

What Does a Verb-Sensitive Approach to Japanese Ditransitive Constructions Tell Us?

Tomoko Ishizuka

1. Introduction

This paper examines Japanese ditransitive constructions from a lexical semantic perspective in lines with Kishimoto (2001) and Levin (2010). Ditransitive verbs in Japanese, a head-final language with scrambling or apparent free word order, allow their internal arguments to surface in two orders, either in the dative-accusative or accusative-dative order, as exemplified in (1).¹ Note that *ni* is ambiguous between the dative marker and the locative marker corresponding to English prepositions like *to*, *at*, *in*, *on*, but it is glossed as Dat throughout this paper since the distinction is not always clear.

- (1) a. Ken-ga Naomi-ni tegami-o ageta.
Ken-NOM Naomi-DAT letter-ACC gave
'Ken gave a letter to Naomi.' [Dat-Acc]
- b. Ken-ga tegami-o Naomi-ni ageta.
Ken-NOM letter-ACC Naomi-DAT gave [Acc-Dat]

There is no obvious interpretive difference between (1a) and (1b), and the research has centered on how the two configurations relate, either by movement (i.e. short-scrambling) or by base-generation. One important finding I report in this paper is that in Japanese spatial or locative goals cannot be animate entities contrary to the widely-accepted view that only possessors or recipients, but not locative goals, exhibit animacy restrictions (e.g. Kishimoto, 2001; Miyagawa & Tsujioka, 2004). This calls for reinterpreting the critical data discussed in the literature. For instance, if *Naomi-ni* in (1b) is indeed a possessor and not a locative goal, (1b) militates against Miyagawa & Tsujioka's (2004) base-generation analysis, according to which the possessor and the theme are generated in that hierarchical order and the theme cannot scramble over the possessor. Although I contend in accordance with Miyagawa & Tsujioka (2004) and many others that the possessor is base-generated higher than the theme on the basis of PRO binding in purpose clauses, the surface linear Theme-Possessor order exemplified in (1b) must be derived by short-scrambling, as the advocates of the movement approach claim (e.g. Hoji, 1985). The analysis I develop here is not totally new but combines elements from previous research, such as Levin's (2010) and Kishimoto's (2001) verb-sensitive approach, the traditional movement approach (e.g. Hoji 1985) and the base-generation approach (Miyagawa & Tsujioka, 2004).

This article is organized as follows: Section 2 reviews the literature on English and Japanese ditransitive constructions that has motivated the present study. Making crucial use of *tokoro* 'place' phrases, section 3 divides the ditransitive verbs taking 'Nom-Dat-Acc' case patterns into three types in accordance with Levin (2010): (i) *ageru* 'give'-type verbs, which realize the caused possession meaning, (ii) *okuru* 'send'-type verbs, which lexicalize the caused possession and caused location meanings, and (iii) *oku* 'put'-type verbs, which only mean the caused location. It then investigates the base-generated positions of the possessor and the location using *tameni* purpose clauses. It will be shown that possessors, but not locative goals, can be identified as the subject PRO in the *tameni* purpose clause modifying theme, which suggests that possessors are generated in the position that c-commands the theme, while locations do not. Section 4 concludes.

* I thank Peter Hallman, for extensive discussions and comments. I also thank Jieun Kim, Shoichi Takahashi and audience at WCCFL 36, at SICOGG 19, and at Aoyama Linguistics & Literature Seminar.

¹ Abbreviations used in the glosses are: Acc (=Accusative), Dat (=Dative), Gen (=Genitive), Des (=Desiderative), Nom (=Nominative), Top (=Topic).

2. The literature

2.1. Literature on English dative alternation

The dative alternation in English (2) has been studied extensively, and a controversy lies in whether (2a) and (2b) are derivationally related (e.g. Larson, 1988; Baker, 1997; Aoun & Li, 1989; Collins, 2017) or reflect the base-generated order of distinct sources (e.g. Harley, 2002; Harley & Miyagawa, 2017).

- (2) a. John gave Mary an apple. [Double Object Frame]
 b. John gave an apple to Mary. [Prepositional Frame]

The base-generation view (e.g. Harley, 2002) assumes that *Mary* in the double object frame (2a) is the prospective possessor or recipient of the direct object, while *Mary* in the prepositional frame (2b) is the location.

