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Polysemy and Idiomatization: A Study of Japanese Transitive-Intransitive Pairs

Toru MATSUZAKI

1. Introduction

This study investigates Japanese transitive-intransitive pairs to determine whether their alternating behaviors will be explained by the syntax-lexical semantics interface as observed in English transitive-intransitive pairs. The primary goal is to elucidate the semantic properties that trigger the syntactic behaviors. I will demonstrate that semantic properties such as change of state and lack of agentivity are key factors in the alternatability of a verb. I further point out that specification of a means or an instrument is another crucial semantic property which distinguishes verbs which alternate in transitivity from those which do not. Furthermore, the present study focuses on the fact that transitive-intransitive pairs do not obtain unconditionally, but that they seem to be constrained by the context in which they occur. I argue that the verb’s polysemy is responsible for such inconsistent behaviors of a single verb, illustrating that verbs with figurative meanings have a strong tendency to fail to undergo the transitive-intransitive alternation.

The structure of the paper is organized as follows. Section I presents two issues regarding transitive-intransitive verb pairs. Section II analyzes verbal semantic properties which contribute to the alternation of verbs. In this section I also mention several sets of verbs which show a contradictory
behavior in terms of transitivity alternation. Section Ⅲ examines two semantic features that appear to be responsible for the unalternatibility of change-of-state verbs. I argue that specification of a means or an instrument plays a key role in rendering change-of-state verbs unable to alternate in transitivity. Section Ⅲ discusses the Japanese verb pair *kir/-kire*-‘cut/get cut’ in light of the inconsistency of alternating behavior. I suggest that verbs characterized by such an inconsistent alternating behavior exceptionally have multiple layers of meaning. Section Ⅲ discusses the notion of polysemy, proposing the possibility that the inconstant behaviors of transitive-intransitive verbs are due in part to semantic drift commonly observed in the semantic change of words.

2. Two Issues of Transitive-Intransitive Alternation

There are two issues concerning the transitive-intransitive alternation that need to be addressed. One is that there are transitive and intransitive verbs which do not alternate in transitivity under any circumstances. As mentioned above, the English verb *hit* simply lacks an intransitive use.

(1)  
a. Tom hit the boy.  
b. *The boy hit.

The Japanese equivalent *tatah*- ‘hit’ also fails to occur in intransitive constructions.

(2)  
a. Taro- wa  Akira-o  tataita.  
   Taro-Nom  Akira-Acc  hit  
   ‘Taro hit Akira.’  
b. *Akira-ga  tatakatta.  
   Akira-Acc  tatak- + ta  

-  -
Akira-Nom got hit  
‘Akira got hit.’

The other complex aspect of the transitive-intransitive alternation is that verbs which alternate in transitivity are not always consistent with their behaviors. Van Voorst 梅林, Lemmens 梅林 For instance, while the English verb break normally alternates in transitivity, it fails to undergo the alternation when the verb takes contract as the Theme argument.

(3) a. He broke the contract.

b. *The contract broke. Levin and Rappaport 梅林

A similar phenomenon is observed among Japanese transitive-intransitive pairs. The intransitive verb tat- ‘to stand’ is paired with tate- ‘set up,’ alternating in transitivity.

(4) a. Boo-ga tat-te iru.

   pole-Nom stand-Asp

   ‘The pole stands.’


   child-Nom pole-Acc put up-Asp

   ‘The child is putting up the pole.’

However, if the intransitive verb tat- occurs with an animate subject, then the transitive counterpart becomes ungrammatical in the construction with the same template:


   child-Nom hallway-in stand-Asp

   ‘A child stands in the hallway.’
   Taro-Top child-Acc hallway-in stand-Asp
   ‘Taro stands a child in the hallway.’

Given the two issues, discussions that follow should be centered on why some verbs alternate in transitivity while others simply do not and what properties of a Theme argument preclude typical transitive-intransitive verbs like break from alternating in transitivity.

3. Conditions for Transitive-Intransitive Alternation


(6) a. Tom dried his clothes in the sun.
   b. His clothes dried in the sun.

