Where Morphology and Syntax Clash:
A Case in Japanese Aspectual Verbs

Masayoshi Shibatani

1. There have been a series of papers discussing the type of underlying structure of English sentences with the aspectual verb *begin*\(^1\). Perlmutter (1970), on the basis of such sentences as those in (1), has argued that *begin* functions both as a transitive verb and as an intransitive verb. While a recent short paper by Ross (1972) supports Perlmutter’s claim, Fischer & Marshall (1969) have argued that *begin* functions only as an intransitive verb in sentences like (1).

(1)  
(a) Begin to work!  
(b) I tried to begin to work.  
(c) There began to be a commotion.  
(d) Heed began to be paid to urban problems.

One might suspect that the problem here stems from the fact that the English verb *begin* has just one surface form, and that in a language such as Japanese which morphologically indicates the transitivity of most verbs, the same type of controversy would
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1) Versions of this paper were presented at a meeting of the Japanese Linguistics Workshop at Berkeley, California and at the annual meeting of the Association for the Teachers of Japanese held in conjunction with the Modern Language Association of America in New York on December 27, 1972. I am grateful to the participants of these meetings for their comments, and particularly to David Peizer for discussing the issues involved. This work was supported by the Contrastive Semantics Project under contract AF 30602-72-C-0406 at the University of California, Berkely.
never arise\textsuperscript{2}).

\begin{tabular}{lll}
(2) & Transitive & Intransitive \\
begin & hazime- & hazimar- \\
continue & tuzuke- & tuzuk- \\
finish/cease & oe- & owar- \\
\end{tabular}

a. (i) Sensei ga zyugyoo o hazime-ta.
   ‘The teacher began the instruction.’
   (ii) Zyugyoo ga hazimat-ta.
       ‘The instruction began.’

b. (i) Sensei ga zyugyoo o tuzuke-ta.
    ‘The teacher continued the instruction.’
    (ii) Zyugyoo ga tuzui-ta.
         ‘The instruction continued.’

c. (i) Sensei ga zyugyoo o oe-ta.
    ‘The teacher finished the instruction.’
    (ii) Zyugyoo ga owat-ta.
         ‘The instruction ended.’

If one considers the verbs of terminative aspect oe-/owar-, the conjecture appears to be borne out. The English sentence (3) can translate to (4a) and (4b), but the sentence (5) translates only to one version (6a).

\begin{enumerate}
\item (3) John finished reading the book.
\item (4) a. Zyon wa hon o yomi-oe-ta.
\item \hspace{1em} b. Zyon wa hon o yomi-owat-ta.
\item (5) The swing ceased to swing.
\item (6) a. Buranko wa yure-owat-ta.
\item \hspace{1em} b. *Buranko wa yure-oe-ta.
\end{enumerate}

\textsuperscript{2}) Japanese examples are transcribed in the National Romanization System (Kunreisiki) with the following deviations: the long vowels are indicated by geminate vowels, and hyphens appear between morphemes whenever such indications are felt helpful.
The ungrammaticalness of (6b) can be accounted for by saying
that the transitive verb ōe- requires as its subject an agent, as does
the English finish; the swing, being inanimate, is not a possible
subject of this verb. In other words, the underlying structure in
Fig. 1 is not permitted. The intransitive counterpart owar-, on the
other hand, can be assumed to take a sentential subject, and the
underlying structure for (6b) can be given in the form of Fig. 2.
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Sentences (4a) and (4b), then, can be said to originate from the
following two underlying structures:

![Fig. 3.1](image3)
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Since (4a) has ‘John’ as its subject, the underlying structure with
the transitive verb ōe- is well-formed. Both of these structure are
semantically well motivated: the structure illustrated in Fig. 3.1 re-
presents the meaning that an agent terminated an event, and the
one in Fig. 3.2 the meaning that a certain event came to an end.
The structure in Fig. 1, on the other hand, is ill-formed, because it represents the meaning that a swing terminated an event, as if it were an agent. Henceforth we will refer to the structures in Fig. 3.1 and Fig. 3.2 as the ‘transitive structure’ and the ‘intransitive structure’, respectively.

The grammaticalness of (4a) and (4b), and the ungrammaticalness of (6b), thus give crucial evidence that the surface morphological indication correlates with the underlying syntactic structure in the case of verbs of terminative aspect; the morphologically transitive form allows only a transitive structure, and the morphologically intransitive form only an intransitive structure.

2. The conclusion reached above seems, at first blush, to indicate that there is no problem in determining the underlying structures for the Japanese aspectual verbs. Subsequent examination of other aspectual verbs reveals, however, that this is not so. Consider the verbs of incipient and continuative aspects:

(7) a. Taroo wa aruki-hazime-ta. ‘Taro began to walk.’
   b. Taroo wa aruki-dasi-ta. ‘Taro started to walk.’
   c. Taroo wa aruki-tuzuke-ta. ‘Taro continued to walk.’

As expected, these sentences, having animate agent ‘Taro’ as the subject, are all grammatical with the transitive forms of the verbs. However, unlike the oe-/owar- case, the sentences with the intransitive forms all turn out to be ungrammatical.

   b. *Taroo wa aruki-de-ta.

