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ABSTRACT

Japanese verbs *yaru* 'give', *morau* 'receive', *kureru* 'give', *(sashi-)*ageru 'give', *itadaku* 'receive', and *kudasaru* 'give' describe a physical event of giving and receiving, including actual movement of an object or transfer of possession. These verbs have auxiliary uses which describe how an event or action is perceived by participants. The image of physical transfer of a gift described by the lexical verbs produces the abstract meaning described by the auxiliary uses. This paper examines cognitive structures of these lexical verbs and auxiliary uses and their relation to investigate the process of abstraction from lexical meaning to auxiliary meaning.

0. Introduction

In Japanese lexicon, some verbs have auxiliary uses. Auxiliary use appears when a subsidiary verb comes after a main verb and a verbal suffix *-te* in a clause-linking construction. For example, there are two uses of *yaru*, lexical use and auxiliary use. Auxiliary *yaru* follows a main verb and *-te*, as in *kat'buy*-te-*yaru*. The grammatical functions of corresponding lexical uses and auxiliary uses differ: lexical uses describe events, while auxiliary uses interpret events. For example, lexical *yaru* in the sentence *Taro-ga muko-gawa-ni-iru Mari-ni shio-o yaru* 'Taro passes the salt to Mari sitting on the other side' describes the movement of the salt from Taro to Mari. Auxiliary *yaru* in the sentence *Taro-ga Mari-ni sugaku-o oshie-te-yaru* 'Taro teaches mathematics to Mari' interprets Taro's act of teaching, indicating Taro's willingness to do something for Mari.

The lexical verbs *yaru*, *morau*, *kureru*, *(sashi-)*ageru, *itadaku*, and *kudasaru* describe events of giving and receiving, including physical movement of an object or transfer of possession. Their auxiliary uses mainly interpret the benefit of events

* I would like to thank Donald Sturge for correcting stylistic errors. The responsibility of remaining inadequacies is my own.
described by the main verb. However, there is some similarity in meaning between these lexical verbs and their auxiliary uses, and this paper examines cognitive structures in an effort to explain the similarity. Section 1 of this paper presents cognitive structures of lexical verbs of giving and receiving. Section 2 presents cognitive structures of the polite lexical verbs of giving and receiving. Section 3 presents cognitive structures of auxiliary uses of yaru, morau, kureru in relation to cognitive structures of corresponding lexical verbs.


Sentences (1) to (6) describe a single event: “Taro gave a flower to Mari,” but the lexical verbs of giving and receiving divide into two groups with different degrees of politeness. Yaru, morau, and kureru in (1), (2), and (3) are rather neutral terms; (sashi-)ageru, itadaku, and kudasaru in (4), (5), and (6) are polite forms.

(1) Taro-ga  Mari-ni  hana-o  yatta
    Taro-SUB Mari-to  flower-OBJ  YARU-PST
(2) Mari-ga  Taro-ni  hana-o  moratta
    Mari-SUB Taro-from flower-OBJ  MORAU-PST
(3) Taro-ga  Mari-ni  hana-o  kureta
    Taro-SUB Mari-to  flower-OBJ  KURERU-PST
(4) Taro-ga  Mari-ni  hana-o  (sashi-)ageta
    Taro-SUB Mari-to  flower-OBJ  (SASHI-)AGERU-PST
(5) Mari-ga  Taro-ni  hana-o  itadaita
    Mari-SUB Taro-from flower-OBJ  ITADAKU-PST
(6) Taro-ga  Mari-ni  hana-o  kudasatta
    Taro-SUB Mari-to  flower-OBJ  KUDASARU-PST

Figure 1, based on Langacker (p.227), represents the image schema of giving and receiving for sentences (1) to (6). The large circles are arrays of entities over which agent (AG) and receiver (RVR) exercise dominion. The double arrows (⇒) stand for emotional effect, agent’s will to act or effect on receiver’s emotion. The single arrow (→) depicts resulting motion of gift or mover (MVR). The agent impels the mover from the agent’s dominion to the receiver’s dominion. In sentences (1) to (6), Taro (AG) impels the flower (MVR) from his dominion to the
dominion of Mari (RVR).
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Figure 1.

*Profile* and *base* are crucial notions for the verbs of giving and receiving *yaru*, *mora*, and *kureru*. Profile contrasts with base, for it is a substructure elevated to a special level of prominence within the base (Ibid., p.5). For example, “tip” designates a profile, with the conception of an elongated object as base.

