

Lexicalisation Patterns of Complex-Predicate Constructions in Japanese

Wenchao Li

Department of Japanese Studies, School of International Studies, Zhejiang University, China

Tel: 86-159-5818-9680 E-mail: wideliau@gmail.com

Received: July 11, 2013 Accepted: August 2, 2013 Published: August 30, 2013

doi:10.5296/ijl.v5i4.3989 URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v5i4.3989>

Abstract

This paper analyses the grammatical elements that render motion/change-of-state constructions in Modern Japanese and looks at what means are used to convey motion and resultative core schema. The finding brings us to the point that constructions rendered by a lexical V-V display two conflation patterns. In cause–effect/means/manner types and the complement relation type, the path segments are conflated in the verbs and may then exhibit verb framing. In the pair relation type, manner and path receive equal semantic and syntactic weights and thus exhibit equipollent-framed behaviour. Constructions with syntactic V-V convey path segments via path/resultative complements rather than verbs. Crucially, the complements appear outside the verb roots. In constructions rendered by a participle complex predicate, the manner verb bears a participial morpheme and appears adjacent to the main verb. The manner and path components in participle complex predicates are morphologically not equipollent. In participle adverbial clauses, the manner component is foregrounded, which suggests that manner is more like an independent lexical item and may then possibly receive equal weight as the path.

Keywords: Complex-predicate, Lexicalisation, Japanese

1. Introduction

Following Talmy's typological dichotomy of lexicalisation (1975, 1985, 1991, 2000), Japanese characteristically conflates the path of motion in the verb, e.g. (1), and hence is allegedly a verb-framed language.

- (1) Taroo wa eki ni (aruite) **itta**.
 Taroo TOP station DAT walk go-PAST
 'Taroo walked to the station.'

In (1), the path of motion is incorporated in the verb *itta* 'went'; the manner *aruite* 'walk' can be omitted.

This view, however, is called into question if attention is paid to the complex-predicate construction, as seen in (2):

- (2) Taroo wa yamano o **kakemeguru**.
 Taroo TOP hill-field ACC run about
 'Taroo runs about in the fields.'

As far as (2) is concerned, Japanese *kakemeguru* 'run-go round' is a verb compound, involving locational motion. The motion morphemes are not bound, i.e. V1 *kakeru* and V2 *meguru* can be used separately. Moreover, they both are atelic verbs.

Given this, it seems that lexicalisation patterns are far from being a clear-cut case. A language may present two or three conflation behaviours.

This paper analyses the grammatical elements that render motion/change-of-state (COS) constructions in Modern Japanese and looks at what means are used to convey motion and resultative core schema. In order to pin down the characters of the language in the process of lexicalisation, it investigates all the relevant elements related to the process of lexicalising motion/COS events into linguistic expressions.

This paper is organised as follows.

Section 2 highlights the manner/result complementarity since it has an implication for Talmy's typological dichotomy. Section 3 sheds light on the specific verb compounds related to this research and explores how motion/COS constructions related to V-V are expressed. Section 4 is devoted to constructions with participle complex predicate and participle adverbial clauses. Finally section 5 summarises the paper.

2. Manner/Result Complementarity

Rappaport Hovav and Levin (2010) (RH&L) argue that verbs fall into two classes: manner verbs (see 3a) and result verbs (see 3b). No verb encodes both manner and result simultaneously.

- (3) a. Manner verbs: specify a manner of carrying out an action
walk, hit, run, shout, smear, sweep, swim, rub

b. Result verbs: specify the result of an event

arrive, clean, come, open, die, empty, fill

RH&L (2010) suggest that manner/result complementarity is principally manifested in two domains: COS verbs, as in (4a), and directed motion verbs, as in (4b):

(4) a. break, crack, fill, empty, melt, open, shatter

b. arrive, come, enter, exit, fall, go, rise

Each domain also has manner verbs, as in (5):

(5) a. hit, kick, pour, shake, shovel, slap, wipe

b. crawl, hop, jog, limp, run, swim, walk

Rappaport Hovav and Levin (2010)

Incorporating this, it seems that manner/result complementarity has an implication for Talmy's (1985, 2000) typological dichotomy of event framing. It should be noted that, as Rappaport Hovav and Levin (2010) argue, this lexicalisation constraint is a property of roots and not morphologically complex verbs. A counterexample that comes to mind is V-V compounds in East Asian languages, or bipartite verbs in some Native American languages. Apparently, the event structure in V-V compounds can have both result and manner roots simultaneously.