More recently, focusing on the semantics of each alternating verb, Rappaport Hovav & Levin (2008:RH&L hereafter) divide the verbs into two types. Verbs like *give* and *offer*, on one hand, only lexicalize a caused possession event, thus the goal is always a recipient, even in the prepositional frame like (2b) (see also Jackendoff, 1992; Pinker, 2013). On the other hand, verbs like *send* and *throw* lexicalize both a caused motion event realized exclusively in the prepositional frame, and a caused possession event realized in either frame. Although the preposition *to* found with *give*-type verbs might give a false impression that the recipient is the goal of a possessional path, they claim that *give*-type verbs neither involve a transfer of possession nor have a path component. RH&L (2008:140) note that “if a court gives a parent visiting rights, the court does not first have those rights; it simply causes the parent to have the rights. There is no transfer of possession, but simply caused possession.” They further discuss various distributional differences between the *to* phrases associated with *give*-type and *send*-type verbs in support of their proposal, such as (i) (in)sensitivity to animacy, (ii) (in)ability to question the *to*-phrase with *where*, (iii) (in)ability to select spatial prepositions beside *to*, and (iv) (in)ability to take a source phrase. Firstly, unlike *send*-type verbs, the preposition *to* of *give*-type verbs only takes animate complements.

- (3) I {*gave/sent} the package **to London**. (RH&L 2008)

Likewise, the complement of *to* of *give*-type verbs cannot be questioned by the locative *wh*-word *where*, in contrast to that of *send*-type verbs (Levinson 2005, cited in RH&L).

- (4) a. {*Where/To whom} did you give the ball? To {*London/my brother}.
 b. {Where/To whom} did you send the package? To {London/my brother}.

Examples (3) and (4) follow if the *to*-phrase of *give*-type verbs is indeed a recipient and not a locative goal, since a recipient is generally an animate entity capable of possession. In addition, *give*-type verbs neither can select spatial prepositions beside *to* nor take a source phrase, as illustrated below:

- (5) a. Fred {sent/threw} the ball {behind the tree/over the fence}.
 b. *Fred gave the ball {at/behind/over} Molly.
 (6) a. Fred {sent/threw} the ball from home plate to third base.
 b. *Josie {gave/offered} the ball from Marla to Bill.

Basing on the above data, RH&L conclude that the *to*-phrase of *give*-type verbs is always the possessor.

Hallman (2015) has completed RH&L’s paradigm by incorporating the distribution of *put*-type locative verbs and proposed a three-way distinction, which is summarized in Table 1. The classification consists of i) verbs like *give* and *lend*, whose PP is always the possessor, ii) verbs like *send* and *throw*, whose PP is ambiguous between the possessor and location, and iii) verbs like *put* and *immerse*, whose PP is exclusively the location. Note that the double object frame only expresses the ‘caused possession’ meaning, while the prepositional frame can mean either the ‘caused possession’ or ‘caused motion.’

<i>Verb type</i>	<i>Prepositional frame</i>	<i>Double object frame</i>
<i>give-type</i>	caused possession	caused possession
<i>send-type</i>	caused possession caused motion	caused possession
<i>put-type</i>	caused motion	

Table 1: A verb-sensitive approach (Hallman 2015, see also RH&L 2008)

Hallman (2015) proposes that the realization of the two meanings in the prepositional frame takes distinct derivational paths: the realization of the caused motion meaning involves a base-generated locative PP, while that of the caused possession meaning involves demotion of the possessor from the double object frame into a PP, via internal passivization. Support for his proposal comes from binding facts with respect to the subject PRO in the purpose clause that are predicated of the theme. In (7a), the object gap in the purpose clause is argued to be derived by \bar{A} -movement of an empty operator coindexed with the direct object in the matrix clause, and the subject PRO can be interpreted as co-referential with the possessor *John*, which suggests that the possessor c-commands the purpose clause PRO (see Hallman 2015, and the references therein). In the prepositional frame counterpart (7b), the subject PRO can also be identified with the PP-internal argument *John*. In contrast, the subject PRO in the locative construction (7c) cannot be identified with the PP-internal location *horse*.

- (7) a. Mary gave **John**_{*i*} a puppy_{*j*} [_{CP} Op_{*j*} [_{IP} PRO_{*i*} to play with e_{*j*}]]. (Hallman 2015:392)
 b. Mary gave a puppy_{*j*} to **John**_{*i*} [_{CP} Op_{*j*} [_{IP} PRO_{*i*} to play with e_{*j*}]].
 c. *Mary put the child_{*j*} on the **horse**_{*i*} [_{CP} Op_{*j*} [_{IP} PRO_{*i*} to carry e_{*j*}]].

This contrast has led Hallman (2015) to conclude that *John* in (7b) is not base-generated as a complement of P unlike *the horse* in (7c), but is the possessor demoted from the indirect object of the double object frame (see also Collins, 2017). The c-command relation between *John* and PRO in (7b), which is necessary in order to identify the subject PRO as *John*, must hold under reconstruction.