(7) a. Taro-wa huku-o kawakasita. ⓧ kawakas- + ta ⓧ
   Taro-Top clothes-Acc dried
   ‘Taro dried his clothes.’
   b. Huku-ga kawaita. ⓧ kawak- + ta ⓧ
   clothes-Nom dried
   ‘The clothes dried.’

(8) a. Taro-wa huku-o hosita.
Taro-Top clothes.Acc hung to dry
'Taro hung his clothes out to dry.'

b. *Huku-ga hosatta. Serviço + ta

            clothes-Nom hung out to dry
'The clothes hung out to dry.'

Hayatsu points out that hos- lacks its intransitive counterpart since it does
not inherently entail the resultant state of dryness, but rather describes or
"focuses on" the act of hanging out something e.g., laundry or seaweed to be dried. On the other hand, kawakas- entails not only the act associated with hos- but the resultant state of things being dry The difference in meaning becomes more apparent when the two verbs are used in a coordinate construction 'A and B', in which the act 'B' always follows
the act 'A' chronologically. Since the resultant state is the result of an act,
one may expect that kawakas- and hos- should be arranged in the order
'hos- and kawakas-' but not vice versa. This predication proves to be cor-
rect, as illustrated below:

(9) a. Taro-wo huku-o hosite kawakasita.

            Taro-Top clothes-acc hung-and let dry
'Taro hung his clothes and let them dry.'

b. *Taro-wo huku-o kawakasi-te hos-ita.

            Taro-Top clothes-acc let dry-and hung out
'Taro let his clothes dry and hung them out.'

Thus, it will be more appropriate for hos- to be translated into 'to hang out
indo dry' In short, the differing syntactic behaviors demonstrated by
kawakas- and hos- in and seem to point to the fact that change of
state plays a significant role in determining the alternatability of verbs in
Japanese.

- -
It is important to note here that Japanese verbs of change of state do not always undergo the transitive-intransitive alternation. Mitsunobu elaborates on this point, providing a list of transitive verbs which, while they entail change of state, lack intransitive counterparts.


While the verbs listed above still raise the issue of how to define change of state, Mitsunobu correctly observes that verbs like kizam- and tog-, which are undoubtedly considered change-of-state verbs, fail to alternate with intransitive counterparts. Towards the end of her article, Hayatsu adds several other transitive verbs that entail change of state but yet do not alternate in transitivity. As illustrated below, they primarily include verbs of cutting.

(11) a. Taroo-wa kyuuri-o kizanda. k kizam- + ta)

Taro-Top cucumber-Acc minced
‘Taro minced cucumbers.’

b. *Kyuuri-ga kizamatta. k kizamar- + ta)

Cucumber-Nom got minced
‘Cucumbers got minced.’

(12) a. Taroo-wa kusa-o katta k kar- + ta)

Taro-Top grass-Acc cut
‘Taro cut the grass (with a sickle)’
b. *Kusa-ga kareta  kare- +ta  
grass-Nom got cut
‘The grass got cut  with a sickle’

(13) a. Taroo-wa kama-de kusa-o naida.  nag + ta  
Taro-Top sickle-with grass-Acc cut
‘Taro cut the grass horizontally  with a sickle’
b. *Kusa-ga nagatta.  nagar- + ta  
grass-Nom got cut
‘The grass got cut horizontally  with a sickle’

(14) a. Taroo-wa katagami-ni sotte nuno-o tatta.  
Taro-Top pattern-along cloth-Acc cut
‘Taro cut the cloth along the pattern  with a pair of scissors’
b. *Katagami-ni sotte nuno-ga tatatta.  tatar- + ta  
pattern-along cloth-Nom got cut
‘The cloth got cut along the pattern  with a pair of scissors’

(15) a. Taroo-wa hootyoo-o togu  
Taro-Top knife-Acc sharpen
‘Taro sharpens a knife.’
b. *Hootyoo-ga togaru  
knife-Nom sharpen
‘A knife sharpens.’

