Verbs and Aspect

Verbs are divided into those which do not express movement (stative verbs in the broad sense), and those which do (movement verbs). There are some verbs that do both. How movement verbs express aspect depends on the characteristics of the verb. There are several classes of movement verbs.

Kindaichi (1950) pioneered in classification of Japanese verbs, where he looked at the *shite iru* form. He categorized motion verbs into stative verbs (e.g., *aru*. *Teiru* is not affixed), punctual verbs (e.g., *shinu* ‘die.’ The *teiru* form expresses the result), durational verbs (e.g., *aruku* ‘walk.’ The *teiru* form expresses that the action is ongoing), and Class 4 verbs (e.g., *sugureru* ‘excel.’ They always occur in the *teiru* form). Okuda (1977) proposed that aspect should be understood by contrasting *suru* and *shite iru*, and that one must see if the verb is about movement or if it is about change, but that the length of time does not matter. He classified verbs into verbs of movement (e.g. *kowasu* ‘destroy’) and verbs of change (e.g., *kowareru* ‘fall apart’). The *shite iru* form of verbs of movement expresses progression, while the *shite iru* form of verbs where the subject undergoes change expresses the result. (Semantically reflexive verbs where the agent’s action also results in the change in the agent, as in *kami o kiru* in the meaning of ‘get a haircut,’ have both characteristics.)

Kudo (1995) advanced this proposition and classified verbs into internal-emotional verbs, stative verbs, and external-motion verbs. She further classified external-motion verbs into agent-movement and patient-change verbs (whose *suru*-form handles the reaching of the final limit of accomplishment as one entity), agent-change verbs (whose *suru*-form handles the termination limit as an accomplishment of the expected change), and agent-movement verbs (whose *suru*-form may handle the reaching of the starting limit or it may handle it as one entity.

As Moriyama (1988) points out, simple verb classification alone does not lead us to comprehensive understanding of aspect. First, aspect is not determined by the lexical meaning of the verb alone. The “nature of the situation” as a whole, which the verb expresses together with other nouns and adverbs, is involved in the aspectual phenomenon. For instance, *hanauta o utau* ‘hum’ and “Haru” o utau ‘sing Haru’ differ from each other in that one does not have an ending point while the other has an anticipated ending point. In these examples, one must see at which point *shita shunkan* ‘the very moment one performed the action’ occurs, and if shite iru ga ...shita kotoniwa natteinai ‘is doing but is not yet done’ applies. In addition to movement vs. change, the time structure (e.g., continuousness, that is, the duration of the development and maintenance of the movement) is an important factor. Consider Tarō wa {hanjikan kakatte/hanjikan} mado o akeru ‘it takes Taro half an hour to open the window vs. Taro opens the windows for half an hour.’ There is a qualitative difference in the duration between the first and second sentences. This difference corresponds to the double meaning (ongoing action vs. maintenance of the result) of the sentence *mado o aketsuzukeru* ‘one keeps opening windows vs. one keeps the window(s) open.’

Given such observations, Moriyama (1988) typified the aspectual characteristics of active situations into combinations of various features, such as continuousness (development and maintenance of the movement), reversibility of the result, existence/non-existence of a terminal point, and development of change (analysis of temporal phases).
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