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Few previous studies have systematically examined the fact that the English present perfect and the German Perfekt behave differently with respect to co-occurrence with adverbials referring to a definite time position (DTP adverbials) in the past such as yesterday/gestern and ten years ago/vor 10 Jahren. This paper aims to explain this fact systematically on the basis of the revised P(osition)-Definiteness Constraint, which is originally proposed to account for the incompatibility of the English present perfect and the DTP adverbials. It is demonstrated that the reason why the German Perfekt, unlike its English morphological counterpart, can occur with the DTP adverbials is due to the interaction between the revised P-Definiteness Constraint and certain characteristics of the German Perfekt. It is also shown that the proposed account provides an explanatory basis for the following two issues: (i) why the German Perfekt can go with DTP adverbials referring to future time, whereas the English present perfect cannot, and (ii) why the German Perfekt has a wider semantic range than the English present perfect.*
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1. Introduction

It is a well-known fact that the English present perfect cannot co-occur with adverbials referring to a definite time position (DTP adverbials) such as yesterday, as in (1a), whereas its German morphological counterpart, i.e. the German Perfekt, can, as in (1b):

* I would like to thank Yukio Hirose and Masao Okazaki for giving me invaluable comments and suggestions, and Wolfgang Klein for answering my questions about his tense theory. All remaining inadequacies are my own.
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(1) a. *I have written a letter to Ryoko yesterday.
b. Ich habe gestern einen Brief an Ryoko geschrieben.
I have yesterday a/one letter to Ryoko written
‘(Lit.) I have written a letter to Ryoko yesterday.’

Previous studies have not succeeded in accounting for this fact systematically. It is often stated by grammarians and linguists (e.g. Wunderlich (1970) and his followers) that the German Perfekt is assigned two different temporal meanings (or ambiguous structures), one of which corresponds to the meaning of the English simple past and thus can occur with DTP adverbials referring to past time. However, this is not a preferable solution because, other things being equal, it is better that a given construction has a uniform meaning, rather than two or more distinct meanings. Furthermore, such an ambiguity analysis cannot explain why German Perfekt forms accompanied by DTP adverbials referring to past time can represent relevance to the present, i.e. current relevance, as shown in (2):

(2) Peter ist vor einem Jahr nach Berlin gefahren. Er studiert dort Medizin.
Peter is before a/one year to Berlin flown he studies there medicine
‘(Lit.) Peter has gone to Berlin a year ago. He is studying medicine there.’

There are some semantic approaches to this co-occurrence problem which are based on the position that a single morphological category (or construction) should represent one uniform meaning.¹ Comrie (1995) makes the following claim: since the German Perfekt is neutral with respect to current relevance and thus does not necessarily express it, it can occur with the DTP adverbials; on the other hand, since the English present perfect always expresses current relevance, it cannot go with the DTP adverbials. However, his characterization of the two types of perfects raises the fundamental question of why they are or should be so characterized.

Klein (2000) presents a semantic-scope analysis of the German Per-

¹ For another type of approach, see Bamberg (1990), who presents a discourse-based analysis of differences between the German Perfekt and simple past (Präteritum), but does not deal with the co-occurrence problem at issue.
fekt. In this analysis, a semantic operator called POST is introduced that represents the "posttime" of something or some situation; the scope of the operator in the semantic representation for the German Perfekt corresponding to the English present perfect differs from that for the German Perfekt corresponding to the English simple past. Although this scope-difference analysis is useful for the explanation of not only some properties of the German Perfekt but also some differences between the English present perfect and the German Perfekt (in this respect, see section 6.2), it does not explain the difference in compatibility with DTP adverbials referring to past time between the two types of perfects because the scope difference has nothing to do with the compatibility difference.

Wolfgang Klein (personal communication) claims that the German Perfekt can go with the DTP adverbials because of the non-operation of the P(osition)-Definiteness Constraint, which is originally proposed by Klein himself to account for the incompatibility of the English present perfect with the DTP adverbials (Klein (1992)). The constraint is stated roughly as follows: the reference time and the event time cannot both be p-definite at the same time. That something is p-definite means that its time position is identifiable to both speaker and hearer. Klein's argument goes as follows. Since the English present perfect requires its reference time to include or coincide with the speech time (S), whose position is always identifiable to both speaker and hearer, the reference time is inherently p-definite; thus, the English present perfect violates the constraint if its event time is specified by a DTP adverbial and thus marked as p-definite. However, the German Perfekt does not necessarily require its reference time to include or coincide with S because in German present tense marking allows the reference time to take place in the future, so the reference time is not inherently p-definite. Thus, Klein concludes, the P-Definiteness Con-

---

2 In this paper, the term situation is used as a cover term for an action, event, state of affairs, or whatever is described by a verb phrase.

3 Klein's (1992: 546) original formulation of this constraint uses the terms topic time and time of the situation. Abstracting the details, however, we can say that the topic time and the time of the situation correspond to the reference time and the event time in the sense of Reichenbach (1947) and his followers (e.g. Hornstein (1990)), respectively.
straint does not operate in the German Perfekt.

However, Klein’s conclusion that the constraint does not work in the German Perfekt is not tenable. It is true that its reference time is not inherently p-definite. But notice that Klein himself admits that the constraint is operative at a pragmatic level (see Harder (1996: 416) and Kiparsky (2002: 128)). This means that when we interpret, say, sentence (1b) above, the reference time can come to be fixed at S, and thus is interpreted as p-definite finally. Since the event time of this sentence, specified by the DTP adverbial *gestern* ‘yesterday,’ is also marked as p-definite, we can say that the sentence is interpreted as a violation of the constraint. Nevertheless, it is perfectly acceptable. Therefore, Klein’s P-Definiteness Constraint as it stands is problematic.

Wada (1995, 2001a) proposes a revised version of the P-Definiteness Constraint in terms of his own tense theory. It has been shown that this constraint interacts with the temporal (or semantic) structure of the perfect form of a language to explain why the English present perfect cannot co-occur with the DTP adverbials, whereas its Japanese counterparts, i.e. the *-te-iru* form and *-ta* form, can (see Wada (2001c) for details). Pursuing this line, this paper aims to explain, based on the revised P-Definiteness Constraint, why the German Perfekt, unlike the English present perfect, can go with DTP adverbials referring to past time, though the two perfects are morphologically the same.