At this stage, the question arises as to:

(i) how complex it can be to build a motion or a COS V-V in Japanese;

(ii) and how the different formations of V-V compounds may invite distinct lexicalisation patterns.

These aspects are the focus of this paper, and to start this, the following section takes a closer look into data from verb compounding.

3. Types of V-V Compounds

Before attempting to explain how the distinct formations of V-Vs may motivate the different options of lexicalisation in Japanese, it appears appropriate to start by clarifying the types of V-V compounds, which have long been an overriding issue in Japanese linguistics (e.g. Teramura 1969, 1984; Kageyama 1993, 1996; Matsumoto 1998; Yumoto 1996, 2001, 2005, 2008). In earlier times, the mainstream was devoted to considering V-V compounds as right-headedness, a view supported by the Japanese scholars Matsushita (1928) and Teramura (1969, 1984). In recent decades, however, V-V compounds have been reconsidered from a lexical-semantic perspective. An influential work in this regard is Kageyama's (1993) publication *Bunpoo To Gokeisei* and the 1996 publication *Goiimiron*, whereby an argument structure viewpoint is adopted. More recently, Matsumoto (1996, 1998) and Yumoto (1996, 2005, 2008) have employed a semantic structure point of view. Other notable works include the papers by Himeno (1999). In order to reach an answer to the question of whether Japanese additionally performs equipollent framing, this study follows Yumoto's account on

V-V compounds.

Yumoto (1996, 2001, 2005, 2008) puts forward a case structure perspective and proposes five patterns of formations in lexical V-V compounds:

(6) a. **Pair relation**

kake-meguru ‘run about’, *hashiri-mawaru* ‘run about’

b. **Means**

tsuki-otosu ‘push-cause.fall’, *naki-otosu* ‘cry-cause.fall’

c. **Cause-effect**

obore-shinu ‘drown die’, *yake-shinu* ‘burnt die’

d. **Accompanying state/manner**

hai-yoru ‘crawl towards’, *koroge-otiru* ‘tumble-fall’

e. **Complement relation**

tsukai-konasu ‘use something efficiently’, *kaki-otosu* ‘forget to write’

In light of the classification, the following sections analyse the encoding options available for describing motion events in clauses with lexical V-V compounds, also highlighting COS constructions, aspects and results in particular.

3.1 Motion/COS Events Rendered by Lexical V-V Compounds

Following Yumoto (1996, 2005, 2008), there are five ways of building a lexical V-V. Our starting point is Pair relation V-V.

3.1.1 Pair relation V-V

(7) Pair relation: *kake-meguru* ‘run about’, *hashiri-mawaru* ‘run about’

The pair relation V-V is composed of [transitive V + unergative V] and *kakemeguru* ‘run about’ is an illustration of this type. The two morphemes *kakeru* ‘run’ and V2 *meguru* ‘run’ are non-scalar change morphemes and both are not bound, apparently receiving an equal semantic status. Kageyama (1999: 195) makes a similar observation, in that the two events represented by V1 and V2 are similar. Moreover, syntactically V1 and V2 both function as the head (cf. Kageyama 1993, Fukushima 2005). Given these comments, we suggest that this pattern is an example of equipollent framing¹.

3.1.2 Means V-V

Means V-V is considered the most productive type among the lexical V-Vs. It contains three argument structure variations. The composition methods along with the argument structures are provided in Table 1.