2.2. The Japanese literature

A traditional view is that the datively-marked Goal and the accusatively-marked Theme are generated in the Dat>Acc hierarchical order, and (1b) is derived from (1a) by short scrambling. The movement approach has been advocated by many linguists, including Hoji (1985), Kishimoto (2008), Koizumi (1995), Tada (1993), Takano (1998), Yatsushiro (2003), and is evidenced by data involving quantifier scope, variable binding, and numeral quantifier floating. The movement view has been largely displaced by Miyagawa & Tsujioka's (2004) base-generation view, according to which there are two goal positions—the high goal (a possessor DP) and the low goal (a location PP) (see also Miyagawa 1997) and the theme and the low goal can be 'freely generated' within the same VP. As a result, the accusative-dative and the dative-accusative orders are equally available, as schematized in (8).

- (8) a. [_{AppIP} High Goal (possessor) [_{VP} Low Goal (location) – Theme]]
 b. [_{AppIP} High Goal (possessor) [_{VP} Theme – Low Goal (location)]]

Miyagawa & Tsujioka (2004: M&T hereafter) claim that the theme cannot scramble over the possessor, thus the surface Acc-Dat order, as in (1b), is necessarily a realization of the base-generated theme and location given in (8b). However, I will show in section 3 that their claim cannot be maintained because locative goals are restricted to inanimate entities in Japanese.

An initial motivation for the base-generation view comes from Miyagawa's (1997) observation with respect to binding of reciprocal anaphors. When an object is scrambled over a reciprocal in the subject position, the sentence becomes ill-formed, as in (9a). He takes (9a) as a manifestation of Rizzi's (1986) Chain Condition violation, such that the reciprocal anaphor locally c-commands the trace of its antecedent.

- (9) a. ???[John-to Mary]-o_i otagai_i-ga t_i mita.
 John-and Mary-ACC_i each.other_i-NOM saw
 ‘John and Mary, each other saw.’ (Miyagawa 1997:4)
- b. (?)John-ga [Hanako-to Mary]-o (paatii-de) otagai-ni (t_i) syookaisita.
 John-NOM Hanako-and Mary-ACC (party-at) each.other_i-DAT introduced
 ‘John introduced Hanako and Mary to each other (at the party).’ (Miyagawa 1997:5)

In contrast to (9a), Miyagawa finds (9b) acceptable, and takes this to mean that there is no trace (thus no movement) and that the goal can be base-generated below the theme. It should be noted, however, that there is interspeaker variation and Koizumi (1995) finds examples like (9b) deviant and takes it as evidence for a movement analysis. I would like to point out that there is another reason to question the validity of using *otagai-ni* as a test to figure out the base-generated position of the goal; that is, *otagai-ni* has an adverbial use and can be used with transitive verbs that do not select a goal, as shown below:

- (10) John-to Mary_i-ga {*Ken/otagai_i}-ni zyuusyo-o sitteiru.
 John-and Mary_i-NOM Ken/each.other_i-DAT address-ACC know
 ‘John and Mary know each other’s address.’

See also Yatsushiro (2003), who claims that *otagai* ‘each other’ is not subject to the chain condition.

The difficulty with data arguing for the structure of ditransitive verbs is that they usually involve delicate judgments and are subject to idiolectal variations (e.g. Kitagawa, 1994; Kishimoto, 2008:144). This is particularly notable with scope phenomena. Japanese is known as a scope rigid language (i.e. only surface scope is available) and availability of inverse scope suggests involvement of scrambling (e.g. Hoji 1985, Kuno 1973, Kuroda 1965, 1970). Consider (11) discussed in M&T (2004).

- (11) a. Taroo-ga dono-nimotu-mo dareka-ni okutta.
 Taro-NOM every-package-mo someone-DAT sent
 ‘Taro sent someone every package.’ (some > every, every > some)
- b. Taroo-ga dareka-ni dono-nimotu-mo okutta.
 Taro-NOM someone-DAT every-package-mo sent
 (some > every, (*)every > some)

Linguists generally agree that surface and inverse scope readings are both available in (11a), but the judgments vary in terms of (11b). Proponents of the movement view, such as Hoji (1985), find (11b) unambiguous only allowing the surface scope reading and take the unambiguity as a piece of evidence for the base-generated goal>theme order. In contrast, advocates of the base-generation view, such as Miyagawa (1997) and M&T (2004), find (11b) ambiguous and take this as evidence for both theme>goal and goal>theme as base structures. According to M&T, the ambiguity available in (11a) and (11b) arises because the location QP and the theme QP are within the same VP and either QP can raise first by QR. Note that this claim also builds on the assumption that animate (in addition to inanimate) entities can be construed as the locative goal. With considerable interspeaker variation, data from scope interpretations are generally inconclusive.²

One type of data involving fairly clear grammaticality judgments comes from idioms. M&T (2004) provide two types of idioms – ‘*ni-V*’ and ‘*o-V*’ – in support of the base-generation view. Availability of *ni-V* idioms like (12a) suggests that the location as well as the theme can be generated adjacent to V.