*Yaru, mora, and kureru* share a single base, but profile different parts of that base. The base is the image schema of giving and receiving in Figure 1, composed of agent, receiver, mover, dominions, agent’s will to act, receiver’s emotional response to the mover, and motion of the mover. *Yaru* takes the agent (gift giver) as subject, and profiles that agent and the act of giving. *Mora* takes the receiver of the gift as subject, and profiles that receiver and the experience of receiving. *Kureru* takes the agent as subject as *yaru* does, but profiles the movement of the mover rather than the agent’s act of giving.

Because of profiling, *yaru* and *mora* require animate subjects, while *kureru* does not. *Yaru* needs a subject and agent having will to act. *Mora* needs a subject and receiver having emotion to feel. Humans like Taro and Mari can be subjects for *yaru, mora, and kureru* in (7), (8), and (9). Things cannot be subjects for *yaru and mora*, and sentences (10) and (11) are inappropriate without personification. Things can be subjects for *kureru* as in (12), though this sentence may sound rhetorical. Inanimate subjects cannot perform a willing act profiled by *yaru*, or feel experience as profiled by *mora*. Inanimate subjects do not interfere with *kureru* profiling gift transfer.

(7)  
Taro-ga  Mari-ni  hana-o  yatta  
Taro-SUB  Mari-TO  flower-OBJ  YARU-PST  
‘Taro gave a flower to Mari.’
(8) *Mari-ga Taro-ni hana-o moratta
Mari-SUB Taro-from flower-OBJ MORAU-PST
'Mari got a flower from Taro.'
(9) Taro-ga Mari-ni hana-o kureta
Taro-SUB Mari-to flower-OBJ KURERU-PST
'Taro gave a flower to Mari.'
(10) *mori-ga Mari-ni shinsenna kuuki-o yatta
woods-SUB Mari-to fresh air-OBJ YARU-PST
'The woods gave fresh air to Mari.'
(11) *hana-ga Taro-ni mizu-o moratta
flower-SUB Taro-from water-OBJ MORAU-PST
'The flower got water from Taro.'
(12) mori-ga Mari-ni shinsenna kuuki-o kureta
woods-SUB Mari-to fresh air-OBJ KURERU-PST
'The woods gave fresh air to Mari.'

Yaru and morau require a mover to convey an agent’s will or elicit emotional response from a receiver. In sentences (13) and (14), the mover is flu. Sentence (13) with yaru is inappropriate, because flu infection occurs without agent’s willingness. Taro cannot control the flu. Sentence (14) is appropriate, because flu infection changes the affected person Mari, receiver of the flu.

(13) *Taro-ga Mari-ni kaze-o yatta
Taro-SUB Mari-to flu-OBJ YARU-PST
'Taro gave Mari his flu.'
(14) Mari-ga Taro-ni kaze-o moratta
Mari-SUB Taro-from flu-OBJ MORAU-PST
'Mari got a flu from Taro.'

Viewpoint is another crucial factor in the use of lexical verbs of giving and receiving. It is useful to compare sentences including watashi ‘I’ to examine viewpoint, because the first person watashi ‘I’ represents the speaker most likely to perceive the event.

In sentences (15) and (16), yaru shows the speaker shares the viewpoint of the
agent. The speaker of (15) is an agent. Sentence (16) is inappropriate, because the speaker is a receiver who contradicts the viewpoint indicated by *yaru*. In sentences (17) and (18), *morau* shows the speaker shares the viewpoint of the receiver. The speaker of (17) is a receiver. Sentence (18) is inappropriate, because the speaker is an agent who contradicts the viewpoint indicated by *morau*. In sentences (19) and (20), *kureru* shows that the speaker shares the viewpoint of the receiver. Sentence (19) is inappropriate, because the speaker is an agent who contradicts the viewpoint indicated by *kureru*. The speaker of (20) is a receiver, in harmony with the viewpoint indicated by *kureru*.

(15) *watashi-ga* Taro-ni hana-o yatta
    I-SUB Taro-to flower-OBJ YARU-PST
    'I gave a flower to Taro.'

(16) *Taro-ga* watashi-ni hana-o yatta
    Taro-SUB I-to flower-OBJ YARU-PST
    'Taro gave me a flower.'

(17) *watashi-ga* Taro-ni hana-o moratta
    I-SUB Taro-from flower-OBJ MORAU-PST
    'I got a flower from Taro.'

(18) *Taro-ga* watashi-ni hana-o moratta
    Taro-SUB I-from flower-OBJ MORAU-PST
    'Taro got a flower from me.'

(19) *watashi-ga* Taro-ni hana-o kureta
    I-SUB Taro-to flower-OBJ KURERU-PST
    'I gave a flower to Taro.'