The organization of this paper is as follows. After outlining the tense theory proposed by Wada (2001a) in section 2, we will briefly

---


5 For the incompatibility of the English present perfect and DTP adverbials with past time reference, some linguists including Klein (1992) give an explanation from various points of view. For example, Michaelis (1998), taking a construction-grammar approach, claims that this incompatibility is a construction-specific problem, and should thus be attributed to an idiosyncratic feature of the present perfect construction. Kiparsky (2002), considering that a DTP adverbial must modify the reference time, which is simultaneous with S in the present perfect, argues that the incompatibility at issue is due to the fact that the event time (which takes place in the past) cannot be modified by a DTP adverbial referring to past time. Here, I will not try to compare the present analysis with those two approaches to show which is better, but merely point out that the latter approaches do not deal with the compatibility of the German Perfekt with the DTP adverbial.
see, in section 3, how the incompatibility of the English present perfect and DTP adverbials with past time reference is accounted for in that theory. In section 4, it will be demonstrated that the reason why the German Perfekt can co-occur with that kind of DTP adverbial is ascribed to interaction between the revised P-Definiteness Constraint and certain characteristics of the temporal structure of the German Perfekt; the application range of the constraint differs between the English present perfect and the German Perfekt. We will consider, in section 5, how the polysemy of the German Perfekt is handled in terms of temporal structure within our framework. Section 6 will further justify my explanation by showing that it can resolve the following two issues from a unified point of view: (i) why the German Perfekt can co-occur with DTP adverbials referring to future time, whereas its English counterpart cannot, and (ii) why the semantic range of the German Perfekt is wider than that of the English present perfect. Section 7 will offer concluding remarks.

2. Background

This section surveys the tense theory proposed by Wada (2001a), on which is based the explanation to be presented below. The theory assumes two levels of the tense field necessary for the process of interpreting tenses: the tense-structure (TS) level and the tense-interpretation (TI) level. The TS level is a representation of the schematic (or general) semantic structure of a given tense form (or predicate). The TI level is one in which the schematic semantic structure interacts with semantic and pragmatic factors such as time adverbials, verbal aspects, characteristics of syntactic environments (e.g. embedded and adverbial clauses) and contextual information to arrive at a finally-determined temporal value.

The tense theory also assumes that the tense structure of a finite predicate consists either of both the absolute tense-component (A-component) and the relative tense-component (R-component) or of only the R-component depending on language type. The A-component is a component in which a tense morpheme integrated with both person and number markers evokes and establishes in the speaker's and hearer's mind a time-sphere which is a time-span grammatically incorporated into the tense structure. Because its location is calculated directly from the speaker's viewpoint as an absolute starting point for tense in-
terpretation, the tense component in question is named “absolute.” On the other hand, the R-component is defined as a tense component which is occupied by the event time, i.e. the time point or period of a relevant part of the situation expressed by the bare verb stem. This component is named “relative” because the event time is not necessarily computed directly from the speaker’s viewpoint. In the case of finite predicates, the position of the event time is determined only after the establishment of a time-sphere; for example, with regard to the finite predicate *plays*, the event time, associated with the bare verb stem *play*, obtains somewhere in the present time-sphere evoked and established by the present tense morpheme -s. Thus, the sentence *Tom plays tennis yesterday* is ungrammatical because the event time, specified by the past time adverb *yesterday*, is contradictory to the established present time-sphere.6

Let us next consider how an Aux-as-Main-Verb hypothesis based on a prototype approach works in the tense theory. Under this hypothesis, although auxiliary verbs such as modals and perfect *have* differ from lexical verbs with respect to syntactic properties, the former can basically represent their own situations as the latter do because the former can be seen as peripheral members of the category “main verb”; thus, an auxiliary verb can represent its own event time (see Wada (2001a: Ch. 1) for further discussion).

To illustrate this point, consider the following examples:

(3)  a. Yoko may leave tomorrow.
    b. Toru has just arrived.

In (3a), *may* expresses the event time associated with the (abstract) situation of the speaker’s inferring something. Similarly, in (3b) *have* expresses the event time associated with the resultant state stemming directly from Toru’s arrival.7

6 In this theory, an irregular verb is also factored into a bare verb stem and inflectional morpheme; for example, *is* is factored into *be* and -s.

7 In this paper, the term resultant state refers to any kind of resultant state which is brought about, directly or indirectly, by the occurrence of the situation described by the past participle. Thus, sentence (i),

(i) I have visited Italy many times.

has a resultant state like the state of the speaker’s knowing a great deal about Italy, which is induced by the occurrence of his visiting Italy many times.
Finally, I turn to a consideration of the notion of temporal focus (TF). Temporal focus is a speaker’s focus fixed at an event time (or part of an event time) to which the speaker pays or is paying special attention.

To illustrate this idea, compare the following pair of sentences:

(4) a. Ryoko will be an English teacher.
    b. Ryoko is going to be an English teacher.

On our version of the Aux-as-Main-Verb hypothesis, sentences (4a) and (4b) both consist of two event times, i.e. the event time associated with the auxiliary verb (will or be going to) and the event time associated with the infinitive, with the former obtaining in the present and the latter taking place in the future. In this sense, these two sentences are both sentences referring to future time. However, it is generally said that, while sentences containing will are future-oriented, sentences containing be going to are present-oriented. This difference in time orientation is properly accounted for by the difference of the position of the TF. In other words, we can explain the difference by claiming that a sentence with will requires the TF to be fixed at the event time connected with the infinitive, whereas a sentence with be going to requires the TF to be fixed at the event time connected with be going to.

Thus far, we have surveyed Wada’s (2001a) tense theory by briefly explaining those of its basic explanatory devices that play an important role in the following discussions. In the next section, I will briefly show how the revised P-Definiteness Constraint explains the incompatibility of the English present perfect and DTP adverbials with past time reference.

3. Incompatibility of the English Present Perfect with DTP Adverbials Referring to Past Time

The revised P-Definiteness Constraint is defined as follows:

(5) Revised P(osition)-Definiteness Constraint: In a clause, the A-component and the R-component cannot both be p-definite.

This constraint is operative at the TI level, where semantic and pragmatic factors other than tense structure can have an influence on tense interpretation. Two comments are in order here. First, the term clause indicates a syntactic unit which is assumed to be a projection of a temporal template, i.e. a temporal-structurally inseparable
unit that is formed at the TS level. For the reasons mentioned in Wada (2001a: Ch. 3), the perfect form, i.e. the combination of have and the past participle (p.p.), is regarded as a temporal template. Second, the R-component of the perfect form consists of two event times, i.e. the event time associated with have (E₁) and that associated with the past participle (E₂).

Now, let us observe how the revised P-Definiteness Constraint eliminates the combination of the English present perfect and DTP adverbials like yesterday and two hours ago, as shown in (6):

(6)   a. *I have written a letter to Ryoko yesterday. (= (1a))
     b. *They have finished the party two hours ago.

