A Descriptive Study of Irish Resultative Construction*

Katsuya Kinjo

0. Introduction

One of the several aspectual expressions in Irish[1] is resultative construction, BE (substantial verb) + Verbal Adjective (VA). This construction is ambiguous in that it allows two different analyses: passive and resultative. One can argue for the resultative analysis using the following illustrative example (cf. Nedjalkov and Jaxontov (1988: 47)):

(i)   Nuair a tháinig mé ar a chúig   bhí   an doras dunta[2]

          when   came I   at five   BE(PAST) the door shut(VA)

ach níl   fhios   agam cathain a   *dhúnadh*   é.

but NEG.knowledge on me   when   that shut(IMPR.PAST) it

'When I came in at five o'clock, the door *was shut,* although I don't know when it *was shut.*'

If one assumes that Irish BE + VA construction functions like English passive, it is natural to think that the "closing the door action" and the state of "being shut" will be expressed by the same strategy. However, this assumption is not correct, observable in (i), where the impersonal rather than BE + VA construction, appears. Other things being equal, if the impersonal sentence and the BE + VA construction without any indication of the agent can convey the same intended meaning, there is no reason to avoid the latter construction. Therefore, this type of avoidance of the BE + VA construction suggests that the construction at issue is not useful in expressing the passive meaning. Further, if passive analysis is correct, it must be the case that the action in question can be described from the point of view of how it was conducted. For instance, passive sentences in English can be combined with the adverbs of manner:

(ii)   The door was *quickly/ slowly/ carefully* closed.

The corresponding sentence in Irish does not allow these adverbs:

(iii)   ??Bhí   an bata briste   go tapaidh / go cúramach.

          BE(PAST) the stick break (VA) quickly   carefully

Thus, this construction will be regarded as resultative in this study, and how it will be described in the framework of Nedjalkov and Jaxontov (1988) will be seen. Definition of some related terms as well as the key notion, resultative, is in order.

1. Resultative and perfect

1.1. Definition of resultative

Employing Nedjalkov and Jaxontov's (1988) terminology, actions, states and qualities can be

distinguished:

> Action : a change in time (e.g. to build, to make)
>
> State   : a stable unchangeable characteristic of thing or person, but not a permanent feature.
>
>> It can have a beginning and an end, or at least a beginning (e.g. to be broken).
>
> Quality : a stable unchangeable characteristic, without beginning and end. Things
>
>> may possess different degrees of quality (e.g. long, tall) and characteristics.

State can be subdivided into *primary state* and *secondary state*. The former may come into being by itself, irrespective of the will or effort of an agent. On the other hand, the latter is defined as a result of someone's conscious action or activity.

The following verb distinctions are introduced:

Terminative verbs denote a transition from one state to another, or acquisition of a quality (e.g. to sit down, to fall, to forget, to ripen, etc.)

Durative verbs do not imply a definite purpose (e.g. to sing, to look, to run, to work) or express a state (e.g. to sit, to know).

Note that it is the terminative verb that typically concerns the meaning of resultative. The term *statives* is used here to denote the forms that express state as defined above. Especially when a lexical item by its base form or entire paradigm denotes the meaning of state - for instance, non-derived verbs (to sit, to sleep, etc.), some adjectives (sick, open, tall, etc.), and predicative adverbs (afraid, aware, etc.) - they are termed *lexical statives*.

The term *resultative* is used here to indicate those verb forms that express a state implying a previous action. Resultative is distinguished from stative in that the latter expresses a thing's state with no implication of its origin; on the other hand, the former expresses both a state and the previous action from which it has resulted. For instance, (1a) expresses the antecedent situations, and (1b) is a logical consequence of (1a): if John has broken a stick, it is broken now. Thus, (1b) is construed as an example of resultative, but (2) expresses the quality of the stick, and does not belong to resultative:

(1)	a.	Bhris	Seán bata.	'John broke a stick.'
		break (PAST) John stick		
	b.	Tá an bata briste.		'The stick is broken.'
		BE the stick break(VA)		
(2)		Tá an bata trom.		'The stick is heavy.'
		BE the stick heavy		

1.2. Resultative and perfect

The demarcation between the resultatives and the perfect is difficult to draw. Treatment of these terms varies among linguists (c.f. Chafe 1970; Comrie 1976; Greene 1979; Hasegawa 1992; Haugen 1972; Inoue 1979; Kozinsky 1988; Lyons 1968; Majewicz 1982, 1985; Maslov 1988; Nedjalkov and Jaxontov 1988).[3] Provision of at least a general idea of the difference between these two notions is appropriate.

