasi-ta keredo, tumetaku nar-anakat-ta.*
 26 watermelon ACC cool(vt)-PST although cool become-NEG-PST
 27 ‘(I) cooled a watermelon, but (it) didn’t become cool.’

29 The situation in Japanese shows a striking contrast with that in Burmese in which (7)
 30 through (14) were considered acceptable by all speakers. Accordingly, this phenom-
 31 enon should not be thought of in Japanese in terms of a binary choice of acceptable
 32 or not acceptable. Rather, the phenomenon must be treated by taking each sentence
 33 as being of a higher or lower degree of acceptability. In order to find the reasons
 34 for the difference in acceptability in Burmese and Japanese, it is necessary to look
 35 closely at differences in the semantics of the two languages.

38 4.2 Semantic differences between result cancellation in 39 Burmese and in Japanese

41 First, compare Burmese (3) and Japanese (22), both of which use the verb for ‘kill’.
 42 Sentence (3), *ḡū māhlā=gò ṭaʔ=tê. dà=bèmê māhlā mǎ-ṭê=bú* ‘He killed Ma Hla. But

1 Ma Hla didn't die', is usable to express the following situations: (A) "He intended to
 2 kill Ma Hla and stabbed Ma Hla with a knife. However, she did not die." Or it can
 3 even be used to express a situation in which the action did not reach the target: (B)
 4 "He intended to kill Ma Hla and tried to stab her with a knife. However, since the
 5 knife he stabbed at her with did not reach Ma Hla, she did not die." On the other
 6 hand, most of the speakers who considered (22), *Taroo wa Ziroom o korosi-ta keredo*,
 7 *Ziroom wa sin-anakat-ta* 'Taro killed Jiro, but Jiro didn't die', natural were probably
 8 thinking of a situation like, for example, the following: (C) "Taro intended to kill
 9 Jiro and stabbed Jiro with a knife. Since Jiro lay motionless, Taro thought Jiro had
 10 died. However, Jiro's life was miraculously saved."

11 The difference between Burmese and Japanese is clear here. In the case of
 12 Burmese, the actor knows that Ma Hla is not dead. In the Japanese case, however,
 13 cancellation is possible in the case where the actor believes the patient to be dead.
 14 The reason the majority of people consider (22) unnatural can be thought to be that
 15 it is difficult for a situation to arise in which one who can be thought to have died
 16 comes back to life. The Burmese example (3) can also be used to express situation
 17 (C), but the important point is that it can also be used to express situations (A) and (B).

18 Next, compare Burmese (7) and Japanese (21), both of which use verbs meaning
 19 'burn'. (7), *mí cō=dê. dā=bēmê mǎ-lāun=bú* '(I) burnt (it), but (it) didn't burn', can be
 20 used to express the following situation: (D) "I lit a match, intending to burn a tree
 21 branch. I applied the flame to the branch, but because the branch was wet, it did not
 22 burn at all." Or, it can be used for (E) "I lit a match intending to burn a tree branch. I
 23 applied the flame to the branch, but the wind blew and the flame went out, so the
 24 branch didn't burn."

25 In contrast, speakers who judged (21) acceptable were probably thinking of
 26 a situation like: (F) "I lit the tree branch on fire. The branch burned a little, but
 27 the wind blew up and the fire went out. Therefore, the branch did not burn up
 28 completely."

29 The difference between Burmese and Japanese is clear in this case as well. In the
 30 situations described by Burmese (7), the tree branch did not catch fire right from the
 31 start. Japanese (21), however, expresses a situation in which the branch partially
 32 burned but did not burn up completely. People who could think of such a situation
 33 probably felt (21) to be natural. Since the event of "burning partially" and the event
 34 of "burning up completely" are different events, denying the latter does not mean
 35 denying the former. Burmese (7) can also express the situation in (F), but the fact
 36 that it can express (D) and (E) is what is important.