Thus, the next question that needs to be addressed is whether there are other semantic properties that differentiate non-alternating verbs as in  from a large number of alternating verbs in Japanese.

4. Semantic Factors Preventing Alternating Behaviors of Verbs

4.1. Specification of Means and Instrument

Hayatsu characterizes the verbs in  in the preceding section as
special verbs with limited use, suggesting that the lack of the intransitive counterparts is due to the verbs’ detailed description of the process of actions  cornerstone. For instance, *kizam* - in *kizam* emphasizes the repetition of the action i.e., cutting an object into pieces more than the resulting state of an entity after being minced. In a similar vein, *tog* - in *tog* cannot be used intransitively because it is more concerned with the object and the situation where the knife is sharpened. In this light, Hayatsu maintains that *kir* - alternates with the intransitive counterpart *kire* - because it describes the act of cutting in general if for more detailed discussion of *kir* / *kire* -, see Section below.

Fundamentally, I concur with Hayatsu’s analysis of Japanese non-alternating verbs of cutting. My position, however, is crucially different from Hayatsu’s in that the semantic property shared by those non-alternating verbs could be minimally characterized as the entailment of the use of an instrument. Verbs like *oros* - ‘grate,’ *hik* - ‘ground’ and *kezur* - ‘sharpen’ lexicalize the use of an instrument but lack intransitive counterparts.

(16) a. Taroo-wa daikon-o  òrosigane-de  orosita.  
    Taro-Top radish-Acc  grater-with  grating  
    ‘Taro grated the radish with the grater’ 
   b. *Daikon-ga  òrosigane-de  orita.  
    radish-Nom  grater-with  got grating  
    ‘The radish got grated well with a grater’

(17) a. Taroo-wa kohii mame-o  hiita.  Òk  hik- + ta  
    Taro-Top coffee bean-Acc ground  
    ‘Taro ground the coffee beans.’ 
coffee bean-Nom  got ground

‘Coffee beans got ground.’

(18) a. Taroo-wa enpitu-o kezutta. Taro-Top pencil-Acc sharpened

‘Taro sharpened a pencil.’

pencil-Nom got sharpened

‘The pencil got sharpened.’

The specificity of an instrument or a means associated with the verbs in

will be made more explicit when compared with alternating
change-of-state verbs like war- ‘break’ and or- ‘snap,’ none of which pre-
suppose the use of an instrument or a means in order for an event to take
place. My argument will be corroborated by the fact that the events de-
noted by such verbs can occur in a variety of ways, as illustrated below:

(19) a. Taroo-wa kabin-o yuka-ni otosi te watte simatta.
Taro-Top vase-Acc floor-onto dropped and broke

‘Taro dropped the vase and broke it.’

b. Taroo-wa koron de ude-no hone-o otte simatta.
Taro-Top fell and arm-Gen bone-Acc broke

‘Taro fell down and broke his arm.’

In short, change of state is a key semantic property that has to do with a
verb’s alternatability in Japanese. It is important to note that an addi-
tional concept ‘specificity of a means’ should be taken into consideration in
accounting for certain change-of-state verbs that fail to alternate in transi-
tivity.
4.2. Subject and Animacy

It has been shown that lexical specification of the use of an instrument precludes a causative transitive verb from de-transitivizing in Japanese. Given this observation, one may question how we can tell whether a given verb is lexically specified in terms of the use of an instrument. One characteristic of English change of state verbs is that they can occur with inanimate subjects. For example, the verb \textit{break} can take instrument or natural force as its subject.

\begin{enumerate}
  \item The earthquake broke the window.
  \item The stone broke the window.
  \item The ball's hitting broke the ball.
\end{enumerate}

On the other hand, verbs entailing a lexically specified instrument as part of their meanings restrict choices of syntactic subjects: they are almost limited to animate or quasi-animate agents [cf. Langendoen 1988 294] Talmy 1985 120] Levin and Rappaport Hovav 1998]. As a result, the verb \textit{cut} cannot obtain with non-animate subjects.