Perfect is generally recognized as expressing "an action (process or state) in the past which has continuing relevance for the present" (Nedjalkov and Jaxontov 1988: 15). Because the matter is subject to controversy, the following characteristics are pointed out to differentiate notions of *perfect* and *resultative* :

(i)   Perfect does not overtly express the after-effects of the action expressed.

(ii)   Resultative mainly concerns the terminative verb, but the
        perfect does not have such a restriction on verbs.

(iii)   The valency of the verb changes in resultative, but not in perfect.

(iv)   The interpretation of time adverbials differs in perfect and resultative.

(Nedjalkov and Jaxontov 1988: 15-17 with modification)

Based on this definition, the following section observes Irish resultative construction, considering (i) its formation, (ii) the restriction on it, (iii) similarity between resultative and stative, and (iii) some typological implication.

2. Irish resultative construction

Irish expression of resultatives by use of the substantive verb (i.e. TÁ paradigm) and the verbal adjective verb form has a unique status in the verb paradigm as well as the verbal noun. It is arguable that verbal adjectives in Irish can be considered as (perfective) participle forms, and that the demarcation between passive and resultative is vague. The first focus here is on verbal adjective formation.

Dillon and O'Croinin (1961) point out that "the past participle is formed with the ending *-te* , *-ta*, depending on whether the verbal stem is slender [i.e. palatalized] or broad [i.e. velarized]" (p.41). Although this formulation and the other statement on aspiration (or *lenition*, cf. Note 7) generally apply, close examination reveals some exceptions. For instance, *cosain* "to defend" ends with a palatalized [n], although it should be followed by *-ta* rather than *-te* ; when the stem ends with a vowel (which in data collected for this study is exclusively [i:]), the verbal adjective suffix should be *-te* . There are some cases where the palatalized consonants such as [r', m'] are followed by *-tha* (e.g. *bagair* "to threaten", *dibir* "to banish", *foghlaim* "to teach"). Hence, Irish verbal adjective suffixes do not take into consideration

whether or not the verb in question is transitive. [4]

Of interest here is the existence of one verb which does not have VA form, namely, the substantial verb. This might be related to the function of the verb, i.e. to express the contingent state. (This point can be clarified by assuming a situation wherein a verbal adjective of BE is used in BE + VA construction. What is it supposed to mean in the ordinary conversational situation?). As a rule, the above suffixation rule can apply to all verbs except the substantial BE. There must be the verbal adjective forms of the durative verbs as well as the terminative verbs. Note that the reason proposed for two types is that the latter type mainly concerns the resultative meaning. If so, what is the meaning of the sentences in which the VA form of the durative verbs is used? (Some durative verbs avoid fitting into the construction (cf. the next section)). Moreover, note that not all the -ta/-te adjectives recorded in dictionaries have their origins in the corresponding verbs. That is to say, this suffix is rather derivative, and it functions to convert an adjective from a noun. Following are some examples (no examples with -te/-the were found in the data):

NOUN		ADJECTIVE with -ta/-tha	
ainscian	"wildness"	ainscianta	"wild, furious"
anás	"need, poverty"	anásta	"needy, clumsy"
blas	"taste"	blasta	"tasty"
cineál	"kind, species"	cineálta	"kind, pleasant, mild"
diabhal	"devil"	diabhalta	"mischievous"
inneall	"arrangement, order"	innealta	"ordered, neat, skilled"
laom	"flash, blaze"	laomtha	"blazing, brilliant"
nádúr	"nature"	nádúrtha	"natural, normal"

2.1. Subjective and objective resultative

Nedjalkov and Jaxontov (1988) recognize two diathesis types of resultatives, the *subjective resultative* and the *objective resultative* [5]:

"... In the case of the subjective resultative, the underlying subject of the state (which is expressed by the surface subject of the stative predicate) is co-referential with the underlying subject of the preceding action, while in the case of the objective resultative it is co-referential with the underlying object of the latter." (p.9)

In Irish, these two resultative types are not formally distinguished as Mongolian cases (cf. Note 5), leading to some interesting phenomena. For example:

Obj. resultative:

(3) a. Bhris Seán bata.   'John broke a stick.'

       break(PAST) John stick

    b. Tá an bata   briste.   'The stick is broken.'