37

38

39 4.3 Incomplete realization of the result

40

41 In Section 4.2, it was observed that, in contrast to Burmese accomplishment verbs
 42 for which a reading was possible in which the change event has not taken place at

all, in Japanese, the change event has arisen and the result of the change is in an incomplete form. This is a big difference between Japanese and Burmese. Let us try looking more closely at Japanese, based on this difference.

The survey in Miyajima (1985) is suggestive with regard to this phenomenon. Based on the survey described earlier, Miyajima assigned points measuring the acceptability of result cancellation depending on the verb. He assigned 1 point for a “Natural” response, 0.5 points for a “Somewhat unnatural but usable” response, and 0 points for a “Completely unnatural” response and calculated a score for each verb, with 100 points as the highest possible total. The results are given below. Verbs in Miyajima’s sample that cannot be considered accomplishment verbs have been omitted.

(24) *korosu* ‘kill’ (17.0), *otosu* ‘drop’ (22.0), *kowasu* ‘break’ (24.0), *nuku* ‘pull out’ (26.5), *akeru* ‘open’ (31.5), *wakasu* ‘boil’ (34.5), *hirogeru* ‘widen’ (36.0), *ireru* ‘put in’ (45.3), *ugokasu* ‘move’ (46.0), *yowameru* ‘weaken’ (46.0), *moyasu* ‘burn’ (53.0), *kawakasu* ‘dry’ (56.5), *hiyasu* ‘cool’ (66.0)

Dividing the results in (24) into 10 point groups, gives the table in (25).

(25)

10–19	20–29	30–39	40–49	50–59	60–
<i>korosu</i> ‘kill’	<i>nuku</i> ‘pull out’, <i>kowasu</i> ‘break’, <i>otosu</i> ‘drop’	<i>hirogeru</i> ‘widen’, <i>wakasu</i> ‘boil’, <i>akeru</i> ‘open’	<i>yowameru</i> ‘weaken’, <i>ugokasu</i> ‘move’, <i>ireru</i> ‘put in’	<i>kawakasu</i> ‘dry’, <i>moyasu</i> ‘burn’	<i>hiyasu</i> ‘cool’

The verbs on the right, *hiyasu* ‘to cool’, *kawakasu* ‘dry’, *moyasu* ‘burn’ have results that have a scalar structure (See Hay, Kennedy and Levin 1999; Kennedy and McNally 1999, 2005; and Tsujimura 2001 concerning “scalar structure”). Taking *hiyasu* ‘to cool’ as an example, the result contained in its semantic structure, “a cooled state”, can have different levels, such as “very cool” or “less cool”. For that reason, the “cooled state” can have a temporal span and one can say, for example, *gohunkan hiyasita* ‘(I) cooled (it) for five minutes.’ The verbs *kawakasu* ‘dry’ and *moyasu* ‘burn’ are the same: *gohunkan kawakasita* ‘(I) dried (it) for five minutes’; *gohunkan moyasita* ‘(I) burned (it) for five minutes.’

On the other hand, the verbs on the left side, *korosu* ‘kill’, *otosu* ‘drop’, *kowasu* ‘break’, and *nuku* ‘pull out’, for example, do not have a scalar structure. For example, the “state of being dead” does not have stages of “very dead” or “less dead”. Because of this characteristic, the “state of being dead” cannot have a temporal span and one cannot say **gohunkan korosita* ‘(I) killed (him) for five minutes.’ The verbs *otosu* ‘drop’, *kowasu* ‘break’, and *nuku* ‘pull out’ are the same: **gohunkan otosita* ‘(I) dropped (it)

1 for five minutes'; **gohunkan kowasita* '(I) broke (it) for five minutes'; **gohunkan*
2 *nuita* '(I) pulled (it) out for five minutes.'

