Correction to: Severing telicity from result On two types of resultative compound verb in Dongying Mandarin

Chenchen Song¹

Published online: 12 June 2018
© Springer Nature B.V. 2018

Correction to: J East Asian Linguist <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10831-018-9170-8>

In the online publication of above-mentioned article a few corrections were incorrectly carried out.

In Introduction, first paragraph below example (1) the correct sentence reads:
Second, I will further adapt the split-VP model along the lines of Cuervo (2003) (event decomposition) and Travis (2010) (Inner Aspect).

In Sect. 7.1, second paragraph below example (52) the correct sentence reads:
A solution to this problem is implied in Travis' (2010) three loci of telicity marking, i.e. V1, Asp, and X in (34), or Voice, Asp, and v BE(-√) in (40).

In Sect. 7.2, paragraph above example (57) the correct text reads:
In addition, the bare *liu* passes the telic tests in Sect. 3 well. As in (57), it is incompatible with an additional telicizing *liu* in completive context, conditional *bu*-negation, and the potential-*liu* construction.

The original article has been corrected.

The original article can be found online at <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10831-018-9170-8>.

✉ Chenchen Song
cs791@cam.ac.uk

¹ Theoretical and Applied Linguistics, Faculty of Modern and Medieval Languages, University of Cambridge, Sidgwick Avenue, Cambridge CB3 9DA, UK