       BE the stick break(VA)

(4) a. Ní   siad an t-urlár.   'They washed the floor.'

       wash(PAST) they the floor

    b. Tá an t-urlár nite.   'The floor is washed.'

       BE the floor   wash(VA)

Subj. resultative:

(5) a. Bhearr Seán é   fein.   'John shaved himself.'

       shave(PAST) John him self

    b. Tá Seán bearrtha.   'John is shaven.'

       BE John shave(VA)

(6) a. D'éag   sé.   'He died.'

       die(PAST) he

    b. Tá sé marbh.   'He is dead.'

       BE he dead

(7) a. Chuir   Seán hata air.   'John put on a hat.'

       put(PAST) John hat   on him

    b. Tá Seán ag caitheamh hata.   'John has a hat on.' or

       BE John at put(VN)   hat   'John is putting on a hat.'

The above examples demonstrate that there is no restriction to the objective resultative, but the subjective resultative is restricted in that the underlying subject (the agent of the action described in (a) sentences) cannot also be a subject of the resultative construction. In this latter case, the VA is substituted by an adjective (6) or the progressive form (7) in order to describe the situation resulting from the event. However, in the case of (5), in which the agent of the action is also the patient, i.e. reflexive situation (cf. Barber 1975), although it cannot be determined that the subject of (5b) was the subject or the object in (a) sentence, the resultative form is permitted. Moreover, the verbs of coming and going do not show this kind of restriction:

(8) a. Tháining   sé go dtí an schoil.   'He came to the school.'

       come(PAST) he to   the school

b. Tá sé tagtha   go dtí an schoil.   'He has come to the school.'

BE he come(VA) to   the school

2.2. Oblique resultative

In Irish what Nedjalkov and Jaxontov (1985: 10) call *oblique resultative*, in which the subject of the resultative construction is not co-referential with the underlying subject or the object, is observable. For example,

(9) a. D'ualaigh mé na paicéid ar an gcarr.[6]

load(PAST) I the packets onto the car

'I loaded the packets onto the car.'

b. Tá an carr ualaithe le paicéid.

BE the car load(VA) with packets

'The car is loaded with packets.'

With regard to whether or not the underlying subject is co-referential with the dative, oblique cases can be subdivided into two groups: (i) A puts B on C (≠ A) >> C has B on (C contains B, e.g. (9)), and A puts B on C (= A) (i.e. A puts on B) >> A (= C) has B on (i.e. A is wearing B). As already observed, the latter case is not expressed with BE + VA construction in Irish (cf.(7))

2.3. Quasi-resultative

Unlike such other languages as Armenian, Chukchee, German and Hindi, Irish does not have quasi-resultative, which is characterized by stative verbs such as those of emotion, (e.g. 'to get angry', 'to surprise') or of physical contact (e.g. 'to fill', 'to surround') (Nedjalkov and Jaxontov 1985: 13-15). For example, Nedjalkov and Jaxontov point out that sentences such as 'The tub is filled with water' and 'I am surprised at it' can express natural states with no previous action or process. Sentences such as 'The village is surrounded by mountains' and 'Mountains surround the village' both express the stative meaning. Observe the following Irish cases:

(10) a. Chuir   sé ionadh orm.   'He surprised me.'

put(PAST) he surprise on me

b. Tá ionadh   orm.   'I am surprised.'

BE surprise on me

(11)   Tá sléibhte   timpeall an bhaile.

BE mountains around the village

'The village is surrounded by mountains./ Mountains surround the village.'

(12)   Tá an bosca líonta   le h-uisce.   'The box is filled with water.'