(20) Taro-ga watashi-ni hana-o kureta
    Taro-SUB I-to flower-OBJ KURERU-PST
    'Taro gave me a flower.'

Figure 2 shows cognitive structures of *yaru*, *morau*, and *kureru*, with profiles and viewpoints. The bold line shows profiles, and the eye (V) shows viewpoint to perceive the event.
2. Cognitive Structures of Polite Verbs of Giving and Receiving
   *(Sashi-*)ageru, Itadaku, and Kudasaru

Cognitive structures of polite verbs of giving and receiving *(sashi-*)ageru, itadaku, and kudasaru are similar to cognitive structures of yaru, morau, and kureru. Profiles and viewpoints of polite verbs correspond to those of yaru, morau, and kureru. *(Sashi-*)ageru profiles agent and willing act of giving, as yaru does. Itadaku profiles receiver and receiver's experience, as morau does. Kudasaru profiles transfer of a gift, as kureru does. The viewpoints of polite verbs will be discussed later in this section.

Social relationship of participants plays an important role in the use of polite verbs *(sashi-*)ageru, itadaku, and kudasaru. Sentences (21) to (26) express
transfer of a flower from Taro to Mari, and only status relationship is different between the two persons. Honorific san after a name indicates when the person is addressed with respect. In (21), social status of Taro (agent) is lower than social status of Mari (receiver). The social relationship is reversed in (22) and (23). Sentences (24), (25), and (26) are inappropriate, because the social relationship indicated by honorific san contradicts the social relationship indicated by (sashi-)ageru, itadaku, and kudasaru. (Sashi-)ageru has an agent of lower status and a receiver of higher status. Itadaku and kudasaru have agents of higher status and receivers of lower status.

(21) Taro-ga Mari-san-ni hana-o sashi-agera
Taro-SUB Mari-san-to flower-OBJ SASHI-AGERU-PST
'Taro gave a flower to Mari-san.'

(22) Mari-ga Taro-san-ni hana-o itadaita
Mari-SUB Taro-san-from flower-OBJ ITADAKU-PST
'Mari got a flower from Taro-san.'

(23) Taro-san-ga Mari-ni hana-o kudasatta
Taro-san-SUB Mari-to flower-OBJ KUDASARU-PST
'Taro-san gave a flower to Mari.'

(24) *Taro-san-ga Mari-ni hana-o sashi-agera
Taro-san-SUB Mari-to flower-OBJ SASHI-AGERU-PST
'Taro-san gave a flower to Mari.'

(25) *Mari-san-ga Taro-ni hana-o itadaita
Mari-san-SUB Taro-from flower-OBJ ITADAKU-PST
'Mari-san got a flower from Taro.'

(26) *Taro-ga Mari-san-ni hana-o kudasatta
Taro-SUB Mari-san-to flower-OBJ KUDASARU-PST
'Taro gave a flower to Mari-san.'

In Figure 3, vertical direction of transfer represents social relationship indicated by the polite verbs. Positions on vertical lines indicate social positions of participants.
Because (sashi)-ageru, itadaku, and kudasaru show the speaker's respect, the speaker always shares the viewpoint of a participant with lower social status. Sentence (27) is inappropriate, because (sashi)-ageru shows the respect for the receiver, and the speaker watashi 'I' is the receiver. The speaker cannot show respect to the speaker him/herself. In (28), the speaker using (sashi)-ageru is the agent. (27) and (28) show that the speaker of (sashi)-ageru must be the agent or an observer sharing the agent's viewpoint. Itadaku and kudasaru show the speaker's respect for the agent, and the speaker cannot be the agent. Sentences (29) and (32) are inappropriate, because the speakers are the agents here. In sentences (30) and (31), the speakers using itadaku and kudasaru are the receivers. Itadaku and kudasaru must be used by a receiver or an observer sharing the receiver's viewpoint.

(27) *Taro-san-ga watashi-ni hana-o sashi-ageta
Taro-san-SUB I-to flower-OBJ SASHI-AGERU-PST
'Taro-san gave me a flower.'
(28) watashi-ga Taro-san-ni hana-o sashi-ageta
   I-SUB   Taro-san-to flower-OBJ SASHI-AGERU-PST
   'I gave a flower to Taro-san.'
(29) *Taro-san-ga watashi-ni hana-o hitadaita
   Taro-san-SUB I-from flower-OBJ ITADAKU-PST
   'Taro-san got a flower from me.'
(30) watashi-ga Taro-san-ni hana-o hitadaita
   I-SUB   Taro-san-from flower-OBJ ITADAKU-PST
   'I got a flower from Taro.'
(31) Taro-san-ga watashi-ni hana-o kudasatta
   Taro-san-SUB I-to flower-OBJ KUDASARU-PST
   'Taro-san gave me a flower.'
(32) *watashi-ga Taro-san-ni hana-o kudasatta
   I-SUB   Taro-san-to flower-OBJ KUDASARU-PST
   'I gave a flower to Taro-san.'

