The Semantic Bases of Japanese and Korean Ditransitives

Beth Levin
Stanford University

DATIVE VERBS: The subset of ditransitive verbs that take agent, recipient (possessional goal), and theme arguments, such as *give*, *send*, and *throw*; contrast the other major subset, verbs of putting.

• RH&L (2008) argue that any account of the argument realization of English dative verbs must be "verb sensitive": a satisfactory analysis requires recognizing semantic distinctions among the verbs.

• In English, the challenge is that dative verbs show two argument realization options—a DATIVE ALTERNATION—one with recipient–theme order and the other with theme–recipient order.

(1)   a.   Terry gave Sam an apple. (double object construction; recipient–theme order)

        b.   Terry gave an apple to Sam. (*to* construction; theme–recipient order)

• Concomitantly, RH&L reassess the English facts used to support a competing "uniform multiple meaning" approach, which takes all dative verbs to have two distinct meanings, each giving rise to its own argument realization, and show they are better understood from a verb sensitive perspective.

• **Goals of the talk:** Argue for a meaning sensitive approach to Japanese and Korean dative verbs, which express their non-agent arguments using dative and accusative case, with either order of these arguments usually possible.

(2)   Japanese:

        a.   DAT-ACC: John-wa   Mary-ni   hon-o   atae-ta.
                            John-TOP   Mary-DAT   book-ACC   give-PST
                            'John gave a book to Mary.'

        b.   ACC-DAT: John-wa   hon-o   Mary-ni   atae-ta.
                            John-TOP   book-ACC   Mary-DAT   give-PST
                            'John gave a book to Mary.'

(3)   Korean:

        a.   DAT-ACC: Mina-nun/-ka   Swuni-eykey   sopho-lul   cwu-ess-ta.
                            Mina-TOP/-NOM   Swuni-DAT   package-ACC   give-PST-DCL
                            'Mina gave a package to Swuni.'

        b.   ACC-DAT: Mina-nun/-ka   sopho-lul   Swuni-eykey   cwu-ess-ta.
                            Mina-TOP/-NOM   package-ACC   Swuni-DAT   give-PST-DCL
                            'Mina gave a package to Swuni.'

NOTE: In cited data glosses and transliterations have sometimes been modified for consistency; Japanese *–ni* and Korean *–ey* and *–eykey* are glossed 'DATive', as is usual in the literature on ditransitives, though they are locative markers as well.

The ACC-ACC order found with a handful of Korean verbs (cf. Kittilä 2006) is largely ignored.

(4)   Korean ACC-ACC: Mina-nun/-ka   Swuni-lul   sopho-lul   cwu-ess-ta.
                        Mina-TOP/-NOM   Swuni-ACC   package-ACC   give-PST-DCL
                        'Mina gave a package to Swuni.'

(NOTE: Verbs of putting will largely be excluded from consideration, even though in Japanese and Korean they may show the same argument realization as other ditransitives and have often been lumped with them in previous discussions (but see Kishimoto 2001:37, n. 1).)

• Given that DAT-ACC and ACC-DAT orders instantiate recipient-theme and theme-recipient orders, respectively, some have suggested that they can be understood as analogous to the English dative alternation (rather than, say, as scrambling; see Hoji 1985, Takano 1998, Yatsushiro 2003).

• Despite this, I will argue that the Japanese and Korean data should not be analyzed in terms of the uniform multiple meaning approach, even though researchers have borrowed from English the argumentation and evidence used to support this approach, adjusting as necessary.

1   Starting point: The argument realization problem posed by dative verbs

REPRESENTATIONS RELEVANT TO AN ACCOUNT OF DATIVE VERBS:

• a verb's root—its core lexicalized meaning (e.g., Grimshaw 2005, Pesetsky 1995, RH&L 1998):

(5) $hand_V$: 'use the hand for transfer'

• the event types—and semantic roles—that this meaning can be associated with,
      giving rise to a "full" verb meaning:

(6)   a.   CAUSED POSSESSION: 'x act cause **y** to have z' → **y** is a RECIPIENT
               e.g., 'x act with the hand cause **y** to have z'
        b.   CAUSED MOTION: 'x act cause z to be at **y**' → **y** is a SPATIAL GOAL
               e.g., 'x act with the hand cause z to be at **y**'