\begin{enumerate}
  \item The earthquake cut the cord.
  \item The ax cut the rope.
  \item The ax's falling cut the curtain.
\end{enumerate}

It has been noted in the literature, however, that a number of languages, including Japanese, have a strong tendency to prevent non-volitional agents such as natural forces and instruments from occurring as transitive subjects [Delancey 1998 30] Croft 2001 101] cf. Talmy 1985 129] Langacker 1987 117] Yoshikawa 1996] For instance, the transitive \textit{war-} 'break' does not occur with an inanimate subject as illustrated below.
23 a. #Zisin-ga mado-o watta.  
    earthquake-Nom window-Acc broke  
    ‘The earthquake broke the window.’  
b. *Ono-ga mado-o watta. 
    ax-Nom window-Acc broke  
    ‘The ax broke the window.’  
c. *Booru-ga atatta-koto-ga mado-o watta. 
    ball-Nom hit-Ger-Nom window-Acc broke  
    ‘The ball’s hitting broke the ball.’

Rather, Japanese is most likely to describe events brought about by inanimate causes as intransitive events, placing affected themes in subject positions. Thus, de-subjectivized causing events are represented in the form of an adverbial phrase as in  moo or a adverbial clause as in  moo-c

23 a. Zisin-no seide mado-ga wareta.   
    earthquake-Gen due to window-Nom broke  
    ‘Due to the earthquake the window broke.’  
b. Ono-ga atat-te mado-ga wareta. 
    ax-Nom hit-and window-Nom broke  
    ‘The ax hit the window and the window broke.’  
c. Booru-ga korogat-te kabin-ni atari kabin-ga wareta. 
    ball-Nom roll-and vase-Obl hit vase-Nom broke  
    ‘The rolling ball hit the vase and the vase broke.’

Other Japanese equivalents to English break-type verbs follow the same syntactic pattern.

24 a. The nail tore my shirt.  
b. Syatu-ga kugi-ni hikkakat-te saketa.
shirt-Nom nail-on catch-and tore

'The shirt caught on the nail and tore.'

a. Too much weight fractured my bones.

b. Zyuuryo-ga kakari sugi-te hone-ga oreta.

weight-Nom on too much-and bones-Nom fractured

'Too much weight was on me and my bones fractured.'

Given the unacceptability or, at best, much less acceptability of inanimate causing events as syntactic subjects in Japanese, the view that the degree of specification of an instrument can be measured by the range of causing events that verbs permit, as observed with English transitive-intransitive pairs, does not hold for Japanese verbs. Rather, I propose that it is our lexical knowledge of verbs that determines the degree of specification of a causer or a causing event. In the following section I discuss the Japanese transitive-intransitive pair kir-/kire- ‘cut/get cut’ to corroborate my argument for the lexicalist view.

5. A Problematic Case: kir-/kire- ‘cut/get cut’

The Japanese contact-effect verb kir- ‘cut,’ unlike the corresponding English verb cut, is morphologically related to the intransitive equivalent kire-, displaying a typical pattern of the transitive-intransitive alternation.

a. Akira cut the thread.

b. *The thread cut.

a. Taroo-ga ito-o kitta ⇨ kir- + ta⇨

Taro-Nom thread-Acc cut

'Taro cut the thread.'

b. Ito-ga kireta.
thread-Nom got cut
'The thread got cut.'

It is interesting to note, however, that in some cases *kir*- fails to alternate with *kire-* as illustrated below.

28 a. Taroo-wa keeki-o kitta.
    Taro-Top cake-Acc cut
    'Taro cut the cake.'

    cake-Nom got cut
    'The cake got cut.'

29 a. Niwasi-ga ki-no eda-o kitta
    gardener-Nom tree-Gen branch-Acc cut
    'The gardener cut the branches of the tree.'