I first present the temporal schema for the English present perfect in (7) below, where the perfect form as a whole constitutes a single temporal template, which is projected onto a clause.

(7)   NON-F (p.p.) ——— FIN (have)
      
      Abs:                                   S (V_{SPK})  
      Rel:  E₂ ———— E₁  
            ↑
            TF

Here and elsewhere in this paper, Abs stands for the A-component, Rel for the R-component, FIN for 'finite predicate,' NON-F for 'non-finite predicate,' and V_{SPK} for 'speaker's viewpoint.' The horizontal arrow means that time flows from left to right, and the vertical arrow points to a target at which the TF is fixed. A rectangle denotes a time-sphere, a vertical line temporal simultaneity, and a horizontal line temporal precedence. The reason why the TF is fixed at E₁ is that since the English present perfect typically highlights the resultant state at S, E₁, i.e. the event time associated with the resultant state, is considered to be a focal point in the temporal schema (see Wada (2001a: Ch. 4)).

The A-component of the English present perfect is occupied at the TS level by the present time-sphere (symbolized by PRES) that includes the speaker's viewpoint; at the TI level, the speaker's viewpoint, in turn, is to be identified with the speaker's consciousness, i.e. the center of mental activities such as thinking and reasoning, which always obtains at S because of its nature: when you speak something, you do some kind of mental activity at the same time. Thus, the A-compo-
nent is always interpreted as p-definite because at the TI level the present time-sphere is taken as containing S, the only time point absolutely identifiable to the hearer without any contextual information or the specification by time adverbials.

We turn to an observation of the R-component. It is not inherently p-definite; it can be made p-definite by a DTP adverbial at the TI level. Thus in (6a), the DTP adverbial yesterday fixes E₂, a constituent of the R-component, and accordingly makes the R-component p-definite.

From these observations, we can say that the A- and the R-component of the present perfect sentences in (6) are both p-definite, so that they violate the revised P-Definiteness Constraint. Hence the unacceptability of (6).

4. Compatibility of the German Perfekt with DTP Adverbials Referring to Past Time

In the previous section, we stated that the English present perfect cannot combine with DTP adverbials referring to past time because such a combination violates constraint (5). The question, then, arises as to why the German Perfekt can be compatible with the DTP adverbials, as shown in (8)–(10) below. After all, not only do both German and English belong to Germanic languages, but also their perfect forms are morphologically the same.

(8) Ich habe gestern einen Brief an Ryoko geschrieben. (= (1b))
    I have yesterday a/one letter to Ryoko written
    ‘(Lit.) I have written a letter to Ryoko yesterday.’

(9) Gestern hat es geregnet.
    yesterday has it rained
    ‘(Lit.) It has rained yesterday.’

(10) Vor 10 Jahren sind wir über Sibirien nach Europa geflogen.
    before 10 years are we via Siberia to Europe flown
    ‘(Lit.) We have flown to Europe via Siberia ten years before.’

Before answering the question, let me first clarify the temporal schema for the German Perfekt. I assume that the temporal schema is like this:
One crucial difference between this schema and the schema for the English present perfect in (7) is the one of the position of the TF: the TF is fixed on E₁ in the case of the English present perfect; by contrast, it is fixed on E₂ in the case of the German Perfekt. In addition, unlike the English present perfect, the German Perfekt requires the non-finite part to be recognized as the figure, i.e. the salient part in a scene, which is surrounded by broken lines; as a result, the other part is recognized as the ground, i.e. the non-salient part in a scene (cf. Langacker (1987, 1991)).

The reason for the saliency of the non-finite part of the German Perfekt is accounted for in the following manner. As is implied in Langacker (1987: 120), what is movable or changeable tends to be recognized as the figure in comparison with what is non-movable or non-changeable. In (11), E₂ is associated with the past-participle (i.e. the non-finite) part, which can describe a situation potentially changeable along the time flow. Thus, by receiving the TF, E₂, or the non-finite part, is made salient compared to the other part of the temporal schema, and hence recognized as the figure.

That the non-finite part is viewed as temporally changeable is supported by Klein’s (2000) statement that the semantic operator POST refers to the “posttime” of some situation described by a German Perfekt sentence. In order to refer to the “posttime” of some situation, the situation must be recognized as having finished or at least as bounded in time. Thus, the operator POST presupposes the change of the situation described by the past participle on the time line. This is illustrated by the following fact: although the German Perfekt has such uses as the resultative and experiential perfects, which all presuppose that the situation described is over at S, it does not have the continuative use; the German simple present (Präsenz) is used instead, as in Er arbeitet seit 3 Jahren an seiner Dissertation ‘he has been writing his dissertation for 3 years.’
Having established the temporal schema for the German Perfekt in (11), I can now explain the compatibility of the German Perfekt with the DTP adverbials. Let us assume that the revised P-Definiteness Constraint applies only to the figure part in the temporal schema, i.e. the non-finite part, and not to the whole of the temporal schema. Under this assumption, German Perfekt sentences like those in (8)–(10) above do not violate the constraint because the non-finite part consists only of the R-component. Even if the R-component is marked as p-definite because of the specification of E₂ by a DTP adverbial, only one tense component, i.e. the R-component, is p-definite. This is why the German Perfekt is compatible with DTP adverbials referring to past time.

Schema (11) also accounts for why in (2) above the German Perfekt with a DTP adverbial referring to past time represents current relevance. Since schema (11) contains E₁, which coexists with S, the German Perfekt temporal-structurally refers to the present and thus can express current relevance. The compatibility of the German Perfekt and the DTP adverbial is not directly related to whether or not it expresses current relevance.

There are at least three reasons (which are not necessarily independent of, but related to, each other) why the temporal schema for the German Perfekt is taken as it is in (11) and thus is different from that for the typical uses of the English present perfect shown in (7) above. The first reason is the difference in syntactic structure between German and English. In (present-day) English, the two elements constituting the perfect form (i.e. the perfect auxiliary and the past participle) cannot be syntactically divided up by such elements as direct and indirect objects, as shown by (12); in (present-day) German, the two elements can be syntactically separated, especially in a finite sentence, as illustrated in (13):

(12) *I have a letter to Ryoko written.
(13) Ich habe einen Brief an Ryoko geschrieben.

I have a/one letter to Ryoko written
‘I have written a letter to Ryoko.’