Moreover, contrary to expectation, sentences (9), whose subjects are inanimate, are ungrammatical despite the fact that the intransitive forms are used, while those in (10) with the transitive forms are all grammatical.
(9) a. *Buranko wa yure-hazimat-ta.
b. *Buranko wa yure-de-ta.
c. *Buranko wa yure-tuzui-ta.

(10) a. Buranko wa yure-hazime-ta.
    'The swing began to swing.'
b. Buranko wa yure-dasi-ta.
    'The swing started to swing.'
c. Buranko wa yure-tuzuke-ta.
    'The swing continued to swing.'

Now, if we were to follow the morphological indications in determining the underlying structures, as we did with oe-/owar-, we would have to posit the intuitively questionable structure Fig. 4 for a sentence like (10a). Furthermore, we would have to exclude a semantically quite plausible structure, Fig. 5, from the set of well-formed underlying structures of Japanese.

Here we are faced with a case where a morphological consideration clashes with a semantic consideration regarding syntactic structure.

Let us therefore pause to consider whether morphology can always provide reliable information about syntactic structure, as appeared to be the case with the previously considered verbs oe-/owar-. A closer look at the matter reveals cases where morpho-
logical consideration are not reliable at all. Such cases may arise as a result of historical change. A member of a transitive/intransitive pair may become disused, and the surviving member may take over the function of the other. On reconsideration of sentences (2ci) and (4a), it is noticed that the verb phrases oe-ta and yomi-oe-ta have a somewhat old fashioned or literary flavor. In fact, the current tendency, in colloquial speech at least, is to use owar- and yomi-owar- more and more commonly. There is even a clear instance in which the morphologically intransitive owar- is taking over the role of the transitive form oe-; both of the following sentences are grammatical:

(11) a. kore de watasi no hanasi o oe-mas-u.
   'With this, I finish my talk.'
   b. kore de watashi no hanasi o owari-mas-u.
   'With this, I finish my talk.'

Sentence (11a), however, sounds very formal or literary, if currently used at all. Here even though owar- is morphologically intransitive, corresponding to the intransitive counterpart kawar- 'change' of the transitive verb kae- 'change', syntactically it functions as a transitive verb. In cases like this, no one wishes to take the morphological consideration seriously in positing the underlying structure. This case should suffice to show that there are cases where morphology and syntax do not go hand in hand, and the following discussion amplifies the case to show that in such a situation syntactic and semantic, rather than morphological, considerations win out.

3. The phenomena observed in (7), (8), (9), and (10) are cases where morphology and syntax clash, and, like the English case, the problem of determining the underlying structures for the sentences
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3) I am indebted to Haruo Aoki for calling my attention to these sentences.
remains even in Japanese, which clearly indicates the transitivity of the aspectual verbs morphologically. Before presenting syntactic and semantic evidence that determines the underlying structures for the sentences under consideration, I review two studies that have dealt with this problem.

Harada (1970), disregarding the morphological peculiarity, argues that a sentence with *hazime-* must originate from an intransitive structure in which the verb *hazime-* takes a sentential subject (cf. Fig. 5). He presents two arguments. One is based on a sentence like (10a) in which the subject is inanimate and cannot function as an instigator of any event. The other is based on the restriction on the occurrence of the honorific prefix *o-* and the honorific ending *ni-nar-* observed in (12c).

   ‘Professor Yamada began (hon.) his study.’

b. Yamada kyoozyu wa benkyoo o si-hazime-ta.
   ‘Professor Yamada began to do his study.’

c. *Yamada kyoozyu wa benkyoo o si-hazime-ni-nat-ta.
   ‘Professor Yamada began (hon.) to do his study.’

While there is no question about the possible underlying structure for a sentence like (10a), Harada’s second argument for excluding a structure like Fig. 6 requires discussion.
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Harada argues that if a sentence like (12b) originates from a structure like Fig. 6, the fact that the matrix sentence does not undergo the cyclic rules of honorification, which attach the prefix o- and the ending ni-nar- to the verb, cannot be explained. On the other hand, Harada continues, if (12b) comes from an intransitive structure (cf. Fig. 5), the reason (12c) is ungrammatical can be straightforwardly explained; just say that the sentence structure does 'not have any NP whose referent is a person to be respected in the matrix sentence, and hence the [derivation of (12c) involves] violation of Exaltation transformation.' (90)

Even though Harada's observation that the sentence in (12c) is ungrammatical is correct, I find his argument against the transitive structure Fig. 6 to be unacceptable. If it were indeed the case that the honorific prefix and ending could freely occur in a structure whose matrix sentence contains the subject to be respected, Harada's argument would hold water. However, the actual situation is not like this at all. Consider, for example, the causative sentence (13). Elsewhere (Shibatani, 1973), I have argued that the sentence derives from a structure like Fig. 7, which has an NP whose referent is a person to be respected in the matrix sentence.

(13) Yamada kyoozyu wa musuko san ni ik-ase-ta.
    'Professor Yamada had the son go.'
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In order for Harada's argument to have any force, it must be the case that the structure in Fig 7 undergoes the honorification rules that attach the prefix o- and the ending ni-nar- to the higher verb sase-, yielding a grammatical sentence. But actually, the resulting sentence (14) is as bad as (12c).