¹ This view on conflation comes from Slobin (2004, 2006), who proposes a third type of lexicalisation pattern, equipollent framing, whereby ‘path and manner are expressed by equivalent grammatical forms’.

Table 1. Variation of argument structure and composition in Means V-V

Argument structure ²	Composition	Example
1. tran.V + unacc.V	change of state + change of location	<i>wake-iru, kiri-iru</i>
2. tran.V + unacc.V	action + change of location	<i>fuki-agaru, uchi-agaru</i>
3. tran.V + tran.V	action + change of location	<i>uchi-ageru, fuki-tobasu</i>
4. tran.V + tran.V	action + change of state	<i>naguri-korosu, oshi-tsubusu</i>

It seems that the compound is headed by V2. The first constituents express the means of the change of location or change of state carried out by V2s. Crucially, it is the second constituent that renders the motion/resultative path, and therefore the events denoted by Means V-Vs appear to suggest verb framing.

3.1.3 Cause-effect V-V

Cause-effect V-V is considered the least productive type among lexical V-Vs. It contains the following different argument structure and composition methods:

Table 2. Different argument structures and compositions in Cause-effect V-V

Argument structure	Composition	Example
1. unerg.V + unacc.V	action + change of state	<i>aruki-tsukareru</i>
2. unacc.V + unacc.V	change of location + change of location	<i>koroge-ochiru</i>
3. unacc.V + unacc.V	change of state + change of state	<i>obore-shinu</i>
4. unacc.V + unacc.V	change of state + change of location	<i>yake-ochiru</i>

As we can see from Table 2, V1 denotes the cause or designates the path of motion/COS and can be conveyed by either an agentive or a non-agentive verb, e.g. *aruku* ‘walk’, *korogeru* ‘tumble’. V2s contribute to the change of location or change of state and usually entail a destination of a motion or an endpoint of a motion or COS event, e.g. *ochiru* ‘fall’, *tsuku* ‘stick to’, which, in light of scalar structure, would be regarded as closed-scale morphemes. Matsumoto (1998) considers V2 to be the head. If we agree with this, the motion/resultative path will be conflated with the head verb and this leads to the motion/COS construction performing verb framing.

3.1.4 Accompanying state/manner V-V

The accompanying state/manner V-V contains the following argument structure:

² tran: transitive, unacc: unaccusative, unerg: unergative

Table 3. Variation of argument structure and composition in Manner V-V

Argument structure	Composition	Example
uner.V + uner.V	agentive motion + change of location	<i>hashiri-noboru, hai-yoru</i> <i>tobi-agaru, tachi-agaru</i>

The paths are rendered by V2s, i.e. *noboru* ‘climb’, *yoru* ‘towards’, ‘ascend’. V1s entail a figurative sense, describing how quick the action *agaru* ‘ascend’ or *noboru* ‘climb’ is. In this sense, V1s behave like modifiers and the motion paths are lexicalised into the second constituents, which should be considered the head. Given this, motion constructions rendered by manner V-V perform verb framing.

3.1.5 Complement Relation V-V

Finally, we come to complement relation V-V, whereby V2s seem to have received affixation. As such, the whole compound is related to a metaphorical reading, e.g. *mi-nogasu* ‘overlook’, *hohoemi-kaesu* ‘smile back’, *seme-kakeru* ‘attack’. Moreover, apart from the accusative case, complement relation V-Vs are also likely to take a dative case, as can be seen from *kare ni hohoemi-kaesu* ‘smile back at him’ and *teki ni seme-kakeru* ‘attack the enemy’.

Yumoto (1996) and Matsumoto (1996) consider these compounds to be composed by a cause component with a result component. The second constituent, which renders the COS path, is usually denoted by a transitive verb or an accusative verb and therefore complement relation V-V performs verb framing.

3.2 Summary

This section has been devoted to motion/COS constructions rendered by verb compounds. From the analyses, we can see that motion/COS constructions rendered by lexical V-V present two conflation options. In the pair relation type, manner and path receive equal semantic and syntactic weights and thus exhibit equipollent-framed behaviour. In cause-effect/means/manner types and the complement relation type, the path segments are conflated in the verbs and may then exhibit verb framing.