3 When a result shown by a verb has a scalar structure, it is easy for a speaker to
4 imagine a situation in which the level of the result actually achieved does not reach
5 the level expected. If achieving the expected level is termed "complete realization"
6 and not achieving that level is "incomplete realization", it is easy to imagine in the
7 case of a scalar structure that a "complete realization" not being achieved and the
8 activity ending with an "incomplete realization". On the other hand, if the event
9 does not have a scalar structure, there is only one result and it is difficult for a
10 speaker to imagine both a "complete realization" and an "incomplete realization".
11 As a result, we can probably say that when it is easy to get an interpretation of
12 "X happened incompletely, but X did not happen completely", it is easy to accept
13 result cancellation. Since "X happened completely" does not imply "X happened
14 incompletely", no contradiction arises in negating "X happened completely". That a
15 reading of incomplete realization is involved in the acceptability of result cancella-
16 tion has not been pointed out in previous research.

17 There are certainly speakers of Japanese who, like Burmese speakers, upon
18 hearing the sentences of (21) and (22), think of a situation in which the event does
19 not happen at all. However, that such speakers are a minority is shown by the fact
20 that in Miyajima's survey there were not many who judged the sentences "Natural".
21 The preceding discussion can be summarized as follows: Since a result is realized,
22 even though it may be an "incomplete realization", for many Japanese speakers, an
23 accomplishment verb entails a result.

24

25

26 4.4 Result defocusing by adverbial elements

27

28 As seen in Section 4.3, an "incomplete realization of the result" interpretation in-
29 creases the acceptability of result cancellation in Japanese. However, there are times
30 when Japanese speakers express a situation in which no result arises at all, just as in
31 Burmese. These are cases in which adverbial elements appear modifying the verb.

32 According to the results of the survey in Miyajima (1985), (27), which includes
33 the adverb *issyokenmei* 'as hard as (I) can', is more acceptable than (26), which
34 does not. (26) was judged "Natural" by 11 people, "Somewhat unnatural but usable"
35 by 22, and "Completely unnatural" by 66 people, but (27) was judged "Natural" by 31,
36 "Somewhat unnatural but usable" by 36, and "Completely unnatural" by 33, show-
37 ing an increase in the number of "Natural" and "Somewhat unnatural but usable"
38 judgments.

39

- 40 (26) *Kakinomi o otosi-ta keredo, oti-nakat-ta.*
41 persimmon ACC drop(vt)-PST although drop(vi)-NEG-PST
42 (I) dropped the persimmon, but (it) didn't drop.'

1 (27) *Issyookenmei kakinomi o otosi-ta keredo oti-nakat-ta.*
 2 very.hard persimmon ACC drop(vt)-PST although drop(vi)-NEG-PST
 3 ‘(I) dropped the persimmon very hard, but (it) didn’t drop.’

4
 5 Since it is difficult to think of the event expressed by *otiru* ‘fall’ as occurring incom-
 6 pletely, it is difficult to explain the improved acceptability of (27) from the point of
 7 view of incomplete realization of the result. Miyajima (1985) considers the cause to
 8 be placement by the adverb *issyookenmei* of focus on the action. I would also like
 9 to consider this to be the cause. Since *issyookenmei* is an adverb that semantically
 10 only modifies the activity portion, it places focus on the action. The result portion is
 11 probably defocused as a result. Other adverbial elements that cause defocusing of
 12 the result include, in addition to *issyookenmei* ‘as hard as (I) can’, *kossori* ‘stealthily’,
 13 *osoruosoru* ‘timidly’, *sinken ni* ‘earnestly’, *isoide* ‘quickly’, and *tikara o komete* ‘putting
 14 one’s strength into’.

15 However, the fact cannot be ignored that on Miyajima’s survey over 30% of
 16 those surveyed judged (27) to be “Completely unnatural”. Accordingly, as a factor
 17 increasing the acceptability of result cancellation, “defocusing of the result by an
 18 adverbial element” is weaker than “incomplete realization of the result”. In addition,
 19 the appearance of an element, the adverbial element, other than the verb is needed.
 20 “Defocusing of the result by an adverbial element” can, therefore, be considered a
 21 secondary factor. The primary factor increasing the acceptability of result cancella-
 22 tion should be considered to be “incomplete realization of the result”.