• the morphosyntactic frames—or syntactic configurations—that realize these event types:

(7)   a.   Double object construction: NP V NP NP (e.g., *Smith handed Jones the medal*)
        b.   *to* construction: NP V NP *to* NP (e.g., *Smith handed the medal to Jones*)

THE TWO PARTS OF THE ARGUMENT REALIZATION PROBLEM WITH DATIVE VERBS:
— associations of verbs and event types: (core) verb (meaning) ⇒ event type
— associations of event types and morphosyntactic frames: event type ⇒ morphosyntactic frame

2   The verb sensitive approach to English (RH&L 2008; also Jackendoff 1990:197f)

• VERB ⇒ EVENT TYPE IN ENGLISH:
— *give*-type verbs: caused possession event type **only**.
— *send*-type verbs: caused motion **and** (for some argument choices) caused possession.

• EVENT TYPE ⇒ MORPHOSYNTACTIC FRAME IN ENGLISH:

— CAUSED POSSESSION: double object construction **and** *to* construction;
    recipient realized as first object or object of *to*.

— CAUSED MOTION: *to* construction **only**.
    spatial goal realized as object of *to*.

2.1 The lexicalized meanings of dative verbs

(8)   a.   *give*-type verbs: *assign, give, lend, loan, offer, promise, rent, sell, . . .*

      b.   *send*-type verbs: *forward, hand, mail, send, ship, . . .*; includes *throw*-type verbs:
              fling, flip, kick, lob, slap, shoot, throw, toss, . . .

       (Will largely ignore verbs involving communication of a message/transfer of information.)

• CORE DATIVE VERBS or, henceforth, *give*-TYPE VERBS:
    lexicalize causing a change of possession, i.e. lexically select a **recipient**: e.g., (6a).

Their meanings could be schematized as in (9), assuming a primitive HAVE, inherently signifying possession, whether stative (e.g., English *have, own*) or not (e.g., English *give, sell*); the verb's root has the ontological type 'poss-type' and elaborates on the form of possession specific to that verb.

(9)   [[x ACT] CAUSE [BECOME [y HAVE$_{<POSS-TYPE>}$ z]]]

— *Give:* This verb's root does not contribute anything beyond what is already encoded in the caused possession event type in (9) (Goldberg 1995, 2006).

— OTHER VERBS OF GIVING: Their roots refine on the nature of the caused possession:
    e.g., *rent* and *lend* specify that the possession is temporary in some sense.
    e.g., *promise*, a verb of future having, contributes a modal operator (Koenig & Davis 2001:85).

• NONCORE DATIVE VERBS or, henceforth, *send*-TYPE VERBS:
    do not lexicalize caused possession; many are said to lexically select a **spatial goal**, e.g., (6b).

— (core) *send*-TYPE VERBS: They inherently describe causing a theme to move to a spatial goal.

(10)   [[x ACT$_{<SEND>}$] CAUSE [y GO [PATH z]]]

— *throw*-TYPE VERBS: They basically describe two-participant events in which one entity instantaneously imparts a force on a second entity, the force recipient. They differ in the manner in which the force is imparted or in the instrument used to impart the force.

(11)   [x ACT$_{<THROW>}$]

NOTE: As *send*- and *throw*-type verbs largely pattern together, they are taken to represent one type.

2.2   Dative verb $\Rightarrow$ event type in English (and beyond)

• *give*-type roots are inherently associated with the caused possession event type;
they are not associated with the caused motion event type, contra other accounts.

• *send*-type roots are inherently associated with the caused motion event type, as in (10).

• *throw*-type roots are associatable with the caused motion event type because events of imparting a force may cause the force recipient to move along a path to a goal.

(12)   [[x ACT$_{<THROW>}$] CAUSE [y GO [PATH z]]]

• The roots of *send-* and *throw*-type verbs may also be associated with the caused possession event type in English (Jackendoff 1990, RH&L 2008) and beyond (Croft et al. 2001, Levin 2008) as they describe activities that provide the means to effect caused possession.

(13)   [[x ACT$_{<SEND/THROW>}$] CAUSE [y HAVE z]]

2.3   Event type $\Rightarrow$ morphosyntactic frame in English

• Caused motion event type $\Rightarrow$ *to* construction **only**; that is, spatial goals are marked by *to*.