4. Motion/COS Constructions Rendered by Participle Complex Predicates

Complex-predicate constructions further include participle complex predicates, which use a manner verb in the -te participial form and a path verb to conflate both manner and path in a single clause, as in (8).

(8) Participle complex predicate

a. [Motion event]

Taroo ga eki ni hashitte-itta.

Taroo NOM station DAT run-go PAST

‘Taroo ran to the station.’

b. [COS event]

Waribashi ga bentoobako ni **watte-haitta**.

chopsticks NOM lunch box DAT broke-enter into PAST

‘The chopsticks broke and entered into the box.’

In participle complex predicates, the manner verb bears a participial morpheme and appears adjacent to the main verb.

In fact, (8) could be expressed in the form of participle adverbial clauses, as in (9):

(9) **Participle adverbial clauses**

a. [Motion event]

Taroo ga **hashitte** eki ni **itta**.

Taroo NOM run station DAT go PAST

‘Taroo ran to the station on foot.’

b. [COS event]

Waribashi ga **watte** bentoobako ni **haitta**.

chopsticks NOM broke lunch box DAT enter into PAST

‘The chopsticks broke and entered into the box.’

The distinction between (8) and (9) lies in that (8a) narrates Taroo’s run to the station, with the manner verb bearing a participial morpheme. (9a) expresses the same event, only it emphasises the manner of how Taroo went to the station. In other words, the manner component is foregrounded in a participle adverbial clause. Therefore, the motion and the manner accompanying it in a participle complex predicate seem more closely related than those in a participle adverbial clause.

Further evidence comes from the insertion of a locative adjunct of particle complex predicates, as in (10):

(10) Taroo ga **isoide** eki made **itta**.

Taroo NOM hurriedly station until go PAST

‘Taroo ran to the station on foot.’

We would therefore assume that manner and path components in participle complex predicates are morphologically not equipollent. Nonetheless, the path is indicated via the main verb and thus presents verb framing. On the other hand, the manner component in a participle adverbial clause is foregrounded, meaning the manner behaves like an independent lexical item. As a result, they are assigned equal status as a path component. Given this,

participle adverbial clauses may possibly exhibit equipollent framing.

5. Summary

This paper has highlighted two groups of grammatical elements that render motion and COS events. It is observed that constructions rendered by a lexical V-V display two conflation patterns. In cause–effect/means/manner types and the complement relation type, the path segments are conflated in the verbs and may then exhibit verb framing. In the pair relation type, manner and path receive equal semantic and syntactic weights and thus exhibit equipollent-framed behaviour. In constructions rendered by a participle complex predicate, the manner verb bears a participial morpheme and appears adjacent to the main verb. The manner and path components in participle complex predicates are morphologically not equipollent. In participle adverbial clauses, the manner component is foregrounded, which suggests that manner is more like an independent lexical item and may then possibly receive equal weight as the path. Table 4 outlines the ways path can be incorporated on the basis of various grammatical elements.

Table 4. Composition methods along with grammatical elements

Grammatical elements	Composition methods ³
V-V compounding	$V_{\text{manner}} V_{\text{path}}, M_{\text{manner}} V_{\text{path}}$
Participle complex predicate	$PART_{\text{manner}} V_{\text{path}}$
Participle adverbial clause	$V_{\text{manner}} V_{\text{path}}$

Table 5 provides the conflation possibilities along with a list of grammatical elements that give rise to this diversity:

Table 5. Grammatical elements in line with conflation options in Japanese complex-predicate constructions⁴

Grammatical elements	Motion	COS
Lexical V-V		
a. Pair relation	<i>ef</i>	<i>ef</i>
b. Means/Caused/Manner	<i>vf</i>	<i>vf</i>
c. Complement relation	<i>vf</i>	<i>vf</i>
Participle complex predicate	<i>vf</i>	<i>vf</i>
Participle adverbial clause	<i>ef</i>	<i>ef</i>

This paper has showed how path can be conveyed in complex-predicate constructions. It turns out then that Japanese is not a pure verb-framed language nor can be deemed a pure satellite-framed language. The conclusion that one can draw here is that it is the distinct

³ M: modifier, PART: participle

⁴ *vf*: verb framing; *sf*: satellite framing; *ef*: equipollent framing

grammatical elements that facilitate the intralinguistic variation of lexicalisation. It is hoped that the outcomes of this study could have benefits in terms of second language acquisition, language teaching and translation.