24 4.5 Validity of previous research

25 The arguments of Sections 4.3 and 4.4 indicated that it is necessary to recognize two
 26 factors that increase the acceptability of result cancellation in Japanese: (i) an
 27 incomplete result realization interpretation, and (ii) defocusing of the result by an
 28 adverbial element. Of these, (i) is the primary factor. The difference between English
 29 and Japanese pointed out in Ikegami (1981, 1985) can be reduced to the fact that in
 30 Japanese there are conditions like (i) and (ii) that increase the acceptability of result
 31 cancellation while there are no such conditions in English.

32 Let us consider here the validity of previous research concerning factors that
 33 make result cancellation possible in Japanese. Kageyama (1996) held that it is because
 34 in Japanese the vantage point was placed with BECOME in Lexical Conceptual Struc-
 35 ture in contrast to English where it is placed with ACT ON that the acceptability of
 36 result cancellation is higher. However, this alone cannot explain the fact that accept-
 37 ability varies depending on the verb. Tsujimura (2003) says that Japanese lexical
 38 causative verbs are underspecified for telicity. However, since, as described above,
 39 for many Japanese speakers accomplishment verbs entail a result, this explanation
 40
 41
 42

1 is invalid. The metonymy explanation in Sato (2005:99–113) and the focusing operation explanation of Ezure (2006) are related to the result defocusing described above, but these cannot explain the variability in acceptability depending on the verb found in the survey data from Miyajima (1985) and shown in the table in (25). Aoki and Nakatani (2013a, b) attempt to explain the phenomenon using the strength of the processing component. In other words, this is an attempt to explain the phenomenon by the strength of the activity portion of an accomplishment verb, but, as argued in Section 4.4, the question of the acceptability of result cancellation should rather be explained with attention to the result portion.

10 Most of previous research attempted to explain the acceptability of result cancellation in Japanese from a single point of view. However, (i) is a factor that bears on the semantics of the result portion and (ii) is a factor that reduces the prominence of the result itself, so it is probably impossible to combine these two into a single point of view.

17 5 Intended results

19 The results expressed by accomplishment verbs in Burmese can always be cancelled. It could perhaps be thought that Burmese simply lacks accomplishment verbs and that what appear to be accomplishment verbs are actually activity verbs. However, I believe that there are accomplishment verbs in Burmese. The first reason for this belief is that, if a sentence like (28) below is not followed by a sentence cancelling the result, the sentence is interpreted as meaning “he is dead”.

26 (28) *t̚u=gò t̚aʔ=tê.*
 27 3sg=KO kill=REAL
 28 ‘(I) killed him.’

30 Secondly, if the existence of accomplishment verbs is not recognized, it becomes impossible to explain why (29) is completely acceptable but (30) is less so.

33 (29) *t̚aʔ=phô t̚nàyi c̚à=dê.*
 34 kill=to one.hour last=REAL
 35 ‘It took one hour to kill (him).’

37 (30) *?pyé=bô t̚nàyi c̚à=dê.*
 38 run=to one.hour last=REAL
 39 Literal translation: ‘It took one hour to run.’

41 The difference in acceptability between (29) and (30) can be attributed to the fact
 42 that *t̚aʔ* ‘kill’ is an accomplishment verb and *pyé* ‘run’ an activity verb. Therefore,

1 Burmese must be considered to have accomplishment verbs including a result part
2 in their lexical semantic structure.

3 Then, how should the fact that Burmese accomplishment verbs allow result
4 cancellation be explained? The author believes that the result of accomplishment
5 verbs in Burmese should be included in the lexical semantic structure as “what is
6 intended by the actor”. Since the result is completely something the actor intends
7 and is something that is in the actor’s mind, it can be cancelled. The fact that, in
8 the absence of a following cancellation clause, (28) is interpreted as meaning “he is
9 dead” is probably a pragmatic interpretation. The reasons for considering this to be
10 a pragmatic rather than semantic problem are described below.