(14) *Yamada kyoozyu wa musuko san ni ik-o-sase-ni-nat-ta.  
    'Professor Yamada had (hon.) the son go.'

If we were to accept Harada's argument, we would have to exclude a structure like Fig. 7 from the set of well-formed underlying structures of Japanese. Moreover, the right structure for (13) would have to be said to be something like Fig. 8, which is of course absurd; the surface subject cannot be attached anywhere.

It thus appears to be the case that the ungrammaticalness of sentences (12c) and (14) must be accounted for by means of some other principle; consequently, Harada's exclusion of the transitive structure Fig. 6 on the basis of the ungrammaticalness of (12c) is not at all motivated.

I turn now to the other work, by Makino (1970). Makino argues that the aspectual verbs, particularly hazime-, should not be treated as real verbs, and that they should be regarded as the features, e. g. [+incipiency] attached to the main verb. He offers six argu-
ments. I consider three of Makino's arguments here, the rest in subsequent sections. Makino argues that the verb compound \textit{aruki-hazime}—'begin to walk'—should be treated as one lexical unit because 'no morpheme or a sequence of morphemes (except an infix attached to the main verb) can occur between the main verb and 'Begin'. (389) He cites ungrammatical sentences like (12c) and (15).

\begin{equation}
\begin{align*}
(15) & \quad \text{a. *Watashi wa hon o yomi-kinoo-hazime-ta.} \\
& \quad \text{b. *Watashi wa hon o yomi-kare-ga-hazime-ta.}
\end{align*}
\end{equation}

I have already argued that this type of argument is very weak. Moreover, sentences that even Makino himself describes as originating from embedding structures do not allow any element between the main verb and the auxiliary verb. For example:

\begin{equation}
\begin{align*}
(16) & \quad \text{a. *Yamada kyoozyu wa okusan ni sin-o-rare-ta.} \\
& \quad \text{b. *Watasi wa sensei ni sikar-kinoo-rare-ta.}
\end{align*}
\end{equation}

(See Makino (1972) in which he argues that the passive sentences derive from the embedding structure with \textit{rare} as the higher verb.) Again these cases must be accounted for by some general principle, and they by no means provide any strong argument for considering \textit{hazime}—to be a verbal feature rather than a real verb in underlying structure.

A second argument by Makino has to do with the fact that only the transitive form \textit{hazime}—is used, despite the fact that the intransitive form \textit{hazimar}—is readily available in the language. That is, if the verb of incipient aspect is to function as both transitive and intransitive in underlying structure, why doesn't the intransitive form surface when the underlying structure has the intransitive version of 'begin'? Cases where morphology and syntax clash have already been displayed.\footnote{Unlike the case discussed in connection with sentences (11), there does not seem to be any historical reason why one form is consistently used in the verbs of incipient and continuative aspects.} Moreover, the fact that only the transitive
form of ‘begin’ is used in the sentences under consideration cannot be accounted for even if we had the feature analysis that Makino suggests. Why must the feature [+inciency] be realized as hazime- rather than hazimaru?

A third argument of Makino’s is phonological. Makino observes correctly that ‘the entire phrase [of the main verb and hazime-] is uttered by using a pitch accent contour with one and only one peak’, while ‘if we are dealing merely with a phrase we have at least two peaks of accent rather than one.’ (393–4) Like the others, this argument is also weak because the verb suffix combination that Makino himself describes as originating from two distinct underlying verbs is also pronounced with one accent peak. Observe: kak-āré-ru ‘write-passive’ or kak-āse-ru ‘write-causative’, etc.

Having shown that Harada’s argument for excluding a transitive structure on the basis of the honorification rules, and Makino’s three arguments for the feature analysis reviewed here are all immaterial as real arguments for their hypotheses, I turn now to my arguments for the analysis that admits two-transitive and intransitive-types of aspectual verb in underlying structure.

4. I first argue for the claim that sentences like those in (17) must originate from the transitive structure in Fig. 9 in some cases.

(17) Taroo wa hon o yomi- (hazime-ta. 
dasi-ta. 
tuzuke-ta. 
oe-ta. 
owat-ta.)

‘Taro began/started/continued/finished reading the book’

The structure in Fig. 9 represents the meaning that NP1 initiates, continues, or terminates a certain event. NP1 is typically an animate agent, and the aspectual verbs function as action verbs. NP2 must
represent an event rather than a state. 5) Furthermore, the subject of the matrix sentence, NP₁, and that of the embedded sentence NP₃ must be coreferential, i.e. the aspectual verbs, when functioning as transitive verbs, impose the Like-Subject constraint. Violation of these conditions results in ungrammatical sentences like the following:

5) However, not all types of event are allowed here. Particularly an instantaneous event cannot coocur with the aspectual verbs when the subject is singular. That is, the so-called achievement verbs such as reach, arrive, etc. are not permitted if the subject is singular, though they can occur with the aspectual verbs when the subject is plural. Compare:

(i) *Taro wa Kyooto ni tuki-hazime-ta.
   ‘Taro began to arrive at Kyoto.’
(ii) Kankookyakuwa Kyooto ni tuki-hazime-ta.
    ‘Tourists began to arrive at Kyoto.’
(iii) Troo wa saikin gakkoo e okurezu ni tuki-hazime-ta.
    ‘Recently Taroo began to arrive at school on time.’
(18) a. *Taroo wa Ziroo ni ni-hazime-ta. (Cf. Taroo wa Ziroo ni nite-ki-hazime-ta.)
   ‘Taro began to become similar to Jiro.’

   b. *Taroo wa Ziroo ga hon o yomi-hazime-ta. (Violation of the Like-Subject constraint)
   ‘*Taro began Jiro to read the book.’