- (12) a. Taroo-wa omotta koto-o **kuti-ni dasu.**
 Taro-TOP thought thing-ACC mouth-DAT let.out
 ‘Taro says what’s on his mind.’ (cf. ???...**kuti-ni omotta koto-o dasu.**)

² The other types of data discussed in the context of ditransitive constructions, which this short paper is unable to review, are also subject to idiolectal variations. For example, M&T (2004) provide data containing double datives (a possessor and a location) and a theme and Kishimoto (2008) uses *kata* ‘way’ nominalization in support of their analyses, but quite a few speakers including myself disallow double datives and Miyagawa (2012) points out that Kishimoto’s *kata* nominalization data critical to his movement analysis is ungrammatical to many speakers.

- b. Taroo-wa hito-no koto-ni **kuti-o dasu.**
 Taro-TOP person-GEN business-DAT mouth-ACC let.out
 ‘Taro cuts in on someone else’s business.’ (cf. *...**kuti-o** hito-no koto-ni **dasu.**)

Reversing the order of the *ni*- and *o*-marked arguments results in losing the idiomatic meanings.

Extending RH&L’s verb-sensitive approach to Japanese ditransitive constructions, Levin (2010) claims that the same event-type and verb-type association found in English ditransitive constructions holds in Japanese. Similar to the English example discussed in section 2.1, she shows in (13) that *ataeru* ‘give’ lexicalizes the caused possession, but not the transfer of possession (contra Kishimoto, 2001).

- (13) Saibanchoo-ga Mary-ni kodomo-no yooikuken-o ataeta.
 judge-NOM Mary-DAT child-GEN custody-ACC gave
 ‘The judge gave Mary custody of the child.’ (Levin 2010: 11)

In support of her claim that *okuru* ‘send’ type verbs license both possessors and locations while *ataeru* ‘give’ type verbs only license locations, she provides (14) and (15) (originally from Kishimoto 2001).

- (14) *okuru* ‘send’-type verbs
- John-wa Mary- $\{ni/e\}$ tegami-o $\{okutta/yoosoosita\}$.
 John-TOP Mary-DAT/TO letter-ACC $\{sent/mailed\}$
 ‘John sent a letter to Mary.’
 - John-wa Mary-no uti-made nimotu-o okutta.
 John-TOP Mary-GEN house-until luggage-ACC sent
 ‘John sent luggage to Mary’s home.’
 - John-wa zitaku-kara Mary-ni tegami-o okutta.
 John-TOP home-from Mary-DAT letter-ACC sent
 ‘John sent a letter to Mary from his home.’
- (15) *ataeru* ‘give’-type verbs
- John-wa Mary- $\{ni/??e\}$ zyoohoo-o $\{ataeta/teikyoosita\}$.
 John-TOP Mary- $\{DAT/to\}$ information-ACC $\{gave/offered\}$
 ‘John gave/offered information to Mary.’
 - *John-wa Mary-no uti-made nimotu-o teikyoosita.
 John-TOP Mary-GEN house-until luggage-ACC offered
 ‘John offered luggage to Mary’s home.’
 - *John-wa zitaku-kara Mary-ni hon-o ageta.
 John-TOP home-from Mary-DAT book-ACC gave
 ‘John gave a book from his home to Mary.’

Incompatibility of *give*-type verbs with the postpositions *-e* or *made* in (15a) and (15b) and with a source phrase in (15c) supports her claim that *ataeru* ‘give’ type verbs lexicalize only the caused possession event and do not select a locative goal. Replaceability of *ni* with the postposition *e* has generally been used as a test to show that a datively-marked Goal is a location PP and not a possessor DP (see (15a)) (Miyagawa & Tsujioka, 2004; Kishimoto, 2008), but the grammaticality judgments are not always consistent across speakers I surveyed, and there is another problem with the *-e* substitution test, which will be discussed in section 3.1.

3. Proposal

In this section, on the basis of the distribution of *tokoro* ‘place’ phrases, I divide Japanese ditransitive verbs into three types: those licensing the possessor as well as the locative goal, those licensing the possessor only, and those licensing the location only. Then with *tameni* purpose clauses, the relative structural heights of the theme, the possessor, and the location will be investigated.