This fact shows that in English the perfect auxiliary can be treated as a syntactically “immediately” higher verb, whereas in German it is not. Taking into account the general tendency that in grammar syntactic closeness often reflects semantic closeness (and vice versa), as shown in *John shot the tree vs. John shot at the tree, we can take the fact under
consideration as indicating that in the case of the German Perfekt the past participle is semantically more independent of the perfect auxiliary than in the case of the English present perfect, and thus the degree of "frozenness" of the German Perfekt as a temporal template (i.e. a semantic unit) is lower than that of the English perfect. This, in turn, leads us to claim that in German the past participle tends to receive less influence of the perfect auxiliary as a higher verb than in English. Thus, in the temporal schema of the German Perfekt the non-finite part alone can become the figure when E₂ receives the temporal focus.

In the English perfect, on the other hand, the degree of frozenness is much higher. Since the perfect auxiliary and the past participle are syntactically in "immediate" relation to each other, they are semantically more closely related to each other. Thus, the English perfect as a whole is recognized as a more solid unit than the German Perfekt. For this reason, it is hard for the figure/ground contrast to come about in the temporal schema of the English perfect; the whole of its temporal structure is regarded as the figure.

As a second reason for the claim made above, we can present the fact that the English perfect exclusively requires have as the perfect auxiliary, whereas the German Perfekt chooses between haben and sein, depending on the type of lexical verbs in the past participle form. Consider the following examples:

(14)  a. Der Patient ist gestorben.
     the patient is died
     'The patient has died.'

     b. Der Gast ist pünktlich gekommen.
     the guest is punctually come
     'The guest has come punctually.'

As (14a, b) show, in the German Perfekt sein is chosen as the perfect auxiliary when the verb type of the past participle is the change-of-state type (14a) or the change-of-location type (14b). We can interpret this fact as indicating that the degree of frozenness of the English perfect is higher than that of the German Perfekt, because in general, when one thing combines with another to form one unit, their connection is weakened if the thing to be combined has two or more options. We can then say that the past-participle part of the German Perfekt has come to be focal independently of the perfect-auxiliary part, and thus to be recognized as the figure.

A third reason for the difference in temporal schema between the
English present perfect and the German Perfekt is related to the semantic evolution or development of the perfect form. As stated in Bybee, Perkins and Pagliuca (1994: Ch. 3), the main path of the development is shown in (15).

(15) resultative → anterior (perfect) → perfective/simple past

We can contend that in the course of this development, the English present perfect basically stays at the stage of signaling the anterior (or the perfect aspect), whereas the German Perfekt not only represents the anterior stage, but also develops into the perfective stage (see, for example, Bybee, Perkins and Pagliuca (1994)).

8 Bybee, Perkins and Pagliuca (1994: 81-87) note that in languages such as French where there is a grammatical form for ‘past-tense imperfective,’ the perfect form in the third stage of the semantic development expresses only ‘past-tense perfective’; in languages such as German and English where there is no grammatical form for ‘past-tense imperfective,’ the perfect form at issue functions as the simple past. Thus, strictly speaking, we should not use perfective, but use simple past, when considering the German Perfekt and the English perfect. But in this paper, I am using simple past to refer to the simple-past form. To avoid confusion, I thus use perfective to refer to the perfect/Perfekt that performs the simple-past function. For the same reason, I use anterior to refer to the perfect/Perfekt that performs the perfect aspect.

   'I have worked in the garden [and must first have a shower].'

b. Danke, ich habe schon gegessen. (Klein (2000: 360))
   'Thanks, I have already eaten'

   'The colossus of Rhodes weighed one hundred tons.'

b. Einstein hat Princeton besucht.
   'Einstein visited Princeton.'
The temporal schemata for the German Perfekts in (16) and (17) are diagrammatically represented in (18) and (19), respectively.\footnote{In some English present perfect sentences, special attention seems to be paid to the situation described by the past participle, and they are often referred to as “hot-news” perfects (cf. Schwenter (1994)). In Wada (2001a: Ch. 4), this type of perfect is assumed to require that the TF be directed at E$_2$, not E$_1$, and is characterized as one which occupies the position between the anterior and the perfective stage in the semantic development. Why, then, is there still a difference in compatibility with DTP adverbials referring to past time between this type of perfect and the German Perfekt in the perfective stage? I assume here that in the temporal schema for the “hot-news” perfect in English the past-participle part does not yet have come to be recognized as the figure; by contrast, as shown in the text, in the temporal schema for the German Perfekt in question the past-participle part is recognized as the figure. This difference is ascribed to that in the degree of frozenness between the two perfects; in English, even in the use of the “hot-news” perfect the past participle is under the direct control of the perfect auxiliary as a higher verb as in the use of the other normal uses (e.g. experiential and resultative perfects), and accordingly is not focalized independently of the higher-verb part; in other words, the whole of the schema for the “hot-news” perfect is viewed as the figure. Since the revised P-Definiteness Constraint is applied to the figure part, the “hot-news” perfect cannot go with the DTP adverbials without violating the constraint. I leave a detailed consideration of this point for future research.}

(18) \[ \text{NON-F (p.p.)} \quad \text{FIN (haben (sein))} \]

Abs: \[ S (V_{SPK}) \rightarrow \text{PRES} \]

Rel: \[ E_2 \rightarrow E_1 \]

\[ \uparrow \]

TF

(19) \[ \text{NON-F (p.p.)} \quad \text{FIN (haben (sein))} \]

Abs: \[ S (V_{SPK}) \rightarrow \text{PRES} \]

Rel: \[ E_2 \rightarrow E_1 \]

\[ \uparrow \]

TF

Schema (18) is temporal-structurally equivalent to schema (7), i.e. the schema for the English present perfect; schema (19) is semantic-functionally equivalent to the schema for the English simple past, as shown in (20).
Here, the past tense morpheme -ed evokes and establishes the past time-sphere, which is in turn considered to express the past time when the speaker’s viewpoint is merged with the speaker’s consciousness, which is fixed at S for the reason we stated above; thus, the event time E takes place in the past time, and can receive the TF because it is the only event time in this schema. In light of the position of the event time receiving the TF, we can argue that schema (19) is semantic-functionally the same as schema (20). And it is this stage of the German Perfekt that can go with DTP adverbials with past time reference.

Why has the temporal schema for the German Perfekt evolved from the anterior stage to the perfective stage? I assume that the temporal focus shift (TF shift) has caused this semantic evolution. As stated above, the degree of frozenness of the German Perfekt seems to be lower than that of the English perfect; and in the German Perfekt the past participle is more likely to be a focal part independently of the auxiliary part than in the English perfect. Therefore, it is fully motivated to say that in the case of the German Perfekt, the TF can easily shift from E₁ to E₂. The TF shift, then, causes the past-participle part to be recognized as the figure; as a consequence, the temporal schema for the perfective stage of the German Perfekt comes about (cf. schema (11)).