• Caused possession event type $\Rightarrow$ double object construction **or** *to* construction;
    that is, recipients meet the semantic characterizations for two syntactic realizations:

— FIRST OF TWO OBJECTS: It is dedicated to the expression of a "projected possessor"
    (Goldsmith 1980:429; also Goldberg 1995, Green 1974, Oehrle 1976, Pinker 1989).

— OBJECT OF *to*: It indicates various argument types, broadly falling under semantic categories covered by dative and allative cases of other languages: spatial goals, recipients, and some arguments with less clear characterizations (e.g., *yield/submit/surrender/subject to*). Available to recipients as they qualify as a kind of goal by the Localist Hypothesis (Gruber 1965, Jackendoff 1983).

2.4   Noteworthy properties of the verb sensitive approach to English dative verbs

• The association of verbs with event types is not uniform across all verbs.
• The pairing of event types with morphosyntactic frames is not one-to-one.

Contrasts in both respects with the alternative **uniform multiple meaning approach**
(e.g., Beck & Johnson 2004, Harley 2003, Krifka 1999, 2004, Oehrle 1976, Pinker 1989):

• VERB $\Rightarrow$ EVENT TYPE IN ENGLISH:
— all dative verbs: caused motion **and** caused possession event types;
    thus, all dative verbs can take spatial goals and recipients.

• EVENT TYPE $\Rightarrow$ MORPHOSYNTACTIC FRAME IN ENGLISH:
— CAUSED POSSESSION: double object construction **only**.
— CAUSED MOTION: *to* construction **only**.

3 Verb Sensitivity: From English to Japanese and Korean

STARTING POINT: Languages should show same association of semantic verb types and event types.

PREDICTION: The distinct association of *give-* and *send*-type verbs with event types posited for English should extend to other languages.

THE ASSOCIATION OF DATIVE VERBS WITH EVENT TYPES:
— *give*-type verbs: caused possession **only**.
— *send*-type verbs: caused motion **and** caused possession.

This prediction gains support from studies of Hebrew and Russian, which reveal that these languages parallel English in 'verb type ⇒ event type' (Francez 2006, Levin 2008).

Goal of the remainder of the talk: Show this is also so in Japanese and Korean.

NOTE: The association between an event type and morphosyntactic frames is a possible locus of crosslinguistic variation as the available frames depend on the resources of particular languages but this will only be discussed as it impinges on verb sensitivity.

4 Key evidence for the verb sensitive approach

A CENTRAL ASSUMPTION OF THE VERB SENSITIVE APPROACH:
send- but not *give*-type verbs are associated with the caused motion event type;
    concomitantly, *send-* but not *give*-type verbs may take spatial goals.

Evidence that this is so is key to supporting the verb sensitive approach.

4.1 English evidence

send-type verbs in the *to* construction show certain properties that *give*-type verbs lack; these follow if *send-* but not *give*-type verbs select a spatial goal (Jackendoff 1990, Levinson 2005, RH&L 2008).

(14)   (In)ability to question the *to*-phrase with *where* (Levinson 2005):

        a.   To whom/where did you throw/send the ball?

        b.   To whom/*where did you give the ball?

(15)   (In)ability to select spatial prepositions beside *to*:

        a.   Fred threw/kicked/sent the ball under the porch/behind the tree/over the fence.

        b.   ∗ Fred gave the ball at/behind/over Mary.

(16)   (In)ability to take a source phrase (even in conjunction with a *to* phrase):

        a.   Jill threw/kicked/sent the ball from home plate to third base.

        b.   ∗ Josie gave/offered the tickets from Marla to Bill.

Thus, the expression of the recipient in a *to* phrase is not on its own evidence that *give*-type verbs select a spatial goal, as posited by the uniform multiple meaning approach.

4.2 Japanese evidence

• THE QUESTION: Since like English *to*, Japanese *–ni* can mark a spatial goal or recipient (Sadakane & Koizumi 1995), do Japanese *give*-type verbs also select recipients only, and not spatial goals?

THE ANSWER: Recent work (e.g., Kishimoto 2001, Miyagawa & Tsujioka 2004) suggests this is so, but I will revisit this issue from a somewhat different perspective.