3.1. The locative goal and its sensitivity to inanimate entities

The literature has assumed that animate entities marked with *ni* are ambiguous between the possessor and the location (e.g. Kishimoto 2001:42, M&T 2004). However, it becomes clear that animate entities cannot be construed as the locative goal if we combine one with intransitive verbs that unambiguously select a *ni*-marked locative goal. This is illustrated in (16).

- (16) Ken-ga Naomi-*(no tokoro)-ni {itta/dekaketa}.
 Ken-NOM Naomi-(GEN place)-DAT {went/went.out}
 Lit. 'Ken went (out) to {*Naomi/where Naomi is}.'

In order to have a proper name signify the place where that person is, the noun *tokoro* 'place' needs to be added. This appears to be a rather general property of Japanese, since not only locative verbs but certain transitive verbs prefer to take inanimate nouns as the direct object, as shown in (17).³

- (17) Ken-wa Naomi-??(no koto)-{ga/o} siri-tai.
 Ken-NOM Naomi-(GEN matter)-{NOM/ACC} know-DES
 Lit. 'Ken wants to know about Naomi('s matters).'

This means that if the dative phrase is animate, it is the (prospective) possessor (or not the locative goal, at the least). We can now use the *tokoro*-phrase as a test to figure out whether or not the dative phrase is the locative goal. Firstly, *ageru/ataeru* 'give' type verbs (e.g. *watasu* 'hand,' *teikyosuru* 'offer') do not select the location, which is confirmed by the incompatibility with the *tokoro*-phrase, as shown in (18).

- (18) a. Naomi-wa Ken-*(no tokoro)-ni pen-o {ageta/ataeta}.
 Naomi-TOP Ken-(GEN place)-DAT pen-ACC gave
 'Naomi gave a pen to {Ken/*Ken's place}.'
 b. Naomi-wa Ken-*(no tokoro)-ni meisi-o watasita.
 Naomi-TOP Ken-(GEN place)-DAT business.card-ACC handed
 'Naomi handed a business card to {Ken/*Ken's place}.'

The only grammatical reading of the examples in (18) with the *tokoro*-phrase is one in which Ken's place is a stand-in for an organization or group of people (e.g. Ken's company or family): in a sense, *Ken-no tokoro* is animate. The pattern conforms to the consensus that possessors are restricted to animate entities capable of possession (e.g. Kishimoto, 2001, M&T, 2004). Following Levin (2010), I assume that *ataeru* 'give' type verbs lexicalize the 'caused possession' event, which I take to mean that they minimally contain the structure of [X causes_{state}[Y possesses Z]].

Secondly, *okunoseru* 'put' type verbs (e.g. *hitasu* 'immerse,' *kakeru* 'pour') select the location, and not the possessor, as shown in (19). When an animate noun is construed as the location, it must mean on top of its referent and not the place where he/she is: in a sense, *Ken* in (19a) is inanimate.

- (19) a. Mei-wa Ken-*(no tokoro)-ni bento-o oita.
 May-NOM Ken-(GEN place)-DAT lunch.box-ACC put
 Lit. 'May put a lunch box on {*Ken/Ken's place}.'
 b. Naomi-ga {senryoo/*Mei}-ni nuno-o hitasita.
 Naomi-NOM {dye/*May}-DAT cloth-ACC immersed
 'Naomi immersed the cloth in {the dye/*May}.'

Without *no-tokoro*, the only available reading of (19a), which is not the intended one, is that the lunch box was literally put on top of Ken('s body). (19b) has an additional requirement of the location being a liquid. This class of verbs minimally consists of the structure of [X causes_{state}[Y at/in/on Z]].

Lastly, (20) shows that the dative phrase of *okuru* 'send' type verbs (e.g. *todokeru* 'deliver,' *nageru* 'throw') can be either animate or inanimate, suggesting that they take both possessors and locative goals.

³ Alternatively, we can interpret this to mean that Japanese lacks silent nouns like MATTER or PLACE.

Interestingly, there is a connotational difference between the dative phrases with and without *tokoro*. If *Naomi* is sending a paper to *Ken* electronically, the dative phrase without *tokoro* is preferred. In contrast, the dative phrase with *tokoro* gives an impression that *Naomi* is mailing the actual paper to *Ken*. This contrast supports the idea that the *tokoro* phrase is indeed the locative goal while the animate dative phrase is the (prospective) possessor.