BE the box fill(VA) with water

Sentences (10) and (11) demonstrate that Irish does not have the quasi-resultative. However, Nedjalkov and Jaxontov's claim that the state of 'being filled with water' does not imply the causing event merits further discussion. If their argument is correct and some languages do have the quasi-resultative while Irish does not, it might be misleading to treat the last example as an exception present in Irish. As Majewicz (1985) points out, the definition of the stative verbs varies from language to language. At least it might be argued that "to fill A with B" should be regarded as an action which can cause a certain result.

2.4. Comparison with other statives

It is known that in Irish there are three ways to express the stative meaning:

(i)   BE   + NP (predicate)   + on NP (subject)

(ii)   BE   + NP (subject) + adjective

(iii)   IS   + adjective   + NP (subject)

For example, the meaning 'I'm tired' can be expressed in the following sentences:

(13)   a.   Tá   tuirse   orm.

            BE tiredness(NOM.sg.) on me

      b.   Tá   mé   tuirseach.

            BE   I   tired

      c.   Is   tuirseach   mé.

            COP.   tired   I

Notice that in resultative sentences using VA, there is no third possibility such as COP. + VA + subject NP:

(14)   *Is   Seán   bearrtha.

             COP.   John   shave(VA)   '(intended meaning =) John is shaven.'

If, as Comrie (1976: 103-4) has pointed out, it is correct to assume that the Irish copula, IS, functions to indicate the permanent state of a thing and BE the contingent state, it might be argued that the ungrammaticality of sentence (14) can be attributed to the inconsistency of the resultant state (temporary) and the meaning of the copula verb. [7]

2.5. General and specific resultative

Resultative meaning can be divided into two groups according to whether the speaker witnessed the action which caused the situation or is merely inferring the preceding action from the resultant state. Nedjalkov and Jaxontov (1988: 28ff) distinguish between these two, calling the former *specific resultative* meaning and the latter, *general-resultative*. [8] Generally, when one finds a general-resultative in a language, the specific-resultative can also be found, but not vice versa. The general-resultative type is

associated with the verb which "expresses either 'non-physical' actions or those which result in destruction or disappearance of a thing" (ibid.). For example,

(15)   Tá an t-airgead goidte.   'The money is stolen.'

          BE the money steal(VA)

This sentence could be uttered in a situation where the money at issue is not where it should be and the speaker knows or supposes that someone has stolen it. It appears that Irish does not distinguish these two types of resultatives, in contrast to other languages (e.g. Chukchee, Eskimo, Mongolian, Nivkh and others (1988: 29)).

With regard to the specific resultatives, the important thing from the typological perspective is that Irish has bi-valent resultatives deriving from tri-valent non-resultatives. For example, such tri-valent transitives as 'to tie (something to somewhere)' or 'to glue (something to something)' can have the resultative counterpart (i.e. bi-valent resultatives):

(16) a.   Cheangail sé an madra don gheata.   'He tied the dog to the gate.'
           tie(PAST) he the dog   to the gate

      b.   Tá an madra ceangailte don gheata.   'The dog is tied to the gate.'
           BE the dog   tie (VA)   to the gate

(17) a.   Ghiúáil   sé stampa ar an gclúdach.
           glue(PAST) he stamp to the envelope
           'He glued a stamp to the envelope.'

      b.   Tá an stampa glúáilte   ar an gclúdach.
           BE the stamp glue (VA) to the envelope
           'The stamp is glued to the envelope.'

The existence of this bi-valent resultative in Irish is in accordance with the following universal stated by Nedjalkov and Jaxontov (1988: 32): "If there are mono-valent resultatives formed from bi-valent verbs in a language, this implies that there must be bi-valent resultatives formed from tri-valent verbs." This universal can be supported by Kozinskiy's (1988) claim that bi-valent (locational) resultatives (e.g. (16) and (17)) are more observable than mono-valent resultatives (e.g. 'The window is broken'), in that bi-valent resultatives manifest both the figure and the ground (in Talmy's (1975) sense), but the mono-valent situation requires one to infer the ground where the "normal" state of the thing at issue is recognized in order to declare that the situation at hand results from a preceding action.

