

On the stativity of the fourth-class verbs and their cousins in Japanese

Introduction: Certain classes of verbs are known to occur only in the *tei-(ru)* form. One such case is what Kindaichi (1950) calls the fourth-class verbs. A fourth-class verb *sobie-(ru)* cannot be used in its simple present tense form.

- (1) a. mukoo-ni yama-ga sobie-teiru
 there-at mountain-nom tower-tei-pres
 ‘A mountain towers over there’
 b. * mukoo-ni yama-ga sobie-ru
 there-at mountain-nom tower-pres

Motion verbs when used non-agentively is another instance, as noted in Tsujimura (2002).

- (2) a. dooro-ga mati-no mannaka-o hasit-tei-ru
 road-nom town-gen middle-acc run-tei-pres
 ‘A road runs in the middle of the town’
 b. * dooro-ga mati-no mannaka-o hasi-ru
 road-nom town-gen middle-acc run-pres

These verbs, however, can be used to express a stative meaning in a simple present tense form in relative clauses, as noted in Takahashi (1973), Kinsui (1994) and Ogawa (2004) among others

- (3) a. mukoo-ni sobie-ru yama-o mite-goran
 there-at tower-pres mountain-acc look-please
 ‘Look at the mountain that towers over there’
 b. mati-no mannaka-o hasir-u dooro-ga mie-ru
 town-gen middle-acc run-pres road-nom visible-pres
 ‘(I) see a road that runs in the middle of the town’

In this paper, we compare the behaviors of these verbs in root and relative-clauses in reference to the so-called non-past adjectival use of the past tense morpheme *-ta*. We claim that we need to distinguish at least two types among the fourth-class verbs, spatial and property fourth-class verbs, and that they form a different class from motion verbs like (2). (We do not include those stative verbs that can also be used in root clauses, named the fifth-class verbs by Kinsui (1994).) Their behaviors are summarized below:

clause type	tense morpheme	4 th class (spatial) <i>sobie-</i> (聳え-)	4 th class (property) <i>sugure-</i> (優れ-)	motion <i>hasi-</i> (走-)	5 th class <i>kotona-</i> (異な-)
root clause	present <i>-(ru)</i>	*	*	*	ok
relative clause	present <i>-(ru)</i>	ok	*	ok	ok
	past <i>-ta</i>	ok	ok	*	ok

Assumptions: We adopt Kartzer’s (1994) hypothesis and assume that external arguments are not true arguments of their verbs. They are introduced by an independent functional phrase

called Voice. We assume that both the so-called present tense morpheme $-(r)u$ and the past tense morpheme $-ta$ are ambiguous. The morpheme $-(r)u$ is ambiguous between the present tense and vacuous place-holder. The morpheme $-ta$ is ambiguous between true past tense and non-past adjectival one. The latter can only modify verbs of change-of-state.

Syntax of root and relative-clauses: Following Yamakido (2000) and Shimoyama (2011)'s insight, we argue that what looks like relative clauses in (3) is not a full-fledged clause but reduced. As opposed to root clauses which must be tensed, relative clauses may or may not be tensed. We show that our examples pass Shimoyama's degree quantification test for the size of modifiers and hence have a reduced structure.

Motion verbs: Motion verbs may be used agentively as in *Taroo-ga hasit-tei-ru* 'Taroo is running' or non-agentively as in (2). We argue that they share the same verb stem, which denotes the set of running events.

(4) [[hasi- (run)]] = $\lambda e[\text{run}(e)]$

When used agentively, the agentive subject is introduced in the VoiceP. When used non-agentively, the subject is introduced in the Locative Phrase. The verb is not a change-of state verb and hence the adjectival $-ta$ cannot be attached.

Fourth-class verbs: Their compatibility with the adjectival $-ta$ suggests that they are change-of-state verbs.

(5) Spatial: [[sobie- (tower)]] = $\lambda x \lambda s \lambda e[\text{tower}(e) \ \& \ \text{towering}(s)(x) \ \& \ \text{cause}(s)(e)]$

Property: [[sugure- (excel)]] = $\lambda x \lambda s \lambda e[\text{excel}(e) \ \& \ \text{excellent}(s)(x) \ \& \ \text{cause}(s)(e)]$

We further argue that these two classes of verbs correspond to Davidsonian statives and Kimian statives respectively in the sense of Maienborn (2003, 2007). The former is rather like an eventive in that they allow adverbial modification as in (1). The latter is an abstract object for "exemplification of a property P at a holder xx and a time t", which is neither directly perceived nor spatially located according to Maienborn. We argue that the aspectual morpheme $-ta$ (or $-teiru$) acts as an exemplifier but tense morphemes cannot. The difference between the two types of fourth-class verbs are thus reduced to the semantic difference in terms of stativity.

Selected References: Kindaichi, H. 1950. Kokugo Doosi no Itibunrui. (A classification of Japanese verbs) *Gengo Kenkyuu* 15: 48:63. Kinsui, S. 1994. Rentai Syuusyoku-no '-ta'-nituite. (On noun-modifying $-ta$) In *Nihongo-no Meisiku Syuusyoku Hyoogen* (Noun-modifying expressions in Japanese) (ed.) Y. Takubo. 29-66, Tokyo: Kurosio Publishing. Kratzer, A. 1994. Severing the external argument from its verb. In *Phrase Structure and the Lexicon*, (eds) J. Rooryck and . Zaring 109-138. Dordrecht: Kluwer. Maienborn, C. 2007. On Davidosonian and Kimian States. In *Existence: Semantics and Syntax*, (eds) I. Comorovski and K. von Heusinger 107-130. Dordrecht:Springer. Takahashi, T. 1973. Doosi-no Rentaikei 'suru' 'sita' nituite-no Iti-Kousatu (A note on noun-modifying forms of verbs 'suru' and 'sita') *Kotoba-no Kenkyuu* (A study of language, 101-132. Tokyo: National Institute of Japanese Language and Linguistics. Tsujimura, N. 2002. A Constructional Approach to Stativity in Japanese. *Studies in Language* 25, 601-629.