• *–ni* may be found with motion verbs, which may select for spatial goals, but never for recipients.

(17) Taro-wa   eki-ni   it-ta.
      Taro-TOP   station-DAT   go-PST
      'Taro went to the station.'

• Motion verbs can also be found with the goal postposition *–e* replacing *–ni*; this postposition "designates an 'intended destination'" (Kishimoto 2001:42); the event delimiting postposition *–made* 'up to/until' (Beavers 2008) may also convey a similar notion.

(18) Taro-wa   eki-e/-made   it-ta.
      Taro-TOP   station-ALL/-until   go-PST
      'Taro went to/up to the station.'

• Interestingly, *–e* may replace *–ni* with the verbs *okuru* 'send' and *yuusoo-suru* 'mail'; these verbs may also be found with a 'from-to' phrase, as well as a *–made* 'until' phrase; both properties are characteristic of verbs selecting spatial goals.

(19) a.   John-wa   Mary-ni   tegami-o   okut-ta/yuusoo-si-ta.
            John-TOP   Mary-DAT   letter-ACC   send-PST/mail-PST
            'John sent a letter to Mary.'

      b.   John-wa   Mary-e   tegami-o   okut-ta/yuusoo-si-ta.
            John-TOP   Mary-ALL   letter-ACC   send-PST/mail-PST
            'John sent a letter to Mary.' (Kishimoto 2001:42, (9))

(20) John-wa   Mary-no   uti-made   nimotu-o   okut-ta.
      John-TOP   Mary-GEN   home-until   luggage-ACC   send-PST
      'John sent luggage to Mary's home.' (Kishimoto 2001:43, (11))

(21) John-wa   zitaku-kara   Mary-ni   tegami-o   okut-ta.
      John-TOP   home-from   Mary-DAT   letter-ACC   send-PST
      'John sent a letter to Mary from his home.' (Kishimoto 2001:44, (14))

• With *ataeru* 'give', *–e* cannot replace *–ni*, nor is *–made* or a 'from-to' combination possible.

(22) ?? John-wa   Mary-e   zyoohoo-o   atae-ta/teikyoo-si-ta.
         John-TOP   Mary-ALL   information-ACC   give-PST/offer-do-PST
         'John gave/offered information to Mary.' (Kishimoto 2001:42, (10))

(23) ∗ John-wa   Mary-no   uti-made   nimotu-o   teikyoo-si-ta/wariate-ta.
        John-TOP   Mary-GEN   home-until   luggage-ACC   offer-PST/assign-PST
        'John offered/assigned luggage to Mary's home.' (Kishimoto 2001:43, (12))

6

(24) ∗John-wa   zitaku-kara   Mary-ni   hon-o   age-ta.
      John-TOP   home-from   Mary-DAT   book-ACC   give-PST
      'John gave a book from his home to Mary.' (Kishimoto 2001:44, (13))

• *okuru* 'send' can take a 'place' argument, *ataeru* 'give' cannot, as expected if *give*-type verbs only take recipients (Kishimoto 2001:48, Miyagawa & Tsujioka 2004:9).

(25) Taroo-ga   Tokyo-ni   nimotu-o   okut-ta.
      Taroo-NOM   Tokyo-DAT   package-ACC send-PST
      'Taro sent a package to Tokyo.' (Miyagawa & Tsujioka 2004:9, (20b))

(26) ∗Taroo-ga   Tokyo-ni   nimotu-o   atae-ta.
      Taroo-NOM   Tokyo-DAT   package-ACC give-PST
      'Taro gave a package to Tokyo.' (intended)

• These observations suggest that Japanese distinguishes *give*-type verbs from *send*-type verbs, as proposed by Ito (2007), Kishimoto (2001), and Matsuoka (2003).

(27) *give*-type verbs: *ataeru* 'give', *azukeru* 'entrust/deposit', *kasu* 'rent/lend', *uru* 'sell', *harau* 'pay', …; include verbs of future having: *yakusoku-suru* 'promise', *wariateru* 'assign', *tamawu* 'grant', *teikyoo-suru* 'offer', …

(28) *send*-type verbs: *dasu* 'let out/send (letter)', *kaesu* 'return', *nageru* 'throw', *okuru* 'send', *todokeru* 'deliver', *watasu* 'hand/pass', *yusoo-suru* 'transport', *yuusoo-suru* 'mail', …

• These observations also support the more general proposal that *give*-type verbs take recipients, but not spatial goals, and, thus, are only associated with the caused possession event type.