There remains another question to be answered. That is, why does the English present perfect stay at the anterior stage in the semantic development? After all, it could have gone further in the development. An answer to this question lies not in the English perfect form itself, but in the peculiarity of presentness in English; i.e., the present

---

10 The reason why the English simple past is said not to express current relevance is clear from schema (20), because unlike the schema for the perfective stage of the German Perfekt (19), schema (20) does not contain any element that obtains at S.
moment, or S, is highly salient and plays a crucial role in English grammar (for arguments for this peculiarity, see section 6.1). Since E1 coexists with S in the present perfect, it is under the strong influence of the presentness. Thus, the peculiarity of presentness makes it difficult for the TF to shift from E1 to E2, and accordingly has thus far prevented the English present perfect from developing into the perfective stage.

In this way, the TF-shift account of the semantic evolution provides a third reason for the difference in temporal schema between the English present perfect and the German Perfekt.

Let me summarize the discussion thus far. Unlike the English perfect, the German Perfekt can go with DTP adverbials referring to past time because the German Perfekt covers the perfective stage (11) as well as the anterior stage (18). The difference in co-occurrence with the DTP adverbials between the two types of perfects is attributed to the difference of the part of the temporal structure to which the revised P-Definiteness Constraint is applied.

5. Polysemy of the German Perfekt

This section examines a theoretical implication of the view we are putting forward here. In particular, I will consider the following questions: whether the German Perfekt is homophonous with respect to temporal structure (i.e. the temporal structure corresponding to the English present perfect and that corresponding to the English simple past are accidentally represented by the same tense form) or it is not.

---

11 This peculiarity is not specific to the present perfect. For example, it is closely related to why the non-stative verb expressing a present-tense perfective usually cannot describe an ongoing event at the present moment in English, as shown in footnote 14.

12 As noted in footnote 9, although the TF is directed at E2 in the “hot-news” perfect, the past-participle part cannot be focalized to become the figure independently of the auxiliary-verb part. This can also be explained in terms of the peculiarity of presentness in English. The fact that the time of the auxiliary verb is simultaneous with S, together with the high degree of frozenness of the English perfect, prevents the past-participle part from getting away from the influence of the presentness.
polysemous (i.e. the two temporal structures are semantically related to each other).

I argue that the two temporal structures of the German Perfekt are in a polysemous relation to each other. Theoretically, it is better to argue so because the two structures are both represented by the combination of the perfect auxiliary and the past participle. And this argument is empirically supported for the reason we have already seen. If the German Perfekt could express the temporal schema which is temporal-structurally, but not semantic-functionally, the same as that for the English simple past, we could not explain why a German Perfekt sentence like that in (2) is appropriate; for the Perfekt in (2), which co-occurs with the DTP adverbial vor einem Jahr ‘one year before’ and could thus be regarded as the English simple past counterpart in the homonymy approach, actually serves as the English present perfect counterpart in that it expresses current relevance.

Now, let me show how this polysemy is dealt with in my approach. Along the lines taken in Wada (2001: Ch. 4), where the issue concerning the polysemy of the English present perfect is solved within the present framework, I will argue that the two temporal structures of the German Perfekt, shown in (11) and (18) above, share the temporal structure in (21) at the TS level.

(21) NON-F (p.p.) FIN (perfect auxiliary)

Abs: $\text{V_{SPK}}$ PRES

Rel: $E_2$ $E_1$

At this level, this abstract temporal structure is not related to the time line, and accordingly not only is the relationship of the speaker’s viewpoint ($V_{SPK}$) to the speech time ($S$) not fixed, but also the position of the temporal focus ($TF$) is not fixed. It is at the TI level that the temporal structure of a given tense form is connected with the time line, the TF being determined to be fixed at either of the two event times and the speaker’s viewpoint being identified with the speaker’s consciousness at $S$. Thus, the temporal schema for the anterior stage (18) and that for the perfective stage (11) are obtained at the TI level. If we go in this direction, we can claim that the two types of the German Perfekt are semantically related to each other and thus in a polysemous relation because they share the same temporal structure at the TS level.
6. Related Issues

This section is devoted to the consideration of two consequences that the present analysis can handle: (i) why in unembedded clauses, the German Perfekt can go with DTP adverbials referring to future time, whereas the English present perfect cannot, and (ii) why the German Perfekt has a wider semantic range than the English present perfect.

6.1. (In)Compatibility of the English Present Perfect and the German Perfekt with DTP Adverbials Referring to Future Time

First, let us observe that the German Perfekt is compatible with DTP adverbials referring to future time,

(22) a. Morgen um zehn hat er die Stadt verlassen.
   tomorrow at ten has he the city left
   (Lit.) Tomorrow at ten he has left the city.’
   (Klein (2000: 360))

b. Ich habe in einer halben Stunde geduscht.
   I have in a/one half hour showered
   (Lit.) I have showered in half an hour.’
   (Klein (2000: 360))

c. Morgen abend habe ich meine Arbeit beendet.
   tomorrow evening have I my work finished
   (Lit.) Tomorrow evening I have finished my work.’

whereas the English present perfect cannot go with those DTP adverbials.

(23) a. *John has arrived tomorrow.  (Smith (1981: 380))

b. ??Tomorrow, John has climbed Mt. Olympus.
   (Hornstein (1990: 85))

c. *John has left by the time you get there tomorrow.
   (Huddleston (1977: 734))

Previous studies have not given a satisfactory explanation for this difference. In fact, Comrie (1995) and Klein (2000) simply make the following claim: because the German Perfekt allows the reference time to come temporally after S and DTP adverbials referring to future time are taken to specify the reference time in the future, there is no contradiction; hence the sentences in (22) are acceptable. However, they do not explain why, unlike the English present perfect, the German Perfekt allows the reference time to be in the future.

The analysis proposed in this paper can systematically explain the
acceptability difference between (22) and (23). It must first be remembered that the German Perfekt and the English present perfect both include in their temporal structures the A-component, occupied by the present time-sphere that is to contain both the present and the future time area when the speaker's viewpoint is merged with the speaker's consciousness at S. With this in mind, let me present a tentative schema common to both the German Perfekt and the English present perfect with future time reference at the TI level.

\[(24) \quad \text{NON-F (p.p.)} \quad \text{FIN (have/haben (sein))}\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Abs:} \\
S \quad O \\
\text{REL:} \\
E_2 \quad E_1 \\
\uparrow \\
\text{TF}
\end{array}
\]

O stands for the time of orientation. Note here that E_1 is simultaneous with the O in the future, and the TF is fixed at E_1, but not at E_2. From this, it is clear that schema (24) corresponds to the perfect form in the anterior stage, but not to that in the perfective stage, and thus is in parallel with schema (18) above with the exception that, while in (24) E_1 is identified with the O in the future, in (18) E_1 is simultaneous with S.