3. Summary

Application of Nejalkov and Jaxontov's framework leads to observation that (i) the resultative

should be distinguished from perfect, (ii) Irish resultative has restrictions on the formation of subject and quasi-resultatives, (iii) there is structural similarity between resultative and other stative expressions, and (iv) Irish has both general and specific resultatives, especially mono-valent and bi-valent (locational) resultatives. As space is limited, concentration has been on resultatives with scant attention to other aspectual categories (cf. Note 6). There remain some problems which are beyond the scope of a brief paper; they include the position of resultatives in Irish aspect and the relationship between so-called substantive verb, BE, and contingent state.

Notes

[1] Irish belongs to the Celtic branch of the Indo-European family. However, unlike other IE languages, Celtic languages share VSO word-order pattern in common. Although the influence of English was powerful, it was the Great Famine (1846-48) which drastically changed the future of Irish. Ó Siadhail (1989) says,

"The Great Famine, which decimated the poorer rural classes, dealt a fatal blow to Irish, which now survives as a community language only in outlying and diminishing rural districts generally referred to as the Gaeltacht. The population of the Gaeltacht may now be considerably less than 25,000 with hardly any monoglots remaining." (1-2)

[2]   The following abbreviations are utilized: COP. = copula, GEN. genitive case, HAB. = habitual form, IMPR. = impersonal form, NEG. = negative, PASS = passive, PAST. = past tense, Q.= interrogative marker, RESULT. = resultative, VA = verbal adjective, VN = verbal noun.

[3]   Hasegawa (1992) discusses Japanese resultative constructions (Valence-Maintaining and Valence-Changing cases) and concludes that VM construction has both the resultative and (present) perfect meanings.

[4]   This point can be compared with Japanese, where there are two distinct resultative markers, *-te-ir-* and *-te-ar-* ; the former attaches to the intransitive verbs, and the latter to the transitive verbs.

[5]   This distinction can be clearly observed in, for example, Mongolian, where there are two verbal endings to form verbal adjectives, i.e. *-xaj* and *-mal*. The former is attached to intransitive verbs to form subjective resultative adjectives (cf. (b)), and the latter, objective resultative (cf. (d)):

a.	jalzr-ax	'to rot'
b.	jalzar-xaj	'rotten'
c.	altd-ax	'to gild'
d.	altad-mal	'gilt'

<div align="right">(Dugarova & Jaxontova (1988, p.209))</div>

Therefore, one might suspect that what I call AFTER-construction ((iv) below) in Irish is the case of subjective resultative. However, the perfect, to which the AFTER-construction belongs, and the resultative are recognized as two different aspectual categories herein.

(iv)   Tá Seán tar éis bata a bhriseadh.   'John has just broken a stick.'

       BE John after   stick at break(VN)

6   Irish prepositions cause 'lenition' and 'eclipsis' in the following nouns. In the case of lenition, for example, the change of [t] to [h] in *teach* [tjax] 'house' - *theach* [hjax] 'house' is notationally indicated by insertion of a letter 'h' immediately after the first consonant letter. On the other hand, one of the prepositions, ar, requires an eclipted form (e.g. *p* [p] > *bp* [b] (eclipted), *b* [b] > *mb* [m] (eclipted)) of a noun, so *gcarr* [ga:r] 'car' is not a misspelled word but an eclipted form of a noun *carr* [ka:r] 'car'. (cf. Morgan 1992)

7   It is well recognized that other aspectual constructions in Irish also utilize the substantial verb BE but not the copula IS. The following display sketches these aspectual constructions:

Resultative   :   BE + VA

Perfect   :   BE + tar éis + VN   (=AFTER construction)

Progressive :   BE + preposition + VN

    e.g.   Táim   ag tabhairt   an leabhar don chailín óg.

                BE(1st.sg.) at give(VN) the book   to the girl   young

                'I'm giving the book to the young girl'

Habitual   :   V (habitual form) / BE + preposition + VN

    e.g.   Bím   i mo chodhladh.   'I (habitually) sleep.'

                BE(PRES. HAB.) in my sleep(VN)

Inchoative   :   Be + ar tí/ chun + VN

    e.g.   Tá sé   ar tí   an bata a bhriseadh.