11 In order to clearly show the result of a causative action in Burmese, sentences
12 using the subordinate clause marker =*ʔaun* ‘until; so as to’ like the following are
13 commonly used.

- 14
15 (31) *t̃u=gò t̃è=ʔaun t̃aʔ=t̃è.*
16 3sg=KO die=until kill=REAL
17 Literal translation: ‘(I) killed him until (he) died.’
18 Free translation: ‘(I) killed him.’

- 19
20 (32) *câ=ʔaun châ=d̃è.*
21 drop(vi)=until drop(vt)=REAL
22 Literal translation: ‘(I) dropped (it) until (it) dropped.’
23 Free translation: ‘(I) dropped (it).’

- 24
25 (33) *pyeʔ=ʔaun phyeʔ=t̃è.*
26 break(vi)=until break(vt)=REAL
27 Literal translation: ‘(I) broke (it) so that (it) broke.’
28 Free translation: ‘(I) broke (it).’

29
30 These may appear somewhat odd. Taking (31) as an example, since the actor carries
31 out an activity with the presumption of the result “(he) is dead’, it could be thought
32 that there is no need to use a subordinate clause to express “until (he) died”. That
33 is, the sentence appears to be a tautology. However, this expression is natural in
34 Burmese.

35 What is important is that, if one cancels the results of (31) through (33), as in
36 (34), the acceptability decreases.

- 37
38 (34) **t̃u=gò t̃è=ʔaun t̃aʔ=t̃è. d̃à=b̃èmə m̃ă-t̃è=b̃ú.*
39 3sg=KO die=until kill=REAL this=though NEG-die=NEG
40 Lit. ‘(I) killed him until (he) died. But (he) didn’t die.’

41
42 That is, the result is entailed with addition of the subordinate clause formed with
=*ʔaun*. This fact is evidence that the subordinate clause is used to show that the

1 intended result is actually realized. Since Burmese accomplishment verbs do not
 2 entail their result, a subordinate clause formed with =*ʔàuv* is used when the speaker
 3 wishes to clearly state that the result occurred. If Burmese accomplishment verbs
 4 semantically entailed their results, a construction like this would probably not be
 5 necessary.

6 Tai (1984: 291) points out that, in a resultative expression in Chinese like *shā-sǐ*
 7 (kill-die) ‘kill’, the resultative complement (*sǐ* ‘die’ in this example) has the function
 8 of showing that the result was realized. Burmese does not have serial verb construc-
 9 tions with a causative meaning like *shā-sǐ* formed on the pattern “transitive verb +
 10 intransitive verb”. This is due to the fact that, as pointed out in Sawada (1988), the
 11 verbs in a serial verb construction in Burmese must share a common subject argu-
 12 ment. An example like the following is therefore ungrammatical (See Vittrant 2006
 13 regarding general characteristics of Burmese serial verb constructions).

- 14
 15 (35) **t̚ú=gò t̚aʔ t̚è=dè.*
 16 3sg=KO kill die=REAL
 17 Intended meaning: ‘(I) killed him.’

18
 19 In the sense that they entail the result, the subordinate clauses formed with =*ʔàuv*
 20 in (31) through (33) can be said to have the same kind of function as resultative
 21 complements in Chinese. Although they use different means, both languages have
 22 constructions to clearly show the realization of results.

23 Recall here the proposal in Tsujimura (2003) for Japanese. Tsujimura proposed
 24 that lexical causative verbs in Japanese are underspecified for telicity and that a
 25 telic interpretation results from conversational implicature. This explanation can be
 26 thought to apply, not to Japanese, but to Burmese. As argued in Section 4.3, since
 27 many Japanese speakers find accomplishment verbs to entail results, it is difficult
 28 to consider them to be underspecified for telicity.

31 6 Conclusion

32
 33 Burmese is a language in which the cancellation of accomplishment verb results is
 34 completely acceptable. It is safe to say that there are no speakers who do not allow
 35 result cancellation. On the other hand, there are many speakers of Japanese who do
 36 not allow result cancellation in Japanese and Japanese and Burmese differ greatly
 37 on this point.