References

- Fukushima, Kazuhiko. (2005). Lexical V-V compounds in Japanese: Lexicon vs. Syntax. *Language*, 81, 568-612. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/lan.2005.0125>
- Himeno, Masako. (1999). *Fukugodooshi no koozoo to imiyooohoo*. Hitsuji Syobo Publishing.
- Kageyama, Taro. (1993). *Bunpou to gokeisei*. Hitsuji Syobo Publishing.
- Kageyama, Taro. (1996). *Doushiimiron-gengo to ninchi no setten*. Kuroshio.
- Kageyama, Taro. (1999). Word formation. In *The Handbook of Japanese Linguistics* (Ed.). Natsuko Tsujimura. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Matsumoto, Yo. (1996). *Complex predicates in Japanese: a syntactic and semantic study of the notion 'word'*. Stanford: Center for the Study of Language and Information.
- Matsumoto, Yo. (1998). Nihongo no Goiteki Fukugou Doushi ni Okeru Doushi no Kumiawase. *Gengo Kenkyuu*, 114, 37-83.
- Rappaport Hovav, Malka, & Beth Levin. (2010). Reflections on Manner/Result Complementarity. In M. Rappaport Hovav, E. Doron, & Ivy. Sichel (Eds.), *Syntax, Lexical Semantics, and Event Structure*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK, 21-38. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199544325.003.0002>
- Talmy, Leonard. (1975). Semantics and syntax of motion. In John Kimball (Ed.), *Syntax and Semantics*, vol. IV (181–238). New York: Academic Press.
- Talmy, Leonard. (1985). Lexicalization patterns: semantic structure in lexical forms. In *Language typology and syntactic description*, vol. III: *Grammatical categories and the lexicon*, ed. Timothy Shopen, 57-149. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Talmy, Leonard. (1991). Path to realization: a typology of event integration. *Buffalo Working Papers in Linguistics*, 91-01, 147-87.
- Talmy, Leonard. (2000a). *Toward a cognitive semantics*, vol.1: concept-structuring systems. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Talmy, Leonard. (2000b). *Toward a cognitive semantics*, vol.2: *typology and process in concept structuring*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Teramura, Hideo. (1969). Katsuyou gobi, jodoushi, hojodoushi to asupekuto (sono ichi). *Nihongo-Nihon Bunka*. Osaka University of Foreign Studies.
- Teramura, Hideo. (1984). *Nihongo no shintakusu to imi* II. Tokyo: Kuroshio: Publishers.
- Yumoto, Yoko. (1996). Gokoosei to goi gainen koozoo-Nihongo no 'doushi + doushi' no fukugougo keisei ni tsuite. *Gengo to Bunka no Shosou-Okuda Hiroyuki Kyouju Taikan Kinen*

Ronbunshuu.

Yumoto, Yoko. (2001). Dooshi kara doo o keisei suru gokeisei ni okeru kaihannchuuka sosei no uketugi nit suite. *Gengo kenkyū*, 119, 453–473.

Yumoto, Yoko. (2005). *Fukugoo dooshi & hasei doushi no imi to tougo – Mojuuru keitairon kara mita nich-eigo no doushi keisei*. Hituzi Syobo Publishing.

Yumoto, Yoko. (2008). Fukugoo dooshi ni okeru koo jitugen – Toogo teki fukugoo to goiteki fukugoo no sai. *Morphology and Lexicon Forum*, 4.