Summary: The verb sensitive approach to Japanese

• VERB ⇒ EVENT TYPE IN JAPANESE:
— *give*-type verbs: caused possession event type **only**.
— *send*-type verbs: caused motion **and** caused possession.

• EVENT TYPE ⇒ MORPHOSYNTACTIC FRAME IN JAPANESE:
— CAUSED POSSESSION: recipient expressed with *–ni* **only**.
— CAUSED MOTION: spatial goal expressed with *–ni* **or** *–e*.

4.3 Korean evidence

THE QUESTION: Are Korean *give*-type verbs associated with the caused motion event type? NO.

• *–eykey* is the form of the dative marker found with animates, contrasting with *–ey*, which is found with non-animates (e.g., Maling 2002). (See Park & Whitman 2003 and Urushibara 1991 for arguments that *–eykey* is more correctly a postposition.)

• *–eykey*, like *–ey*, is also found with verbs that clearly only take spatial goals, i.e. verbs of motion; thus, it may introduce spatial goals, as well as recipients.

(29) na-nun   Swuni-eykey   ka-ss-ta.
      I-TOP   Swuni-DAT   go-PST-DCL
      "I went to Swuni.'

(30) na-nun   kakey-ey   ka-ss-ta.
      I-TOP   store-to   go-PST-DCL
      'I went to the store.'

● In clear spatial uses, *–eykey* may be suffixed by *–lo* (simply glossed 'LO'), which "denotes the direction 'to, toward, (heading) for'" (Sohn 1994:257; see also Son 2006:195, n. 21), while *–ey*, the dative found with inanimates, alternates with *–lo* (there is no form *–ey-lo*).

(31) na-nun   Swuni-eykey-(lo)   ka-ss-ta.
      I-TOP   Swuni-DAT-(LO)   go-PST-DCL
      'I went to Swuni.'

(32) na-nun   kakey-ey/-lo   ka-ss-ta.
      I-TOP   store-DAT/-LO   go-PST-DCL
      'I went to the store.'

● Interestingly, *–eykey* can be suffixed with *–lo* with *ponay* 'send', but not *cwu* 'give'.

(33) na-nun   Swuni-eykey-lo   sopho-lul   ponay-ss-ta.
      I-TOP   Swuni-DAT-LO   package-ACC   send-PST-DCL
      'I sent the package to Swuni.'

(34) *na-nun   Swuni-eykey-lo   sopho-lul   cwu-ess-ta.
      I-TOP   Swuni-DAT-LO   package-ACC   give-PST-DCL
      'I gave a package to Swuni.'

● This distributional property supports extending to Korean the proposal that only *send-* and not *give*-type verbs are associated with the caused motion event type: only they then select for spatial goals, as well as recipients, and, thus, only they allow the addition of *–lo*.

● Just as the *–ni/–e* alternation supports making a distinction between spatial goals and recipients in Japanese, so too does the distribution of *–lo* support a comparable distinction in Korean.

● Thus, Korean distinguishes *give*-type verbs from *send*-type verbs, with only the latter being associated with the caused motion event type.

(35) *give*-type verbs: *cwu* 'give', *kennay* 'hand', *kicungha* 'donate', *mathki* 'entrust', *phal* 'sell', *pillye cwu* 'lend', *senmwulha* 'present (gift)', *sensaha* 'present (gift)', *sey noh/cwu* 'rent (apartment)', *taychwulha* 'lend (bank context)', *tayyeha* 'rent (video/car)', ...; include verbs of future having: *ceykongha* 'offer', *kwenha* 'offer', *namki* 'bequeath', *pwuyeha* 'grant', *sunginha* 'grant (right)', *swuyeha* 'award' *yaksokha*, 'promise', ...

(36) *send*-type verbs: *centalha* 'forward (e-mail)', *pannapha* 'return (books)', *panpwumha* 'return (merchandise)', *pansongha* 'return (package)', *paysongha* 'ship', *paytalha* 'deliver', *ponay* 'send', *pwuchi* 'mail', *cha* 'kick', *chi* 'hit', *phaysuha* 'pass', *tenci* 'throw', *thosuha* 'toss', ...