Now, let me start to explain the compatibility difference under discussion. It is predicted that the interaction between schema (24) and constraint (5) prevents the perfect/Perfekt from co-occurring with the DTP adverbials, for the A-component is inherently p-definite for the reason we saw in section 3 and the R-component can be made p-definite because of the specification of E_1 by the DTP adverbial. In fact, the English sentences in (23) are all unacceptable.

The question then arises of why the German Perfekt is compatible with the DTP adverbials, as shown in (22), contrary to the prediction. To answer this question, we have to consider what kind of modality is carried when the German Perfekt under discussion is used. Here, modality is defined as the speaker's subjective mental state or attitude toward the proposition at the time of his utterance or thought; usually, non-modal forms (i.e. forms without modal verbs) are considered to express an assertion, namely a modality in which the proposition is stated firmly as a fact or belief (cf. Wada (2001: Ch. 1)). In order to clarify the point, compare the following sentences:
In (25a), the modal *will* expresses a prediction about Naomi's playing tennis; in (25b), the non-modal *is* represents an assertion about Naomi's being strong in tennis.

With this in mind, let us turn to an examination of (22). Since the German Perfekt sentences in (22) are all in the non-modal form, the modality represented by them is assertion. But here arises another question as to why in (22) we can make an assertion, using the non-modal forms, about what will happen in the future. After all, it is usual that we make a prediction about the future events, and make an assertion about what was a past fact or what is going on now; and this is usually the case in English.¹³

Thus, let us assume that in the case of the German Perfekt with future time reference, the speaker shifts his viewpoint onto the time of orientation in the future that is simultaneous with $E_1$, the event time connected with the perfect auxiliary. If the assumption is correct, the resultant state expressed by the perfect auxiliary is interpreted as a present state from the shifted viewpoint of the speaker, and thus we can assert the resultant state (as well as the situation represented by the past participle) as a fact. In this way, we can explain why the non-modal Perfekt sentences can easily receive a future interpretation.

Why, then, does German, unlike English, allow the speaker's view-

¹³ The so-called English present futurate construction (or sentence) seems to be an exception. But note that the construction expresses a scheduled or arranged future, not a "simple" future; i.e., it involves a situation that is regarded as already known at present as well as a future situation (see Huddleston (1977), Huddleston and Pullum (2002), Prince (1982), Smith (1981), among others).

In Wada (2001b), this fact is accounted for in the present theory. In particular, an English futurate sentence like *The train leaves at 5:30 tomorrow* is analyzed in such a way that the speaker makes an assertion about a future situation on the basis of a present situation; the speaker does not shift his viewpoint to the future, but fixes it at $S$, i.e. the time when the speaker's consciousness sticks to. This explanation makes a sharp contrast with the explanation about German sentences in the present tense referring to future situations such as those in (22), (28a), (29), (31a), (32a) and (33a); in the latter explanation the speaker shifts his viewpoint from $S$ onto a time of orientation in the future for the reasons mentioned in the text.
point to shift to future time? An answer to this question lies in the
degree of distinction between the present and the future time area;
i.e., in English the distinction between the two time areas is relatively
clear, whereas in German the distinction is highly blurred. This differ-
ence is schematized as follows:

(26) a. English
    b. German

P and F stand for the present and the future time area, respectively.
The vertical line in the rectangle implies a clear distinction between the
two areas.

There are a number of phenomena to support the claim made above. The
first phenomenon is that, while English has a special grammatical
device, i.e. the present progressive, to exclusively represent a phase of
the situation that is restricted to the moment of the speech act, German
do not have such a device, but requires the simple present to be used
instead. This is attested by a pair like that of (27).

(27) a. I am writing a letter.
    b. Ich schreibe einen Brief.

I write a/one letter
'(Lit.) I write a letter.'
'I am writing a letter.' [the intended reading]

This fact can lead us to assume that in English the present time area is
given a special status and thus the conceptual distinction between the
two time areas is highly reflected in its grammar; as a result, the dis-
tinction is rather sharp. Pursuing this line of reasoning would lead us
to claim that German does not make a clear-cut distinction between the
two time areas because it does not have a special grammatical device
which exclusively represents a phase of the situation obtaining at the
very moment of the speech act.

Second, the German simple present can easily refer to a future situation
in comparison with the English simple present, irrespective of the verb type.

in two years go I my hometown back+to
'(Lit.) In two years I go back to my hometown.'
    b. In two years I will go back to my hometown.
(29) Ich bleibe morgen zu Hause.
I become tomorrow at home
'I will stay at home tomorrow.' (Dahl (2000: 355))

(30) a. *Everything is all right tomorrow.
b. Everything will be all right tomorrow. (Declerck (1991: 61))

In (28) the verb type is non-stative, whereas in (29) and (30) the verb type is stative.14

Furthermore, even without DTP adverbials referring to future time, the German simple present can easily refer to a future situation irrespective of the verb type; English usually requires the will-form in the same environment. This fact is exemplified by the following pairs of examples.15

14 As mentioned in Langacker (1991: 251–252), the non-stative verb expressing a present-tense perfective usually cannot exactly share the same time with the speech act by virtue of its nature of requiring a change of state; since S is regarded as a moment, the situation described by the non-stative verb which needs some time to happen cannot occur at the very same time as S.

In the English language, since the S part is viewed as the present time area, the non-stative verb in the simple present (representing a present-tense perfective) usually cannot refer to a single event obtaining at S for the reason stated above (note that the sports-commentary use and the performative use are exceptions). For example, consider the sentence Mary plays tennis. It cannot represent the single event of Mary's playing tennis that obtains at S. This is because the event's taking some time to happen requires a longer time than the moment of utterance, i.e. S. The sentence cannot express a single future event, either. This is because English requires a sharp distinction between the present and the future time areas. The speaker's viewpoint cannot move into the future time area for the speaker to be able to make an assertion about the future event; thus, the speaker cannot help but make a prediction about the future event from his viewpoint fixed at S (by using the will-form). Hence, the verb in the non-modal form (represented by plays) cannot usually refer to the future situation.

