

Re: Neutral meaning of the particle "O"

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.lang.japan/2006-03/msg00922.html>

- *From:* Sean <notsean@xxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Wed, 22 Mar 2006 01:56:04 GMT
-

On 3/21/06 4:37 PM, in article
1fbbb9259c98fee7b1a9597e03c59df1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx, "Dan Rempel"
<drempel@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

mirror wrote:

On Tue, 21 Mar 2006 14:16:17 -0800, Dan Rempel
<drempel@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

What is your definition of transitivity?

In English: A verb that takes an object without being separated from that object by a preposition. By definition, this object is regarded as a "direct object." Transitivity names this relationship, but it does not define it -- a verb that directly bumps against an object (no preposition involved) is what defines it.

I think it would help clarify your arguments if you used more commonly accepted definitions for some of these terms. To the best of my knowledge transitivity refers to the number of objects a verb takes, without regard to the type of object. A direct object is a noun phrase that has a particular grammatical relationship to a predicate (I don't think objects of prepositions are referred to as "direct objects), and so on. I've been trying to follow this thread, but I'm still really unclear on exactly what you're trying to say, although my innate \neg -ness may have something to do with that.

I was starting to think that (of myself), but I've been changing my mind. I think mirror may have got him/herself into a philosophical cramp for no pressing reason. I don't quite see why the lack of a preposition "defines" transitivity, although it is a syntactic feature of transitivity in English.
In Engli