Let us now study some of the grammatical correlates of the structure in Fig. 9. Having an agent and an aspectual verb functioning as action verb, the transitive structure in Fig. 9 should yield sentences that express the ability of the agent, NP1, to perform the action expressed by the aspectual verb. Indeed this is the case, as shown below:

(19) a. Watasi wa (itudemo) hon o yomi-
   \[
   \begin{cases}
   \text{hazime-rare-ru.} \\
   \text{das-e-ru.} \\
   \text{owar-e-ru.} \\
   \text{oe-rare-ru.}
   \end{cases}
   \]
   ‘I can begin/start/finish reading the book (anytime).’

   b. Watasi wa (itumademo) hon o yomi-tuzuke-rare-ru.
   ‘I can continue reading the book as long as I like.’

Here the potential forms rare-/re- can freely occur. (Notice that I am now considering the possibility of the morphologically intransitive owar- ‘cease’ being a transitive verb; and it seems to work just like others that are morphologically transitive.) However, a sentence like (20) that originates from an intransitive structure cannot occur with rare- or re-.

(20) a. Taroo wa ne-sugi-ru. ‘Taro sleeps excessively.’

   b. *Tarooo wa ne-sugi-
   \[
   \begin{cases}
   \text{rare-ru.} \\
   \text{re-ru}
   \end{cases}
   \]

A corollary of the possibility of having expressions like (19) with aspectual verbs is the fact that the sentences originating from
the structure in Fig. 9 can form imperative or request sentences. As pointed out by Searle (1969) and Gordon & Lakoff (1971), there is a close correlation between a sincere order or request and the ability to do what is ordered or requested on the part of the one who receives the order or request. That this correlation is linguistically reflected can be shown by the following pair of sentences:

(21) a. *Anata wa okane ga ir-are-ru.  
   ‘*You can need money.’
   b. *Okane ga i-re !  
       it-te kudasai  
   ‘*Need money!’  
   ‘*Please need money.’

A sentence that cannot produce the potential form cannot produce the imperative or request form, either. In other words, one can order or request sincerely only when he assumes that the person who receives the order or request can do what is ordered or requested.

It follows from the above discussion that since some Japanese sentences with aspectual verbs can produce the potential forms, they can also produce imperative or request forms. Indeed this is the case, and the following sentences are all grammatical.

(22) a. Ima sugu hon o yomi-  
      { hazime-ro !  
      das-e !  
      }  
   ‘Begin/start reading the book right now.’
   b. Asu made ni hon o yomi-  
      { owar-e !  
      oe-ro !  
      }  
   ‘Finish reading the book by tomorrow.’
   c. Motto hon o yomi-tuzuke-ro !  
   ‘Continue to read the book further!’

(23) a. Ima sugu hon o yomi-  
      { hazime-  
      te-kudasai.  
      dasi-  
      }  
   ‘Please begin/start reading the book right now.’
b. Asu made ni hon o yomi-owat- \( \{ \text{owat-} \} \) te-kudasai.
   \( \{ \text{oe-} \} \)
   'Please finish reading the book by tomorrow.'

c. Motto hon o yomi-tuzuke-te-kudasai.
   'Please continue reading the book further.'

As expected a sentence like (20a) can produce neither the imperative nor the request form.

(24) a. *Ne-sugi-ro! 'Sleep excessively!'
   b. *Ne-sugi-te kudasai. 'Please sleep excessively.'

Following the same line of reasoning, we expect the sentences that derive from the structure in Fig. 9 to be successfully embedded under the matrix sentence with verbs like meireisu-ru and settokusu-ru. Again our expectation is fulfilled, as the following sentences are grammatical.

(25) a. Watasi wa Taroo ni hon o yomi-
   hazine-ru
   das-u
   tuzuke-ru
   owar-u
   oe-ru
   yoo ni meireisi-ta.
   'I ordered Taro to begin/start/continue/finish reading the book.'

b. Watashi wa Taroo ni hon o yomi-
   hazine-ru
   das-u
   tuzuke-ru
   owar-u
   oe-ru
   yoo ni settokusu-ta.
   'I persuaded Taro to begin/start/continue/finish reading the book.'
If the sentences in (17) were to originate only from the structure illustrated in Fig. 10, all of these cases considered above would be a unaccounted for.

Here *Taroo* is not the agent of the aspectual verbs; yet it must be said that he has the ability to begin, continue, or terminate a certain event in order to account for the potential forms. It may be argued that (a) if one picks up a book and reads it, he is beginning to read; and therefore, whether a certain event begins or not depends on the act of the embedded subject, and (b) it is because of this that the potential forms are produced. That such an argument does not hold is shown by the fact that sentence (20a) does not have a grammatical counterpart with the potential form. Moreover, although the excessiveness of sleep is controllable a sentence like (20b) is nevertheless ungrammatical. Thus the fact that sentences like (17) yield the potential forms, and that sentences like (20a) do not is structurally determined.