29 b. *Ki-no eda-ga kire-ta.
    tree-Gen branch-Nom got cut
    'The branches of the tree got cut.' [Washio 2015: 66]

It seems that the Theme arguments, i.e., *cake* and *branch of the tree* are the only constituents that are responsible for the aberrant behaviors displayed in 28a and 28b. The question to be addressed is what semantic element(s) of a Theme may play a role in triggering such conflicting behaviors of the pair *kir*/kire-.

I argue that specification of a means or an instrument still provides an explanation for the problem. More specifically, *kir*- in 29a and 29b shows no alternation since it presupposes the use of an instrument. Its non-instrumental nature is made more explicit by the fact that the verb is not compatible with the adjunct *te-de* 'by hand.'
(30) a. #Taroo-wa keeki-o te-de kitta
   Taro-Top cake-Acc hand-by cut
   'Taro cut the cake by hand.'

b. #Niwasi-ga ki-no eda-o te-de kitta
   gardener-Nom tree-Gen branch-Acc hand-by cut
   'The gardener cut the branches of the tree by hand.'

By contrast, when kir- alternates with hire-, no instrument is necessarily specified for the verb. Thus, the verb can occur both with instrumental and non-instrumental adjuncts, as shown below.

(31) a. Taroo-wa ito-o te-de kitta
   Taro-Top thread-Acc hand-by cut
   'Taro snapped the thread by hand.'

b. Taroo-wa ito-o hasami-de kitta
   Taro-Top thread-Acc scissors-with cut
   'Taro cut the thread with a pair of scissors.'

In short, whether the Japanese contact-effect verb kir- lexically specifies the use of an instrument depends on a Theme with which it occurs [cf. Washio (2003) 43-44]. In view of the discussions presented above, I propose that the verb kir- be semantically differentiated: that is, to cut something by using any possible means and to cut something by using an instrument. The verb in the latter sense fails to undergo the transitive-intransitive alternation due to the specification of an external causer [i.e., instrument

6. Polysemacy

In the preceding section we have observed that the differing alternating
behaviors demonstrated by the Japanese contact-and-effect verb *kir*- rest on whether or not it specifies the use of an instrument lexically. In fact, it has been noticed in the literature that there are hardly any transitive-intransitive verbs in Japanese which always show the alternating behavior (Nishio 1999) Kageyama 1988 Ono 1986 Even *war-/ware*- ‘break’, which is considered a typical transitive-intransitive pair, does not obtain when the transitive is used more or less in a figurative sense, not describing destruction of physical objects.

62 a. Taroo-wa uisukii-o mizu-de watta.
   Taro-Top whisky-Acc water-with mixed
   ‘Taro mixed whisky with water.’

   b. *Uisukii-ga mizu-de wareta.
      whisky-Nom water-with mix
      [Whisky mixed with water.] [Kageyama 1988]

63 a. Minna-de kanzyoo-o watta
   everyone-among bill-Acc split
   ‘Among everybody, we split the bill.’

   b. *Minna-de kanzyoo-ga wareta
      everyone-among bill-Nom split
      ‘The bill split among everyone.’

64 a. Yokozuna-wa dohyoo-o watta
   grand champion-Top sumo-ring-Acc stepped over
   ‘The *sumo* grand champion stepped over the ring.’

   b. *Dohyoo-ga wareta
      sumo-ring-Nom got stepped over
      ‘The ring got stepped over.’

Nishio 1999 suggests that a verb’s inconsistent behavior regarding
the transitive-intransitive alternation is attributed in general to polysemy of the verb. The meanings of war- in 正しい and 詐って above are among many other meanings that are associated with war-. It is this figurative meaning, as opposed to the basic meaning of physical destruction, which prevents the alternation of war- and yabur-. Other physical change-of-state alternating verbs like yabur-/yabure- ‘tear, break’ show the same phenomenon.

a. Taroo-wa yakusoku-o yabutta
   Taro-Top promise-Acc broke
   ‘Taro broke his promise.’

b. *Yakusoku-ga yabureta
   promise-Nom broke
   ‘His promise broke.’