38 Since the result of an accomplishment verb is not entailed in Burmese, cancella-
 39 tion is allowed. The reason that results are not entailed in Burmese is that the results
 40 expressed by the verb are ones that are intended by the actor. I would like to leave
 41 the problem of how the intended result of an accomplishment verb in Burmese
 42

1 should be represented in semantic structure for researchers working in the various
 2 linguistic theories. In Japanese, on the other hand, the results of accomplishment
 3 verbs should basically be considered to be entailed. For precisely this reason, quite
 4 a few speakers do not allow cancellation of results. However, acceptability of cancel-
 5 lation does increase under the influence of some factors. The two factors are: (i) an
 6 interpretation of incomplete realization of the result, and (ii) defocusing of the result
 7 by adverbial elements. Of these, (i) is the primary factor. The results of accomplish-
 8 ment verbs are entailed in English as in Japanese, but English lacks conditions like
 9 (i) and (ii).

10 Finally, I would like to mention other languages. The phenomenon of result
 11 cancellation discussed above has been reported in such languages as Chinese (Tai
 12 1984), Hindi (Singh 1991), Tamil (Talmy 1991), and Mon (Jenny 2005), in addition
 13 to Burmese and Japanese. According to the observations in Kato (1996), result
 14 cancellation is also possible in Pwo Karen, a language neighboring Burmese, as
 15 shown in (36)

- 16
 17 (36) *jə mà θi ʔəwê. lānānθi θi ʔé.*
 18 1sg CAUS die 3sg but die not
 19 ‘I killed him. But he didn’t die.’
 20

21 According to Phan Thi My Loan (p.c.), result cancellation is also possible in
 22 Vietnamese, as shown in (37).

- 23
 24 (37) *Tôi đã giết nó. Nhưng nó chưa chết.*
 25 1sg PST kill 3sg but 3sg not.yet die
 26 ‘I killed him. But he hasn’t died.’
 27

28 On the other hand, according to Marasri Miyamoto (p.c.), Thai does not allow result
 29 cancellation, as shown below.

- 30
 31 (38) **phǒm khâa khâw. tɛɛ khâw mây taay.*
 32 1sg kill 3sg but 3sg not die
 33 Intended meaning: ‘I killed him. But he didn’t die.’
 34

35 However, Thepkanjana and Uehara (2009: 605; 2010: 299) point out that result
 36 cancellation is possible in Thai in a serial verb construction, as shown below.⁴

- 37
 38 (39) *tamrùat khâa phûuráay mây taay.*
 39 police kill criminal not die
 40 ‘The police tried to kill the criminal but he/she was not dead.’
 41

42 ⁴ Marasri Miyamoto (p.c.) reports finding this sentence of low acceptability. There appears to be some individual variation in acceptability judgments.

1 The phenomenon of result cancellation with accomplishment verbs appears to be
 2 widely distributed among the languages of East Asia, Southeast Asia, and South
 3 Asia. I would like to suggest, therefore, that this may be an areal feature. However,
 4 as indicated in this chapter, the actual situation expressed by result cancellation
 5 may vary depending on the language. I would like to emphasize, then, that it is not
 6 simply whether or not this phenomenon exists, but attention must also be paid to
 7 semantic differences.

10 Acknowledgments

12 This chapter was translated from Japanese by John Haig. I thank U Shwe Pyi Soe,
 13 Daw Htet Htet, and Ma Thu Thu Nwe Aye who helped me as native speakers of
 14 Burmese by judging the acceptability of Burmese sentences. Thanks are also due
 15 to the two editors of this volume as well as to an anonymous reviewer for helpful
 16 comments to improve the draft.