- (20) a. Naomi-wa Ken-(no tokoro)-ni ronbun-o {okutta/todoketa}.
 Naomi-TOP Ken-(GEN place)-DAT paper-ACC {sent/delivered}
 ‘Naomi {sent/delivered} a paper to {Ken/Ken’s place}.’
- b. Mei-wa Lisa-(no tokoro)-ni booru-o nageta.
 May-TOP Lisa-(GEN place)-DAT ball-ACC threw
 ‘May threw a ball to {Lisa/where Lisa is}.’

However, as Kishimoto (2001:39) correctly points out that verbs like *okuru* is neutral with respect to whether a moved entity reaches the goal. *Ken* and *Lisa* in (20) might or might not become the recipient because ‘sending’ and ‘throwing’ do not entail the successful arrival of the entities. I propose that these animate dative phrases are not the possessor, but precisely speaking the ‘addressee’ or ‘intended recipient/target.’ Nevertheless, they largely pattern like the possessor associated with *ataeru* type verbs, as shown in the next section. Therefore, the addressee is subsumed under the possessor in the following table, which summarizes the proposed classification.

<i>Verb type</i>	<i>Event type</i>	<i>Goal type</i>
<i>give-type</i>	caused possession	possessor
<i>send-type</i>	caused possession	possessor
	caused motion	location
<i>put-type</i>	caused motion	location

Table 2: Three types of ditransitive verbs in Japanese

Note that this classification mirrors that of English ditransitives proposed by Hallman (2015) (Table 1).

One difference worth mentioning between the addressee and the possessor is that the former can be introduced by the postposition *-e*. As mentioned in section 2.2, substitution of *-ni* to the postposition *-e* has been used as a test to identify whether the goal is the location PP or the possessor DP (e.g. M&T 2004, Kishimoto 2008, Levin 2010). For example, Kishimoto (2008:150) concludes on the basis of (21) that *ataeru* ‘give’ does not license the location and *Hanako-e* associated with *okuru* is the location PP.

- (21) Taro-ga Hanako-e okasi-o {okutta/*ataeta}.
 Taro-NOM Hanako-to sweets-ACC sent/gave
 ‘Taro {sent/*gave} sweets to Hanako.’

Although agreeing with Kishimoto in that *ageru* does not select the location, I claim that *Hanako-e* is not the location. This is confirmed by (22), where *Naomi-e* is incompatible with *iku/dekakeru* ‘go/go.out.’

- (22) Ken-ga Naomi-*(no tokoro)-e {itta/dekaketa}.
 Ken-NOM Naomi-(GEN place)-to {went/went.out}
 ‘Ken went (out) to {*Naomi/where Naomi is}.’

Unlike *-ni*, *-e* needs not be licensed by a verb: e.g. *isya-e no mitinori* ‘a path to (become) a doctor,’ *Keiko-e no omoi* ‘feelings towards Keiko,’ *Lisa-e no tegami* ‘a letter to Lisa.’ The animate complements of *e* in these nominal examples are neither the location nor the possessor, but more like the addressee or target (i.e. the endpoint of an abstract path). Note that the writer might end up throwing away the letter he wrote to Lisa. Thus, a successful replacement does not guarantee that the *ni*-counterpart is the location (contra Kishimoto 2001, 2008 and others). It simply means that its θ -role is similar to the one introduced by the postposition *e*, which is not restricted to the spatial/locative goal but includes the addressee.

3.2. Purpose clauses

Following Hallman (2015), we use purpose clauses in order to understand the structure of ditransitive verbs. According to Nakayama & Tajima (1993: N&T hereafter), the *tameni*-clause, exemplified in (23), is a purpose clause when it has the feature [-past] or [-perfective] and contains an empty object identified by a matrix argument (see also Hoji, 1985). The empty object is argued by N&T (1993) to be derived by null operator (\bar{A}) movement because of its distributional similarities to other null operator constructions in Japanese, such as topic, relative clause, cleft and comparative constructions.

- (23) John_j-ga [Op_i [PRO_j paatii-de e_i nomu tameni]] ano wain_i-o kata.
 John-NOM party-at drink to that wine-ACC bought
 ‘John bought that wine to drink at the party.’ (adapted from N&T 1993:9)

Appealing to tests like VP-preposing, Hoji (1985) and N&T (1993) show that the *tameni*-purpose clause is a constituent within VP. As the unacceptability of (24a) shows, a constituent within VP cannot be separated from the main verb under VP-preposing (N&T 1993:8). Now compare (24b) with (24c).

- (24) a. *Kai-sae John-ga ano wain-o shita.
 buy-even John-NOM that wine-ACC did
 Lit. ‘Even buy, John did that wine.’
 b. [Op_i [PRO Paati-de e_i nomu tameni]] ano wain_i-o kai-sae John-ga shita.
 party-at drink to that wine-ACC buy-even John-NOM did
 Lit. ‘Even buy that wine to drink at the party, John did.’
 c. *Ano wain_i-o kai-sae John-ga [Op_i [PRO paatei-de e_i nomu tameni]] shita.
 that wine-ACC buy-even John-NOM party-at drink to did
 Lit. ‘Even buy that wine, John did to drink at the party.’