On the other hand, the German language does not require a sharp distinction between the two time areas. Thus, the speaker's viewpoint can shift into the future time area, so that the speaker can make an assertion about a future event from the shifted viewpoint by using the simple present form.

15 Note that, as Comrie (1995: 150) mentions, the non-stative type (e.g. (31a) and (33a)) is likely to get future time reference, whereas the stative type (e.g. (32a)) has the potential for both present and future time reference. But the point here is that German simple present sentences allow for future time reference without the future adverbials, irrespective of the verb type.
(31) a. Also gut, ich gehe hin und schmeisse es ins Feuer.  
    'All right, I go and throw it in the fire.'

b. All right, I will go and throw it in the fire.

(Comrie (1995: 150))

(32) a. Ich bin in Berlin.  
    'I am in Berlin.'

b. I will be in Berlin.

(Comrie (1995: 150))

(33) a. Wir treffen uns (morgen) am Bahnhof.  
    'We meet ourselves at the station tomorrow.'

b. We will meet at the station tomorrow.

These observations enable us to claim that in German the speaker can easily shift his viewpoint into the future and make an assertion about a future situation from there, and thus does not necessarily make a prediction about it from S; since the distinction between the present and the future time area is interpreted as blurred, the speaker’s viewpoint can easily be shifted from S onto the O in the future.

What, then, does this shift of the viewpoint bring about in the temporal structure of the German Perfekt? We can answer this question as follows. Since an unembedded clause is a linguistic environment in which the viewpoint of only one speaker is operative (as opposed to, say, indirect speech complements), shifting the viewpoint from S to a future time of orientation deprives S of its raison d’être in the temporal structure, and accordingly the S part “goes off-stage.” After all, in this case S is virtually irrelevant to the calculation of the temporal relation because the shifted viewpoint in the future time area is the very starting point of the temporal calculation.

Still another question to be addressed is why the TF is fixed on E₁ in the case of the German Perfekt with future time reference, when fixing the TF on E₂ is also a logical possibility. In fact, in its past time reference counterpart E₂ can receive the TF, as shown in (11) above.

A hint for answering this question lies in our cognitive abilities. Relevant to the discussion here are the subjective/objective distinction in the sense of Langacker (1987, 1991) and the reference-point ability arranged for linguistic purposes by Langacker (1993).

To illustrate these two notions, let us consider the following examples:
(34) A famous movie star is sitting across the table.
(35) A famous movie star is sitting across the table from me.

(Langacker (1991: 217–218))

In (34), included in the “objective scene” or the “locus of viewing attention” (Langacker (1987: 129)) are the entities denoted by a famous movie star and the table (and possibly space surrounding them). The reference point that the speaker (or the “conceptualizer” in Langacker’s terms) uses to establish mental contact with the target entity denoted by a famous movie star in that scene is the place where the speaker stands, i.e. the default reference point or the “ground” (cf. Langacker (1991: 217–218, 1993: 5–6)). Langacker (1991: 94) notes that, when the reference point is viewed as out of the objective scene (i.e. in the default case), the speaker is not aware of it and thus it cannot be focalized; i.e., it is construed subjectively. In (35), the entity expressed by me is added to the objective scene represented in (34). In this case, the speaker, objectifying himself, views himself as a described entity in the objective scene that serves as the reference point for the target entity, i.e. a famous movie star. Since it is in the objective scene, it can be focalized. In this connection, Langacker (1993: 6) states that in order to fulfill its reference-point function, the reference point must first become salient as the focus of the objective scene.

Let us now try to answer the question raised above by applying these observations to the temporal scene. It was claimed above that the German Perfekt with future time reference requires that the speaker’s viewpoint be shifted from S onto the O in the future which is simultaneous with E₁. Here, this can be interpreted as follows: the speaker’s consciousness staying at S (corresponding to Langacker’s conceptualizer) objectifies his separated viewpoint at the O in the future and views the O as a temporal reference point for the two event times, i.e. the conceptual entities denoted by the Perfekt form. In this case, since the temporal reference point is incorporated in the objective scene established by the sentence in the Perfekt form, the O must be salient in order to fulfill its reference-point function. Since E₁ is simultaneous with the salient O, it can be taken as inheriting the saliency from the O in question, and thus as highlighted in this schema. To guarantee this, the temporal focus (TF) must be directed at E₁.¹⁶

¹⁶ Wolfgang Klein (personal communication) merely points out that in the finite
How, then, can we explain the case of the German Perfekt in the perfective stage, where the TF is directed at E₂, but not E₁, simultaneous with S, as we saw in section 4? In this case, since the speaker's viewpoint is merged with his consciousness at S, S as the default reference point is seen as out of the objective scene, and thus cannot be salient. Therefore, we can fix the TF at E₂, but not necessarily at E₁ (note, however, that since both event times are in the objective scene, each of them has the potential to receive the TF).

Taking into consideration both the statement that the S part goes off-stage and the statement that the TF is fixed on E₁, which is simultaneous with the O in the future, we can claim that, while the S part comes to be defocalized and thus recognized as the ground, the other parts come to be focalized and thus recognized as the figure. In other words, only the present time area in the present time-sphere becomes the ground. The full-fledged version of the schema for the German Perfekt with future time reference is as follows:

(36) NON-F (p.p.)  FIN (haben (sein))

Abs:  

Rel:  E₂ ——— E₁

Here again, the figure is represented by the area surrounded by broken lines.

We are now in a position to explain why the German Perfekt can co-occur with DTP adverbials indicating a future time. Take as an example (22a), i.e., *Morgen um zehn hat er die Stadt verlassen* 'Lit.)
Tomorrow at ten he has left the city.’ As we saw in section 4, the revised P-Definiteness Constraint applies only to the figure part. With this in mind, let us account for the grammaticality of (22a). The R-component of the sentence in question is marked as p-definite because the DTP adverbial morgen um zehn ‘tomorrow at ten’ specifies E1, i.e. a constituent of the R-component. On the other hand, the A-component is not interpreted as p-definite here, because the present time area of the present time-sphere, which includes S, goes off-stage and is not in the figure part. Thus, (22a) does not violate constraint (5).

Before closing this subsection, let us briefly consider the status of the German Perfekt with future time reference in comparison with the other two types of Perfekt. I argue that the temporal schema for this type of Perfekt (36) is in a polysemous relation to both that for the Perfekt in the anterior stage (18) and that for the Perfekt in the perfective stage (11) at the TI level. At the TS level, the future use of the German Perfekt shares the same temporal schema in (21) above with the other two uses. Thus, they are all semantically related to each other. Note also that in the future use of the German Perfekt, though the time of orientation for E1 is interpreted not as S, but as the O in the future at the TI level, the O is still in the present time-sphere. In this way, the three uses of the German Perfekt are regarded as polysemous in my tense theory.