Given this view, what remains to be explained is why a verb with a figurative sense is less likely to alternate in transitivity. I propose that the most probable solution to this issue will be sought in the concept of semantic drift. Miyagawa 咲絵 originally proposed this concept to explain idiomatization of a verbal phrase consisting of a nominal and a verb. Idiomatization, by definition, refers to a process in which a combination of a nominal and a verb takes on a non-literal meaning due to the linguistic phenomenon called semantic drift 咲絵 咲絵. For instance, the subject-verb structure consisting of Japanese nominal ude ‘arm’ and the verb nar- ‘ring’ gives rise to a non-literal meaning as illustrated below:

ude + nar- で ude ga なる
ing ring arm Nom ring
‘be itching for で lit. one’s arm ringsで 咲絵 咲絵

- で -
The key assumption behind idiomatization is that the meaning of an idiomatic verb phrase triggered by semantic drift is unpredictable from its original meaning. In the current discussion I would use semantic drift to mean any type of semantic shift away from the prototypical sense of a word. Under this assumption, the notion of semantic drift might explain the ungrammaticality of にゅうべん abobe: war- in uisukii-o war- is used figuratively, that is drifting away from its original and fundamental meaning of physical destruction.

7. Conclusion

In this paper, I presented a lexical semantic analysis of transitive-intransitive pairs in Japanese, addressing at the outset two issues regarding the particular pairs. First, I illustrated that not all verbs alternate in transitivity. Given this fact, the principal goal of the first part of the paper was to explain what semantic elements of verbs differentiate alternating verbs from non-alternating ones in Japanese. My study showed that change of state is the key semantic property which accounts for why such verbs as hos- ‘hang бро dry’ and tatak- ‘hit’, which lexically entails no change of state brought about on a Theme argument, fail to alternate in transitivity. Furthermore, I demonstrated that specification of a means or an instrument whereby an event is carried out seems to be more crucial in describing certain transitive change-of-state verbs which, under no circumstances, alternate with intransitive equivalents. Since an instrument is almost always associated with agentivity due to the inseparable connection existing between the two, agentivity may be another key concept that needs to be further investigated.

The second issue has to do with the fact that the alternating behavior
does not always obtain for transitive-intransitive pairs. Rather, whether or not a transitive-intransitive pair successfully alternates seems to depend on the context - or more specifically - the type of a Theme argument that the verb takes. Based on this view, I demonstrated that the transitive-intransitive pair kir-/hire- fails to obtain when it takes a Theme argument which requires that the agent use a cutting tool to achieve the act of cutting. Furthermore, I introduced the notions of polysemy and semantic drift to account for non-alternating behaviors of the transitive-intransitive pair war-/ware-. One problem with the concept of semantic drift is that it is not always clear how we should determine the basic meaning of a verb. That is, it seems almost impossible to determine which meaning of the pair kir-/hire- is the act of cutting something by hand or with an instrument is the basic one. Nevertheless, in view of the examples of non-alternating contexts examined above, I suggest that the effect of semantic drift on the alternatibility of the transitive-intransitive verb deserves further investigation.

Notes

1 The following abbreviations are used in the present study: Acc=accusative particle, Asp= te-iru aspect marker, Gen=genitive, Ger=gerund, Nom=nominative particle, Obl=oblique, Top=topic particle.

2 Since there is no intransitive counterpart to tatak-, I have coined a hypothetical form, upon which native speakers would agree as the most probable form. In what follows, whenever I need to coin a hypothetical form, I follow this principle.

3 Brousseau and Ritter note that the same phenomenon is observed in French.

   a. Jean a brisesa l'accord
      'John broke the argument'
   b. *L'accord s'est brise
      'The agreement broke'

4 Jacobsen and Hayatsu consider mog- to make an transitive-
intransitive pair, paring it with the transitive moge-.

5 For example, the following example shows that migak- does not necessarily entail change of state.

Kutu-o migaita kedo, yogore-wa otinakatta
shoe-Acc polished but stain-Top did not come off
‘polished the shoes, but the stain did not come off.’
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