For the cases of imperative and request sentences, if one maintains the structure of Fig. 10, the underlying structure would take a nonsensical form like Fig. 11. Fig. 11 represents the incoherent meaning ‘I order/request you that an event, namely you read a book,
begin, start, etc.’ As discussed earlier, to sincerely order someone to do something presupposes that he has the ability to do it. One cannot be ordered that a certain event begins or continues. One of Makino’s arguments was based on his erroneous belief that the structure in Fig. 11 is a well-formed imperative structure.

Similarly if one is to maintain that the structure in Fig. 9 is to be excluded, the grammatical sentences in (25) must be assumed to have nonsensical underlying structures; the ones that have meireisu-ru and settokusu-ru instead of ORDER and REQUEST in Fig. 11. Again the structures would violate the identity constraint that holds between the one who receives an order and the one who begins a certain event.

As we have seen, verbs such as meireisu-ru and settokusu-ru impose the identity constraint on the indirect object of the matrix sentence and the subject of the lower sentence. Some other class of verb requires the identity of the subject of the matrix sentence and that of the immediately embedded sentence. For example, tumori da ‘intend’ requires this Like-Subject constraint. Thus sentences (26a) and (26c), whose underlying representations are (26b) and (26d), respectively, are ungrammatical due to the violation of the Like-Subject constraint.
Now if sentences like (17) are derived from a transitive structure like that in Fig. 9, they should be successfully embedded under the matrix sentence with tumori da. Indeed this is the case, as the following sentences are all grammatical.

(27)  a. Watasi wa asu kara hon o \( {\text{yomi-hazime-ru}} \) tumori da. \( {\text{yomi-das-u}} \)
     'I intend to begin/start/reading the book starting tomorrow.'

     b. Watasi wa hon o asu made yomi-tuzuke-ru tumori da.
     'I intend to continue reading the book until tomorrow.'

     c. Watasi wa asu made ni hon o yomi-\( {\text{owar-u}} \) tumori da. \( {\text{oe-ru}} \)
     'I intend to finish reading the book by tomorrow.'

If sentences like those in (17) were to derive only from the intransitive structure with the sentential subject, we would expect the same situation as in (26c) to obtain. But since the sentences in (27) are all grammatical, our claim that the sentences embedded beneath tumori da in (27) are derived from the transitive structure is supported by the phenomenon of the Like-Subject constraint.

The last argument for the transitive structure in Fig. 9 comes from the fact that the sentences in (17) can form indirect passive sentences. An indirect passive sentence in Japanese, as typified by (28b), conveys the meaning of someone's being affected (often adversely) by someone else's doing something or undergoing some change.
(28) a. Haha ga sin-da. ‘My mother died.’
   b. Watasi wa haha ni sin-are-ta.
      ‘I was affected by my mother’s having died.’
   c. (Watasi (haha sin) rare-)

It appears to be the case that the sentence embedded immediately below the matrix sentence (Watasi (S) rare-) cannot have as its subject an inanimate thing, including a sentential subject. To see this consider the pair of sentences in (29).

(29) a. Taroo wa ne-sugi-ru. ‘Taro sleeps excessively.’
   b. Taroo wa ne-sugos-u. ‘Taro oversleeps.’

As we have already noted, the verb sugi- is the intransitive counterpart of the transitive verb sugos-, and these can be used as independent verbs as shown below:

(30) a. Taroo no asobi wa do ga sugi-ru.
    ‘The way Taro plays is beyond the limit.’
   b. Taroo wa do o sugos-u. ‘Taro exceeds the limit.’

Presumably the structure in Fig. 11 underlies (29a) and the one in Fig. 12, (29b).
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Now it turns out that only (29) produces a possible indirect passive sentence. Compare:

(31) a. *Watasi wa Taroo ni ne-sugi-rare-ta.
‘I was affected by Taro’s sleeping excessively.’

b. Watasi wa Taroo ni ne-sugos-are-ta.

‘I was affected by Taro’s oversleeping.’

The phenomena in (31) are consistent with the fact that a sentence like (32a) is also ungrammatical, while (32b) is grammatical.


‘I was affected by my glasses’ becoming broken.’

b. Watasi wa Taroo ni megane o war-are-ta.

‘I was affected by Taro’s breaking my glasses.’

The claim that the sentences in (17) may originate from the transitive structure in Fig. 9 is borne out by the fact that they form grammatical indirect passive sentences, as observed below:

(33) a. Watasi wa Taroo ni moo hon o yomi-[hazime-]rare-ta.

das-

{owar-}

oe-

‘I was affected by Taro’s having begun/started/finished reading the book already.’

b. Watasi wa Taroo ni mada hon o yomi-tuzuke-rare-ta.

‘I was affected by Taro’s still continuing to read the book.’