Figure 4 on the next page shows cognitive structures of polite verbs of giving and receiving with profiles, participants' social relationship, and viewpoints. Viewpoints of polite verbs (sashi-)ageru, itadaku, and kudasaru correspond to those of yaru, morau, and kureru.


Auxiliary uses of yaru, morau, and kureru describe abstract and subjective interpretation of an event, not transfer of an object. However, these auxiliary uses have meaning similar to corresponding lexical verbs. Cognitive structures of these auxiliary uses have characteristics in common with cognitive structures of the lexical verbs.

To understand abstract meaning of an event, people compare that event to some earlier experience that seems less abstract. Events so compared must have similarities. Such comparison of events combines events together, producing a new blended event with characteristics derived from the original events. This mechanism is blending (Fauconnier).

When a person benefits from an event, that event compares to the image schema of giving and receiving. The person who benefits corresponds to receiver;
Figure 4.
the person who causes that event corresponds to agent; the benefit from the event corresponds to mover. These correspondences lead to comparison and blending of the event with benefit and the image schema of giving and receiving.

Auxiliary uses of yaru, morau, and kureru blend cognitive structures of lexical verbs and cognitive structures of main verbs. Sentences (33) to (36) describe that Taro showed Mari the way. However, sentence (33) describes a physical happening, while (34), (35), and (36) describe an event with physical and emotional factors blended. The participants physically do something, while carrying out intention to do that or emotionally getting affected.

(33) Taro-ga Mari-ni miti-o oshie-ta
Taro-SUB Mari-to way-OBJ show-PST
‘Taro showed Mari the way.’

(34) Taro-ga Mari-ni miti-o oshie-te-yatta
Taro-SUB Mari-to way-OBJ show-TE-YARU-PST
‘Taro showed Mari the way.’

Mari-SUB Taro-from way-OBJ show-TE-MORAU-PST
‘Mari learned the way from Taro.’

(36) Taro-ga Mari-ni miti-o oshie-te-kureta.
Taro-SUB Mari-to way-OBJ show-TE-KURERU-PST
‘Taro showed Mari the way.’

Figure 5 on the next page shows the process of blending for the cognitive structure of auxiliary yaru used with a transitive verb affecting a human patient (PNT). In the example Taro-ga Mari-ni miti-o oshie-te-yatta ‘Taro showed Mari the way’, (a) and (b) blend to produce (c). Common features combine the structure of transitive oshieru ‘to show’ (a) and the structure of lexical yaru ‘to give’ (b) into the blended structure of auxiliary yaru (c). The agent and receiver (or patient) are the same, Taro and Mari, and the direction of agent’s energy or emotional effect is the same, from Taro to Mari. This blending draws profiles and viewpoint from the structure of the lexical verb yaru (b), but dominions and mover are discarded.
(a) **OSHIERU** 'TO SHOW'

(b) **YARU** (lexical) 'TO GIVE'

(c) **OSHIE-TE-YARU** (auxiliary 1)

_Taro-ga Mari-ni miti-o oshie-TE-YATTA_

'Taro showed Mari the way.'

**Figure 5.**

(a) **OSHIE** 'TO SHOW'-**TE-MORAU**

Mari-ga Taro-ni miti-o oshie-TE-MORATTA

'Mari learned the way from Taro.'

(b) **OSHIE** 'TO SHOW'-**TE-KURERU**

_Taro-ga Mari-ni miti-o oshie-TE-KURETA_

'Taro showed Mari the way.'

**Figure 6.**
Figure 6 shows the structures of auxiliary *morau* and *kureru* blended with the structure of transitive verb. These blended structures inherit profiles and viewpoints from corresponding lexical verbs.

Auxiliary uses with intransitive verbs have different blended structures. Intransitive verbs do not correspond as closely to the image schema of giving and receiving as transitive verbs do. Intransitive verbs do not take patients, while in sentences with transitive verbs, patients usually benefit from events, corresponding to receivers in the image schema of giving and receiving.