20 Additional abbreviations

22 KA – case particle =*kâ*/*=gâ* ‘agent (subject)/source’; KO – case particle =*kô*/*=gô*
 23 ‘patient/theme/recipient/goal’; LO – subordinate clause marker =*lô*; PI – particle
 24 =*pi*/*=bi* indicating a perfect-like meaning; PN – personal name; vi – intransitive
 25 verb; vt – transitive verb; 1sg – first person singular; 3sg – third person singular

28 References

- 30 Alam Sasaki, Yukiko. 2001. “Moyashita keredo moenakatta” no wa naze?: “Yowai tasseidōshi” to
 31 “tsuyoi” tasseidōshi. In Masahiko Minami and Yukiko Alam Sasaki (eds.), *Gengogaku to nihon-*
 32 *gokyōiku II* [Linguistics and Japanese language teaching II], 57–74. Tokyo: Kurosio Publishers.
- 33 Aoki, Natsuno and Kentaro Nakatani. 2013a. Process, telicity, and event cancellability in Japanese: a
 34 questionnaire study. *Papers from the Thirtieth Conference November 10–11, 2012 and from the*
 35 *Fifth International Spring Forum April 21–22, 2012 of the English Linguistic Society of Japan*,
 257–263.
- 36 Aoki, Natsuno and Kentaro Nakatani. 2013b. Jishō kyanseru kanōsei ni suite no shitsumonshi
 37 chōsa: sono shōsai dēta [A questionnaire study on event cancellability: its data in detail].
 38 *Kōnandaigaku Kiyō Bungakuhen* (The Journal of Konan University: Faculty of Letters) 163. 41–57.
- 39 Cornyn William S. and Raven I. McDavid, Jr. 1943. Causatives in Burmese. *Studies in Linguistics*
 1(18). 1–6.
- 40 Ezure, Kazuaki. 2006. “Moyashitemo moenakatta”: jishō mukōka ni kansuru nichieigo taishōkenkyū
 41 [A comparative study of event cancellation in English and Japanese]. *Kanagawakenritsu Gaigo-*
 42 *tankidaigaku Kiyō Sōgōhen* (Bulletin of Kanagawa Prefectural College of Foreign Studies) 29.
 23–36.