                BE he about to the bat at break(VN)

                'He is about to break the bat.'

8   This inferential description leads one to the study of evidentials in several languages (cf. Haugen

1972). In Turkish, the evidential marker -*miş*, which also functions as a marker of perfective meaning, functions to express only the inferential event (cf. Aksu & Slovin (1986) for detail). Japanese also has several evidential markers, such as -*soo*, -*yoo*, and -*rasii*, and one hearsay marker, -*soo* (cf. Aoki (1986)).

References

Aksu-Koç, Ayhan and Dan I. Slobin, 1986. A psychological account of the development
    and use of evidentials in Turkish. In W. Chafe & J. Nichols (eds.) *Evidentiality* :
    the linguistics coding of epistemology. Vol. XX of Advances in Discourse Processes.
    Norwood, N.J.: Ablex Publishing Co., pp. 185-200.

Aoki, Haruo. 1986. Evidentials in Japanese. In W. Chafe and J. Nichols (eds.), pp. 223-38.

Barber, E. J. W. 1975. Voice- Beyond the passive. Proceedings of the First Annual Meeting of
    the Berkeley Linguistic Society, pp. 16-24.

Chafe, Wallace L. 1970. Meaning and the Structure of Language. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

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

Dillon, Myles. 1941.Modern Irish *atá sé deanta agam* "I have done it". Language, 17, pp.49-50.

Dugarova, Galina S. and Natalia S. Jaxontova 1988. Resultative and perfect in Mongolian. In V.
    P. Nedjalkov (ed.) *Typology of Resultative Constructions.*, pp. 209-20.

Foclóir Póca English-Irish/ Irish-English Dictionary. 1986. An Gúm.

Greene, David. 1979. Perfects and perfectives in modern Irish. Ériu, XXX, pp. 122-41.

Hasegawa, Yoko. 1992. On the ambiguity between the perfect and the resultative: evidence from
    V-te ar- construction in Japanese. To appear in Proceedings of the Eighteenth Annual Meeting
    of the Berkeley Linguistic Society.

Haugen, Einar. 1972. The inferential perfect in Scandinavian: a problem of contrastive
    linguistics. Canadian Journal of Linguistics, 17:2, pp.132-39.

Inoue, Kyoko. 1979. An analysis of the English present perfect. Linguistics, 17, pp. 561-81.

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

Lyons, John. 1968. Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Majewicz, Alfred F. 1985. The Grammatical Category of Aspect in Japanese and Polish in a
    Comparative Perspective. Poznan: Adam Mickiewicz University Press.

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

Morgan, Pamela S. 1992. Some Irish prepositions: Central sense and overlap. Working Papers in Linguistics 1: Irish. Department of Lingusitics, UC Berkeley., pp. 65-106.

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

Ó Siadhail, Mícheál. 1989. Modern Irish: Grammatical Structure and Dialectal Variation. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sayers, Peig. 1974. Peig. Comhlacht Oideachais Na hÉireann.

Talmy, Leonard. 1975. Figure and ground in complex sentences. Working Papers on Language Universals, 17. Stanford: Stanford University Press, pp. 65-76.

論文要旨

アイルランド語結果相構文の記述的研究

金 城 克 哉

　アスペクト表現の研究は日本語でも活発におこなわれているが、研究者の理論的背景などにより、個々の表現の記述に一貫性がなく、言語間の比較研究に役立つ基盤は見出しにくい。この論文ではアイルランド語の結果相表現の記述を、ネジャルコフとホントフ（1988）の枠組みの中で行う。彼らの研究は結果相について、類型学的にかなり広い視野をもっていることが特徴である。ここではアイルランド語の結果相表現を次のように特徴づける。(1)結果相表現は受動表現と区別されるべきものであること。(2)主語および動詞にはある種の制限がみられること。(3)結果相表現は構文的に他の状態表現とかなり近い関係にあること等。ここでは詳しく論じる余裕はなかったが、結果相表現がアスペクト表現全体の中で占める位置、アスペクト表現に共通して見られるＢＥ動詞（コピュラとは区別される）の意味特徴と各々の表現との関わりなど、これからのアスペクト研究に残された課題は大きいといえる。