6.2. Differences in Semantic Range between the English Present Perfect and the German Perfekt

A second issue that the present approach can explain as a consequence is why the German Perfekt has a wider semantic range than the English present perfect. This subsection is devoted to the clarification of this point.

Compare first (37) with (17a), repeated here as (38).

(37) *The colossus of Rhodes has weighed 100 tons.

(38) Der Koloss von Rhodes hat hundert Tonnen gewogen.

The colossus of Rhodes has hundred tons weighed

‘The colossus of Rhodes weighed one hundred tons.’

Klein (2000: 369-371) argues that the English present perfect and the German Perfekt corresponding to it require only the predicate part (or VP) to be in the scope of the operator POST (the narrow scope reading), whereas the German Perfekt corresponding to the English simple past requires the whole of the proposition (consisting of the subject and
the predicate part) to be in the scope of the same operator (the wide
scope reading). His explanation goes as follows. In the narrow scope
reading, certain properties affected by the occurrence of the situation
described by the past participle must hold for its “posttime,” i.e. the
present time, because the “posttime” is part of and thus closely related
to the proposition described. However, it is nonsense to state that the
English perfect sentence in (37) has certain properties that take place at
present, i.e. at a time after the colossus of Rhodes weighed 100 tons in
the past. After all, we know from encyclopedic knowledge that the
colossus still weighs 100 tons if nothing special happens, and thus (in
the normal context) there are no notable properties affected by the
occurrence of the situation described by the past participle. Hence the
unacceptability of (37).

On the other hand, Klein’s argument goes, in the wide scope reading
the speaker simply refers to the “posttime” of the whole proposition; it
is irrelevant to ask whether or not the properties at the “posttime” are
affected by the occurrence of the situation represented by the past par-
ticiple. Under this reading, sentence (38) merely refers to a time after
the colossus of Rhodes weighed 100 tons, i.e. the present, and says
nothing about the properties at present. Since the German Perfekt
allows for the wide scope reading, sentence (38) can be viewed as
acceptable.

In my temporal schema-based analysis, this explanation of Klein’s
can be recaptured in the following manner. Here, I will first repeat
the schema for both the English present perfect and the German Per-
fekt corresponding to it (i.e. the German Perfekt in the anterior stage)
and that for the German Perfekt corresponding to the English simple
past (i.e. the German Perfekt in the perfective stage) as (39) and (40),
respectively.

(39) \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{NON-F (p.p.)} \\
\text{Abs:} \\
\text{Rel:} \\
\text{FIN (have/haben (sein))} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{S (V_{SPK})} \\
\text{PRES} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{E}_2 \\
\uparrow \\
\text{E}_1 \\
\text{TF} \\
\end{array}
\]
With these schemata in mind, let us first consider the English present perfect in (37). As is clear from (39), since the TF is fixed on E₁, the resultant state at S (i.e. the present time) is highlighted. Consequently, the resultant state must be meaningful enough; for if it is not, highlighting it is nonsense. But in fact, the resultant state described in (37) is not worth focusing on. Hence the unacceptability of (37).

By contrast, the German Perfekt in (38) can be considered to have schema (40). In this schema, the TF is directed at E₂, but not E₁, and thus the resultant state is not highlighted; as a result, the meaningfulness of the resultant state at S need not to be asked. Hence the acceptability of (38).

Furthermore, the temporal schemata in (39) and (40) explain the difference in acceptability between (41) and (17b), repeated here as (42).

(41) *Einstein has visited Princeton.
(42) Einstein hat Princeton besucht.
Einstein has Princeton visited
‘Einstein visited Princeton.’

The unacceptability of (41) is often accounted for by saying that the English present perfect requires its subject to refer to the entity that still exists at present (see Chomsky (1971: 212) and Inoue (1979: 575)). However, such an account is ad hoc because it cannot explain why the same does not hold for the German Perfekt in (42) nor why even in English a sentence like (43) will be acceptable, though its subject NP Einstein as a famous scientist is a dead person.

(43) Einstein has influenced me more than any other patent office employee. (Klein (2000: 371))

In this connection, Inoue (1979) states that irrespective of the existence of the subject NP, a present perfect sentence in English is acceptable if it matches a discourse topic in which it is embedded.

Let me explain, in terms of our temporal schemata, what Inoue tries to account for. As stated above, the English present perfect has sche-
ma (39) and its resultant state must be meaningful enough at S. In (43), the resultant state affected by Einstein's great influence is meaningful enough. However, sentence (41) alone does not stimulate us to imagine how much the present state of the university is affected by Einstein's visiting Princeton in the past or how the university itself is changed by his visit (cf. Inoue (1979: 575-576)). Hence the unacceptability of (41). But if such a sentence is embedded in an appropriate discourse topic like (44) below, it becomes acceptable.

(44) Princeton has memorable occasions. (Inoue (1979: 576))

(44) stimulates us to specify the resultant state of sentence (41). The resultant state can be like this: the value of the university becomes higher because of Einstein's visit. This result suggests that Inoue's statement is right and our temporal schema-based analysis can also deal with the issue.

In the case of the German Perfekt, on the other hand, the meaningfulness of the resultant state at S is not relevant. As (40) shows, its temporal schema states that the situation represented by the past participle, whose event time (E₂) receives the TF, is highlighted and its resultant state, whatever it is, merely obtains at S. Therefore, the effect of Einstein's visiting Princeton on the "posttime" is not a condition of use of the German Perfekt in the perfective stage. Hence (42) is acceptable.

7. Concluding Remarks

In this paper, we have explained, within the framework proposed in Wada (1995, 2001a), the reason why the English present perfect cannot go with DTP adverbials referring to past time, whereas the German Perfekt can. In particular, we have argued that the German Perfekt can occur with such adverbials because the revised P-Definiteness Constraint applies only to the non-finite part of the temporal schema; the English present perfect cannot go with them because the same constraint applies to the whole of the temporal schema.

We have also shown that our temporal schema-based analysis can be extended to answer the following two issues: (i) why the German Perfekt can co-occur with DTP adverbials referring to future time, whereas the English present perfect cannot, and (ii) why the German Perfekt has a wider semantic range than the English present perfect.
REFERENCES


Department of Communication Studies
Ibaraki University
2–1–1 Bunkyo, Mito-shi
Ibaraki 310–8512
e-mail: naoaki@mx.ibaraki.ac.jp