- 1 Hay, Jennifer, Christopher Kennedy, and Beth Levin. 1999. Scalar structure underlies telicity in
2 “degree achievements”. In Tanya Mathews and Devon Strolovitch (eds.), *Proceedings of Seman-*
3 *tics and Linguistic Theory (SALT) 9*, 127–144. Ithaca, NY: CLC Publications.
- 4 Hayatsu, Emiko. 1989. Yūtsui tadōshi to mutsui tadōshi no chigai ni tsuite: imiteki na tokuchō o
5 chūshin ni [On the semantic difference between paired and unpaired transitive verbs in Japanese].
6 *Gengo Kenkyū* (Journal of the Linguistic Society of Japan) 95. 231–256.
- 7 Ikegami, Yoshihiko. 1981. “*Suru*” to “*naru*” no *gengogaku*: *Gengo to bunka no taiporōji e no shiron*.
8 Tokyo: Taishukan Shoten.
- 9 Ikegami, Yoshihiko. 1985. ‘Activity’ – ‘accomplishment’ – ‘achievement’ – A language that can’t
10 say ‘I burned it, but it didn’t burn’ and one that can. In Adam Makkai and Alan K. Melby
11 (eds.), *Linguistics and philosophy: Essays in honor of Rulon S. Wells*, 265–304. Amsterdam:
12 John Benjamins.
- 13 Jenny, Mathias. 2005. *The verb system of Mon*. Zurich: Arbeiten des Seminars für Allgemeine
14 Sprachwissenschaft.
- 15 Kageyama, Taro. 1996. *Dōshi imiron: Gengo to ninchi no setten* [Verb semantics: The interface of
16 language and cognition]. Tokyo: Kuroshio Publishers.
- 17 Kageyama, Taro and Wesley M. Jacobsen (eds.). 2017. *Transitivity and valency alternations: Studies*
18 *on Japanese and beyond*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- 19 Kato, Atsuhiko. 1996. Pōkarengo (tōbu hōgen) no dōshirenzoku ni okeru shudōshi ni tsuite [On head
20 verbs of serial verb constructions in Pwo Karen]. *Gengo Kenkyū* (Journal of the Linguistic Society
21 of Japan) 113. 31–61.
- 22 Kato, Atsuhiko. 2010. Birumago no ‘ue’ o arawasu meishi no kōchishiteki yōhō ni tsuite [On the
23 postposition-like usage of a Burmese noun that means ‘on’]. *Journal of the Research Institute*
24 *for World Languages, Osaka University* 4. 31–54.
- 25 Kato, Atsuhiko. 2015. Birumago no jishōkyanseru [Event cancellation in Burmese]. *EX ORIENTE* 22. 1–
26 36. Osaka University.
- 27 Kennedy, Christopher and Louise McNally. 1999. From event structure to scale structure: Degree
28 modification in deverbal adjectives. In Tanya Mathews and Devon Strolovitch (eds.), *Proceed-*
29 *ings of Semantics and Linguistic Theory (SALT) 9*, 163–180. Ithaca, NY: CLC Publications.
- 30 Kennedy, Christopher and Luise McNally. 2005. Scale structure, degree modification, and the
31 semantics of gradable predicates. *Language* 81(2). 345–381.
- 32 Liu, Ch’i-wen. 2006. *Chūgokugo no asupekuto to modariti*. Osaka: Osakadaigaku Shuppan.
- 33 Miyajima, Tatsuo. 1985. “Doa o aketa ga, akanakatta”: dōshi no imi ni okeru <kekkaei>. *Keiryō*
34 *Kokugogaku* [Mathematical Linguistics] 14(8). 335–353.
- 35 Okell, John. 1969. *A reference grammar of colloquial Burmese*. London: Oxford University Press.
- 36 Satō, Takuzō. 2005. *Jidōshibun to tadōshibun no imiron*. Tokyo: Kasama Shoin.
- 37 Sawada, Hideo. 1988. Gendai Birumago ni okeru dōshihairetsu no ruikai ni tsuite. *Gengogaku*
38 *Kenkyū* 7. 73–110. Kyoto University.
- 39 Singh, Mona. 1991. The perfective paradox: or how to eat your cake and have it too. *Proceedings of*
40 *the Seventeenth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 469–479.
- 41 Tai, James H-Y. 1984. Verbs and times in Chinese: Vendler’s four categories. *Papers from the Para-*
42 *session on Lexical Semantics, Chicago Linguistic Society*, 289–296. Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Talmy, Leonard. 1991. Path to realization: A typology of event conflation. *Proceedings of the*
Seventeenth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society, 480–519. Berkeley Linguistics
Society.
- Thepkanjana, Kingkarn and Satoshi Uehara. 2009. Resultative constructions with “implied-result”
and “entailed-result” verbs in Thai and English: a contrastive study. *Linguistics* 47(3). 589–618.
- Thepkanjana, Kingkarn and Satoshi Uehara. 2010. Syntactic and semantic discrepancies among the
verbs for ‘kill’ in English, Chinese and Thai. *Proceedings of the 24th Conference on Language,*
Information and Computation, 291–300. Tohoku University.

- 1 Thin Aye Aye Ko. 2002. *Gendai kōgo Birumago ni okeru goikōzō to imitokuchō: Birumago to Nihongo*
2 *no taishō no kanten kara*. Kobe: Kobe University dissertation.
- 3 Tsujimura, Natsuko. 2001. Degree words and scalar structure in Japanese. *Lingua* 111. 29–52.
- 4 Tsujimura, Natsuko. 2003. Event cancellation and telicity. In William McClure (ed.), *Japanese/Korean*
5 *Linguistics* 12, 388–399. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- 6 Vendler. 1967. *Linguistics in philosophy*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- 7 Vittrant. 2006. Les constructions des verbes en série: Une autre approche du syntagme verbal en
8 birman. *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 101(1). 305–368.
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28
- 29
- 30
- 31
- 32
- 33
- 34
- 35
- 36
- 37
- 38
- 39
- 40
- 41
- 42