Assuming that the cases discussed above suffice to prove that some sentences with aspectual verbs must originate from a transitive underlying structure of the form given in Fig. 9, I now consider some arguments for the claim that certain sentences originate from the intransitive structure illustrated in Fig. 10.6)

6) It is beside the point whether the transitive hazime- should be decomposed as suru ‘do’ and hazime- minus suru, the latter functioning only as an intransitive verb. An analysis like this would be making the same claim as ours, namely, that the surface hazime- comes from two different underlying forms. Cf. Newmeyer (1969) for this alternative.
5. I have been careful not to say that sentences like those in (17) originate only from the transitive structure; instead I have said that they may originate from the transitive structure. The reason for this is that I assume that certain sentences can come from both transitive and intransitive underlying structures. Evidence for this comes from the 'cognitive synonymy' of the following pair of sentences.

(34) a. Otoko wa onna o damasi-{hazime-} ta.
    \{tuzuke-\}

    'The man began/continued to deceive the woman.'

b. Onna wa otoko ni damasi-{hazime-} rare-\, ta.
    \{tuzuke-\}

    'The woman began/continued to be deceived by the man.'

Unlike the indirect passive case considered earlier, the passive morpheme rare is attached to the aspectual verb this time. Were these sentences to come from transitive structures with unlike subjects, otoko and onna in (a) and (b), respectively, of the aspectual verbs, a greater difference in meaning would be expected. However, the sentences in (34) are very close in meaning.

Similar synonymy can be observed even when the subject of the passive version is inanimate as in (35). Since, as claimed below,

(35) a. Booto wa mise no garasu o wari-{hazime-} ta.
    \{tuzuke-\}

    'The rioters began/continued to break the glass of the stores.'

b. Mise no garasu wa booto ni war-are-{hazime-} ta.
    \{tuzuke-\}

    'The glass of the stores began/continued to be broken by the rioters.'

an inanimate noun, e.g. glass, cannot be the underlying subject of
an aspectual verb, the synonymy in (35) can be accounted for only by admitting that sentences like (35a) can also come from the intransitive structure. Otherwise, (35a) and (35b) would always have a greater difference in meaning.

Makino argues that an argument such as that given just above is inadequate on the basis of the following pair of sentences that are not synonymous.

(36) a. Otoko wa wazato onna o damasi-\{hazime\} ta.\{tuzuke\}
   ‘The man began/continued to deceive the woman intentionally.’

   b. Onna wa wazato otoko ni damas-are-\{hazime\} ta.\{tuzuke\}
   ‘The woman intentionally began/continued to be deceived by the man.’

Indeed there is a much greater meaning difference here due to the presence of the adverb *wazato*. However, this meaning difference has nothing to do with the analysis of the aspectual verbs. The problem falls in the domain of the analysis of the passive sentence.

A pair of active and passive sentences are quite close in meaning. But the synonymy disappears when certain adverbs are introduced. Compare the following two pairs of sentences:

(37) a. Otoko wa onna o damasi-ta.
   ‘The man deceived the woman.’

   b. Onna wa otoko ni damas-are-ta.
   ‘The woman was deceived by the man.’

(38) a. Otoko wa wazato onna o damasi-ta.
   ‘The man deceived the woman intentionally.’

   b’ Onna wa wazato otoko ni damas-are-ta.
   ‘The woman was intentionally deceived by the man.’

Certain adverbs always modify the surface subject; accordingly, the
meaning of the passive sentence may become distinct from the original active sentence. Thus, it is utterly irrelevant to bring in this kind of phenomenon, which belongs to an entirely different problem, in the discussion of the aspectual verbs.

A piece of evidence for the claim that sentence like those in (17) may have two different underlying structures comes from the following fact: To a question like (39a), one can answer either with (39b) or (39c).

(39) a. Oya, ano oto? Nani ga hazimat-tan da?
   ‘That noise? What has begun?’

b. Kodomo no asobu no ga mata hazimat-tan des-u yo.
   ‘Children’s playing began again.’

   ‘The children began to play again.’

The question (39a) asks for information as to what event has begun, rather than who has begun what. The answer (39b) comes from an intransitive structure with the sentential subject attached with the nominalizer no, together with the intransitive verb hazimar-. Now the fact that (39c) is a good answer to (39a) shows that the former, though it has a morphologically transitive verb, comes from a structure similar to the one for (39b) which represents the meaning of a certain event’s having begun.

Another corroborating fact for the claim is that a sentence like (39c) can also answer the question (40a).

(40) a. Gakkoo kara kaet-te Taroo wa itiban saki ni nani o hazine-masi-ta ka?
   ‘After having returned from the school, what did Taro begin first?’

b. Gakkoo kara kaeru nari Taroo wa tomodati to asobi-hazime-masi-ta.
   ‘As soon as he returned from the school, Taro began
to play with his friends.'

The question (40 a), unlike (39 a), asks for information concerning what Taro began, rather than simply what began. Together with the case considered immediately above, this case supports the claim that certain sentences with aspectual verbs originate from two different underlying structures; the transitive structure with the meaning that a certain agent begins, continues, etc. a certain event, and the intransitive structure with the meaning that a certain event begins, continues, etc.

6. We have so far discussed sentences that can originate from two different underlying structures. I consider now the claim that there are at least two types of sentence that unambiguously originate from the intransitive structure. The first type of sentence is represented by the following:

(41) a. Hanako wa hutori hazime-ta.  
{dasi- }
'Hanako began to become fat.'

b. Taroo wa eraku nari-hazime-ta.  
{dasi- }  
'Taro began to become a great man.'

c. Taroo wa Hanako ga suki ni nari-hazime-ta.  
{dasi- }  
'Taro began to like Hanako.'