In (24b), the *tameni* clause is preposed with the main verb, while in (24c), it is left with the auxiliary verb. The ill-formedness of (24c) suggests that the *tameni*-clause is base-generated under VP. This is an expected result given that the purpose clause is predicated of the theme and is directly subordinate to it.

The ditransitive construction (25) shows that the subject PRO in the scrambled purpose clause can be bound by a quantifier contained in the possessor in the matrix clause. This guarantees that the possessor c-commands the purpose clause and the theme (Nishigauchi, 1984), in this case under reconstruction.

- (25) Lisa-wa [Op_j [PRO_i atode e_j yomu tameni]]_k dono-kodomo_i-ni-mo t_k hon_j-o ageta.
 Lisa-TOP later read to every-child-DAT-MO book-ACC gave
 ‘Lisa gave a book_j to every child_i [PRO_i to read e_j later].’

Likewise, the subject PRO can be bound by the quantifier in the animate *ni*-phrase associated with *okuru*.

- (26) kooti-wa [Op_j [PRO_i e_j mite kenkyusuru tameni]]_k dono-sensyu_i-ni-mo t_k bideo_j-o
 coach-TOP see.and study to every-player-DAT-MO video-ACC
 okutta.
 sent
 ‘The coach sent a video_j to every player_i [PRO_i to watch and study e_j].’

In contrast, the subject PRO in the purpose clause cannot be identified by the daitively-marked location.

- (27) a. Ken_i-wa [Op_k [PRO_{i/*j} e_k hakobu tameni]] uma_j-ni nimotu_k-o noseta.
 Ken-TOP carry to horse-DAT goods-ACC put
 Lit. ‘Ken_i put goods_k on the horse_j [PRO_{i/*j} to carry e_k].’
 b. Ken_i-wa [Op_k [PRO_{?i/*j} e_k nameru tameni]]_l neko_j-ni hatimitu_k-o kaketa.
 Ken-TOP lick to cat-DAT honey-ACC poured
 Lit. ‘Ken_i poured honey_k on the cat_j [PRO_{?i/*j} to lick e_k].’

causing or possessing, in the type of locative P, or in the presence of other additional projections in the syntax.

3.4. Remaining puzzles

There is still a puzzle with respect to idioms: idioms consisting of the location, the theme, and locative verbs appear in the Dat-Acc linear order and not in the reverse order, as exemplified in (31a). Likewise, there are many idioms consisting of the *ni*-marked location and the theme like (31b), but they always appear in the ‘Location-*ni* Theme’ order.

- | | | | | |
|------|----|---|----|---|
| (31) | a. | hi-ni abura-o sosogu
fire-DAT oil-ACC pour
‘make–worse’ | b. | nuka-ni kugi
bran-DAT nail
‘having no effect, waste of effort’ |
|------|----|---|----|---|

This is quite puzzling and inconsistent with the pattern with the *ni*-V idioms reported by M&T (2004). How can we reconcile these idiom facts? One possibility is that in idioms like (31a) and (31b) the location PP might have moved higher than the theme in order to check off the [+Dat] Case feature and the double dative marking *ni-ni* is realized as a single appearance of *ni*. This is not that surprising given that Korean, for example, allows stacking of a locative P and dative Case (*Swuni-eykey-(lo) kassta*. Swuni-DAT-TO went ‘(I) went to Swuni’), but I do not have an answer to offer to this puzzle yet.

4. Conclusion

In this paper, I first show that animate entities cannot be the locative goal, but require an overt *tokoro* place phrase (e.g. *Ken*(-no tokoro)* ‘Ken’s place’). Then using the distribution of *tokoro*-phrases, I divide ditransitive verbs into three kinds: i) *ataeru* ‘give’ type verbs, selecting the possessor, ii) *oku* ‘put’-type verbs selecting the location, and iii) *okuru* ‘send’ type verbs compatible with the possessor as well as the location. On the basis of binding of PRO in the purpose clause modifying the Theme, I also show that the possessor, but not the location, is generated in the position that c-commands the theme and the purpose clause, and conclude that Possessor>Theme>Location is the base order. One consequence of these findings is that Miyagawa & Tsujioka’s base-generation analysis that disallows scrambling of the theme over the possessor cannot be maintained since there are examples with a Theme followed by an animate Possessor (see (1b)). Scrambling of the theme over the possessor is in fact possible, as assumed by the proponents of the movement view (e.g. Hoji, 1985; Koizumi, 1995).