Of course it is possible for a person to benefit from the event described by intransitive verbs. But lack of structural correspondence leads to loose attachment of main clause to the participant who benefits. The benefit receiver of an event is presented with particle *ni* or with explanatory particle *no-tame-ni*. *Ni* suggests the main clause’s closeness with the receiver, and *no-tame-ni* suggests a loose connection between the main clause and the receiver. *Ni* is attached to the name of the gift receiver of lexical *yaru* as in (37), and usually to the name of the benefit receiver of a transitive verb as in (38), with exceptions as in sentence (41). Sentence (39) is inappropriate, because *ni* is attached to the name of the benefit receiver from an event described by an intransitive verb. *No-tame-ni* is attached to the name of the benefit receiver of an intransitive verb as in (40).

(37)  
\[ \text{Taro-ga Mari-ni} \]  
\[ \text{Taro-SUB Mari-to} \]  
\[ \text{hana-o yatta} \]  
\[ \text{hana-OBJ YARU-PST} \]  
\[ \text{‘Taro gave a flower to Mari.’} \]  

(38)  
\[ \text{Taro-ga Mari-ni} \]  
\[ \text{Taro-SUB Mari-to} \]  
\[ \text{miti-o oshie-te-yatta} \]  
\[ \text{way-OBJ show-TE-YARU-PST} \]  
\[ \text{‘Taro showed the way to Mari.’} \]  

(39)  
\[ *\text{Taro-ga Mari-ni} \]  
\[ \text{Taro-SUB Mari-to} \]  
\[ \text{shin-de-yatta} \]  
\[ \text{die-TE-YARU-PST} \]  
\[ \text{‘Taro died for Mari.’} \]  

(40)  
\[ \text{Taro-ga Mari-no-tame-ni} \]  
\[ \text{Taro-SUB Mari-for-the-benefit-of} \]  
\[ \text{shin-de-yatta} \]  
\[ \text{die-TE-YARU-PST} \]  
\[ \text{‘Taro died for Mari.’} \]  

Figure 7 shows the cognitive structure of auxiliary *yaru* with intransitive verb
shinu ‘to die’. The wavy line represents the participant’s change of state from being alive to being dead. The rectangle represents the event of dying.

Taro-ga Mari/no-tame-ni shin-DE-YATTA
‘Taro died for Mari.’

Figure 7.

Even with transitive verbs, if the patient is not identical to the benefit receiver, no-tame-ni identifies the benefit receiver, indicating loose attachment of main clause and benefit receiver. Figure 8 shows the cognitive structure for such a case, sentence (41).

(41) Taro-ga Mari/no-tame-ni Mari-no kodomo-ni
Taro-SUB Mari-for-the-benefit-of Mari’s child-OBJ
oshie-te-yatta
teach-TE-YARU-PST
‘Taro taught Mari’s child for Mari.’

Taro mari
taro

Figure 8.

One interesting usage of yaru occurs when yaru has no benefit receiver. Yaru sometimes has no patient, or receiver to benefit from the event (Toyoda, p.85). Then, yaru expresses the speaker’s strong will to make the event happen, as in (42):
(42) *izzo-no-koto shin-de-yaru*  
would rather (I-SUB) die-TE-YARU-FTR  
'I would rather and will die.'

Figure 9 shows the process of blending for *yaru* identified in sentence (42). The cognitive structure of *yaru* blended with an intransitive verb shows the speaker’s will to act with no receiver affected. This structure of auxiliary *yaru* differs from that in Figure 5, Figure 7, or Figure 8. The profile of the agent and the agent’s emittance of energy, deriving from the cognitive structure of lexical *yaru*, enables the speaker to express strong will to cause action. In this blending, only profiles and viewpoint project from the cognitive structure of lexical *yaru* onto the blended cognitive structure of auxiliary *yaru*, with the other parts discarded.
CONCLUSION

Cognitive structures of Japanese verbs of giving and receiving share a single base structure, the image schema of gift transfer. But profiles, viewpoint, and social relationship among participants differ.

Profiles remain in blending, while elements not profiled in the base structure are easily discarded. After a main verb and a verbal suffix -te in a clause-linking construction, the structure of a verb of giving and receiving blends with the structure of the main verb. This blending produces a new cognitive structure of auxiliary use for the verb of giving and receiving, with profiles from the lexical verb. Elements not profiled do not always remain in blended structures. For example, receiver in the structure of lexical yaru is not profiled. Such a receiver remains when blended with a transitive verb, but may be discarded when blended with an intransitive verb. Blending produces some different structures for a single verb.

When elements are discarded in blending, meaning becomes more abstract. This study on the process of blending in Japanese verbs of giving and receiving sheds some light on the mechanism of abstraction, though more study is needed to clarify the whole mechanism.
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