The sentential subject in these sentences contains an event that cannot be initiated at one's free will. It is because although one may ultimately become fat or a great man by his endeavor, the event itself takes place as an eventual consequence of his cumulative effort. In other words, one cannot freely control the beginning of the event that occurs as a result of rather remote events, e.g. eating, working hard, etc. Similarly, a change of psychological state cannot
be initiated at one's free will.

This claim and what is said above are borne out by the fact that the sentences (41) fail to form potential, imperative, or request sentences, as observed below:

\[(42)\]
\[a. \text{*Hanako wa itudemo hutori-} \{\text{hazine-rare-ru.}\} \{\text{das-e-ru.}\} \]
\[\text{Hanako can begin to become fat any time.}\]
\[b. \text{*Taro wa itudemo eraku nari-} \{\text{hazine-rare-ru.}\} \{\text{das-e-ru.}\} \]
\[\text{Taro can begin to become a great man any time.}\]
\[c. \text{*Taro wa itudemo Hanako ga suki ni nari-} \{\text{hazine-rare-ru.}\} \{\text{das-e-ru.}\} \]
\[\text{Taro can begin to like Hanako any time.}\]

\[(43)\]
\[a. \text{*Hutori-} \{\text{hazine-ro!}\} \{\text{das-e!}\} \]
\[\text{?Begin to become fat!}\]
\[b. \text{*Eraku nari-} \{\text{hazine-ro!}\} \{\text{das-e!}\} \]
\[\text{?Began to become a great man.}\]

7) The continuative aspect verb *tuzuke-* behaves differently here. The following are grammatical:

(i) Taroo wa dokomade mo eraku nari-tuzuke-rare-ru.
\[\text{Taro can continue to become great to any extent.}\]

(ii) Motto eraku nari- \{ tuzuke-ro! \} \{ tuzuke-te kudasai. \}
\[\text{Continue to become a greater man!}\]
\[\text{Please continue to become a greater man.}\]

This is because once a certain change begins to take place, whether one makes such a change to continue or not is up to him. For example, if one does not want to become greater, he can always stop working hard. However, verbs of psychological state, such as suki ni naru ‘come to like’ do not allow the potential, imperative, or request sentences even with the continuative aspect verb.
What is observed here is consistent with the cases observed in (20b) and (24) only if these sentences unambiguously originate from an intransitive structure. It is predictable from this that the following sentences are also ungrammatical.

(45) a. *Isya wa hutori- {hazimeru} yoo Hanako o settokusi-ta. {dasu}

'?The doctor persuaded Hanako to begin to become fat.'

b. *Haha wa eraku nari- {hazimeru} yoo musuko o settoku-si-ta. {dasu}

'?The mother persuaded the son to begin to become a great man.'

c. *Nakoodo wa Hanako ga suki ni nari- {hazimeru} yoo {dasu} Taroo o settokusi-ta.

'?The go-between persuaded Taro to begin to like Hanako.'

Unlike settokusuru 'persuade', kitaisuru 'expect' does not always
require the presence of the indirect object in the matrix sentence; hence the identity between the indirect object of the matrix sentence and the subject of the immediately embedded sentence is not required. Hence, the following sentences are all grammatical.

(46) a. Isya wa Hanako no hutori (hazimeru) no o imaka-

\begin{equation*}
\text{imaka to kitaisu-ru.}
\end{equation*}

'The doctor impatiently awaits Hanako's beginning to become fat.'

b. Haha wa musuko no eraku nari- (hazimeru) no o

\begin{equation*}
\text{imaka-imaka to kitaisi-te iru.}
\end{equation*}

'The mother impatiently awaits the son's beginning to become a great man.'

c. Nakoodo wa Taroo no Hanako ga suki ni nari-

\begin{equation*}
\text{hazimeru} \text{ no o imaka-imaka to kitaisi-te iru.}
\end{equation*}

'The go-between impatiently awaits Taro's beginning to like Hanako.'

(47) *Watasi wa so no otoko o nikumi-haze-ru yoo ni tomodati

\begin{equation*}
o \text{settokus-} \text{ta.}
\end{equation*}

' ?I persuaded a friend to begin to hate the man.'

Considering the following ungrammatical sentence, Makino argues that the verb *hazime*- has nothing to do with determining the grammaticalness of sentences like (45) and (47), and further that this phenomenon supports his feature analysis. He claims that 'the main verb settoku-suru (persuade) requires that [V, + incipiency, + volitional] in his feature system.'

(391) The verb *nikum-* 'hate', being [− volitional], cannot occur under *settokusuru*; hence the ungrammaticalness of (47). This account by Makino, however, involves a serious problem. Verbs like
suki ni naru ‘come to like’ and nikumu- ‘hate’ happen to be [− volitional] so Makino’s account will hold for them but verbs like hutoru ‘become fat’ and eraku naru ‘become a great man’ are [+ volitional] and they can occur directly under settokusuru, as observed below:

(48) a. Isya wa moo sukosi hutoru yoo Hanako o settokusi-ta.
   ‘The doctor persuaded Hanako to become a little fatter.’

   b. Haha wa eraku naru yoo musuko o settokusi-ta.
   ‘The mother persuaded the son to become a great man.’