References

- Aoun, Joseph & Yen-hui Audrey Li (1989). Scope and constituency. *Linguistic Inquiry* 20:2, 141–172.
- Baker, Mark C (1997). Thematic roles and syntactic structure. *Elements of grammar*, Springer, 73–137.
- Collins, Chris (2017). A smuggling approach to the dative alternation. <https://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/003370>.
- Halle, Morris & Alec Marantz (1993). *Distributed morphology and the pieces of inflection*. Citeseer.
- Hallman, Peter (2015). Syntactic neutralization in double object constructions. *Linguistic inquiry* 46:3, 389–424.
- Harley, Heidi (2002). Possession and the double object construction. *Linguistic variation yearbook* 2:1, 31–70.
- Harley, Heidi & Shigeru Miyagawa (2017). Ditransitives.
- Hoji, Hajime (1985). *Logical form constraints and configurational structures in Japanese*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Washington.
- Hovav, Malka Rappaport & Beth Levin (2008). The english dative alternation: The case for verb sensitivity. *Journal of Linguistics* 44:1, 129–167.
- Jackendoff, Ray (1992). *Semantic structures*, vol. 18. MIT press.
- Kishimoto, Hideki (2001). The role of lexical meanings in argument encoding. *Gengo Kenkyu (Journal of the Linguistic Society of Japan)* 2001:120, 35–65.
- Kishimoto, Hideki (2008). Ditransitive idioms and argument structure. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 17:2, 141–179.
- Kitagawa, Yoshihisa (1994). Shells, yolks, and scrambled eggs. *Proceedings of NELS*, vol. 24, 221–239.
- Koizumi, Masatoshi (1995). *Phrase Structure in Minimalist Syntax*. Ph.D. thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

- Kuroda, S-Y (1970). Remarks on the notion of subject with reference to words like also, even or only. *Annual Bulletin* 4, 127–152.
- Larson, Richard K (1988). On the double object construction. *Linguistic inquiry* 19:3, 335–391.
- Levin, Beth (2010). The semantic bases of Japanese and Korean ditransitives. *Handout, 20th Japanese/Korean Linguistics Conference, Oxford University, Oxford, UK.*
- Miyagawa, Shigeru (1997). Against optional scrambling. *Linguistic Inquiry* 1–25.
- Miyagawa, Shigeru (2012). Nominalization and argument structure: evidence for the dual-base analysis of ditransitive constructions in Japanese. *Case, Argument Structure, and Word Order*, Routledge, 98–127.
- Miyagawa, Shigeru & Takae Tsujioka (2004). Argument structure and ditransitive verbs in Japanese. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 13:1, 1–38.
- Nakayama, Mineharu & Kazuhiko Tajima (1993). Purpose clauses in Japanese. *Lingua* 91:1, 1–32.
- Nishigauchi, Taisuke (1984). Control and the thematic domain. *Language* 215–250.
- Pinker, Steven (2013). *Learnability and cognition: The acquisition of argument structure*. MIT press.
- Tada, Hiroaki (1993). *AA-bar partition in derivation*. Ph.D. thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Takano, Yuji (1998). Object shift and scrambling. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 16:4, 817–889.
- Yatsushiro, Kazuko (2003). VP internal scrambling. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 12:2, 141–170.

Proceedings of the 36th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics

edited by Richard Stockwell, Maura O’Leary,
Zhongshi Xu, and Z.L. Zhou

Cascadilla Proceedings Project Somerville, MA 2019

Copyright information

Proceedings of the 36th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics
© 2019 Cascadilla Proceedings Project, Somerville, MA. All rights reserved

ISBN 978-1-57473-474-4 hardback

A copyright notice for each paper is located at the bottom of the first page of the paper.
Reprints for course packs can be authorized by Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

Ordering information

Orders for the printed edition are handled by Cascadilla Press.
To place an order, go to www.lingref.com or contact:

Cascadilla Press, P.O. Box 440355, Somerville, MA 02144, USA
phone: 1-617-776-2370, fax: 1-617-776-2271, sales@cascadilla.com

Web access and citation information

This entire proceedings can also be viewed on the web at www.lingref.com. Each paper has a unique document # which can be added to citations to facilitate access. The document # should not replace the full citation.

This paper can be cited as:

Ishizuka, Tomoko. 2019. What Does a Verb-Sensitive Approach to Japanese Ditransitive Constructions Tell Us?
In *Proceedings of the 36th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, ed. Richard Stockwell et al., 198-208.
Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project. www.lingref.com, document #3463.