According to Makino’s feature system, the entire verb phrases hutori-hazime-ru ‘begin to become fat’ and eraku nari-hazime-ru ‘begin to become a great man’ must be something like [V, + incipiency, + volitional, …]. Yet the sentences in (45) are all ungrammatical, contrary to what Makino’s account predicts.

It seems that, contrary to Makino’s claim, the grammaticalness of sentences (45) and (47) has nothing directly to do with the feature [volitional] of the main verbs, e.g. hutoru, eraku naru, and that it is determined by the nature of the verb hazime- and das- used in the sentences. That is, the sentences in (41) have the syntactically intransitive hazime- and das-, which do not allow the structure to be embedded beneath verbs like ORDER, REQUEST, settokusuru ‘persuade’, meireisuru, ‘order’, etc. (because of the violation of the identity constraint that holds between the indirect object of the matrix sentence and the subject of the sentence immediately below). Thus, even if one has the feature analysis, he has to admit two types of the feature [incipiency]—one that allows the structure to be embedded beneath the class of verbs noted above, and the other that disallows this. But such an analysis is no more than an ad hoc solution to the problem.

Sentences (41), moreover, fail to produce grammatical sentences
where embedded beneath the verb that imposes the Like-Subject constraint, as shown below:

(49) a. *Watasi wa asu kara hutori-\{hazimeru\} tumori da.  
     {?I intend to begin/start to become fat starting tomorrow.}'

b. *Watasi wa rainen kara eraku nari-\{hazimeru\} tumori \{dasu\} da.  
     {?I intend to begin to become a great man starting next year.}'

c. *Watashi wa asu kara Hanako ga suki ni nari-\{hazimeru\} tumori da.  
     {?I intend to begin to like Hanako starting tomorrow.}'

Again, these data support the claim that sentences (41) originate from the intransitive structure that violates the Like-Subject constraint.

As also expected, the sentences that originate from the intransitive structure lack well-formed indirect passive counterparts.

(50) a. *Taroo wa Hanako ni hutori-hazime-rare-ta.  
     'Taro was affected by Hanako's beginning to become fat.'

     (Cf. Taroo wa Hanako ni hutor-are-ta.  
     'Taro was affected by Hanako's getting fat.')</p>

8) For some reason I do not understand, the indirect passive sentences with \textit{das-} are not ungrammatical to me, although some say that they are as bad as sentences (50). For example:

(i) Taroo wa Hanako ni hutori-das-are-ta.  
     'Taro was affected by Hanako's beginning to become fat.'

(ii) Hanako wa Taroo ni suki ni nari-das-are-ta.  
     'Hanako was affected by Taro's beginning to like her.'
'Taro was affected by his younger brother's beginning to become a great man.'
(Cf. Taro wa ootoo ni eraku nar-are-ta.
'Taro was affected by his younger brother's becoming a great man.')

c. *Hanako wa Taro ni suki ni nari-hazime-rare-ta.
'Hanako was affected by Taro's beginning to like her.'
(Cf. Hanako wa Taro ni suki ni nar-are-ta.
'Hanako was affected by Taro's liking her.')

All of these cases indicate that sentences like those in (41) bear all the characteristics of a sentence that originates from the intransitive structure of Fig. 10. Unless one posits two different types of aspectual verbs in underlying representation, the phenomena observed in § 4 and those observed here would not be accounted for systematically. Moreover, the correlation of these two sets of phenomena and those observed between a sentence with sugos- 'exceed (tr.)' and the one with sugi- 'exceed (intr.)' would be unexplained. (Cf. sentences (29).)

The other type of sentence that I assume to originate only from the intransitive structure characteristically has an inanimate thing as its subject. Sentences like (6 a) and (10) derive from the intransitive sentence structure in Fig. 10. This is because an inanimate thing cannot be agent of the transitive aspectual verbs containing the meaning of activity.

There is, however, a certain type of inanimate subject that shares the characteristics of an agent, namely automatic machines, e.g. automobiles, and natural phenomena, e.g. raining. Although sentences with these subjects cannot produce imperative or request forms, some of them can produce potential and indirect passive sentences, as observed below:

Where Morphology and Syntax Clash

'This automobile can start moving anytime.'

b. Watasi wa zidoosya ni kyyu ni ugoki-das-are-ta.
'I was affected by the automobile's starting out suddenly.'

c. Watasi wa ame ni moo huri-hazime-rare-ta.
'I was affected by the rain's beginning to fall already.'

Perhaps these sentences should be considered derivable either from the transitive or from the intransitive structure, just as sentences (7) were.

7. The Japanese aspectual verbs considered in this paper highlight the case where morphology and syntax clash. The phenomena considered show that even though morphological indications may correlate with the types of underlying structure for most cases, there are problems in determining the correct underlying structures even in a language in which the transitivity is morphologically indicated. I have tried to show that in cases like this, both syntactic and semantic considerations override the morphological ones. It is only by allowing morphologically transitive, e.g. hazime-, and intransitive, e.g. owar-, aspectual verbs to function both as transitive and intransitive verbs in underlying structures that a number of related phenomena can be accounted for systematically.
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