NOTE: Jung & Miyagawa (2004) make a somewhat overlapping cut by differentiating the verbs allowing ACC-ACC, which are a subset of the *give*-type verbs, from other dative verbs.

• Further evidence that Korean *send*-type verbs are associated with the caused motion event type, but *give*-type verbs are not:

— *send*-type verbs can take a 'place' argument, *give*-type verbs cannot.

(37) a. na-nun   Tokyo-ey/-lo   sopho-lul   ponay-ss-ta.
          I-TOP   Tokyo-DAT/-LO   package-ACC   send-PST-DCL
          'I sent the package to Tokyo.'

      b. ∗ na-nun   Tokyo-ey   sopho-lul   cwu-ess-ta.
          I-TOP   Tokyo-DAT   package-ACC   give-PST-DCL
          'I gave the package to Tokyo.' (intended)

— *send*-type verbs can take a 'from-to' combination, but *give*-type verbs cannot.

(38) a. na-nun   Tokyo-eyse/-lopwuthe   Seoul-lo   sopho-lul   ponay-ss-ta.
          I-TOP   Tokyo-ABL/-ABL   Seoul-LO   package-ACC   send-PST-DCL
          'I sent the package from Tokyo to Seoul.'

      b. ∗ na-nun   Tokyo-eyse/-lopwuthe   Seoul-lo   sopho-lul   cwu-ess-ta.
          I-TOP   Tokyo-ABL/-ABL   Seoul-LO   package-ACC   give-PST-DCL
          'I gave the package from Tokyo to Seoul.' (intended)

Summary: The verb sensitive approach to Korean

• VERB ⇒ EVENT TYPE IN KOREAN:
— *give*-type verbs: caused possession event type **only**.
— *send*-type verbs: caused motion **and** caused possession.

• EVENT TYPE ⇒ MORPHOSYNTACTIC FRAME IN KOREAN:
— CAUSED POSSESSION: recipient expressed with –*eykey* **only**.
— CAUSED MOTION: spatial goal with –*ey* **or** –*lo*, if inanimate, and –*eykey* **or** *eykey-lo*, if animate.

5   Evidence from verb–abstract theme combinations

The caused possession event type is amenable to abstract as well as concrete entities as themes.

PREDICTION OF THE VERB SENSITIVE APPROACH: Instances of caused possession should show the same argument realization options independent of the type of theme.

5.1   Evidence from English (RH&L 2008)

THE PREDICTION FOR ENGLISH: The recipient should still show two argument realization options even with abstract themes.

• EVIDENCE: *give*-type verbs are only associated with the caused possession event type, and when they take abstract themes, they can be found in both the double object and *to* construction.

(39)   a.   We gave a fresh coat of paint to the house.
                  We gave the house a fresh coat of paint.

         b.   The music lent a festive air to the party.
                  The music lent the party a festive air.

         c.   The judge gave/awarded custody to the child's uncle.
                  The judge gave/awarded the child's uncle custody.

         d.   The new spray cleaner gave a streaked appearance to the mirror in the bedroom.
                  The new spray cleaner gave the mirror in the bedroom a streaked appearance.

● Unlike examples with concrete themes, these have a 'cause to come into existence' reading and, concomitantly, lack a source of transfer.

● In contrast, proponents of the uniform multiple meaning approach assume that the *to* construction always encodes caused motion and, thus, must involve a path of motion.

— Thus, they take uses of *give*-type verbs with abstract themes not to be open to a caused motion interpretation: without a source of transfer, there can be no path constituent.

— Such uses, then, should be incompatible with the *to* construction.

— Indeed, proponents of this approach (Goldberg 1992, Harley 2003, Krifka 2004) claim that the *to* construction is unavailable with abstract themes.

(40)   a.   The kids gave me a headache.

         b.   ?? The kids gave a headache to me.

(41)   a.   Interviewing Richard Nixon gave Norman Mailer a book. (Oehrle 1976:44)

         b.   ∗ Interviewing Nixon gave a book to Norman Mailer.

— However, the reduced acceptability of (40b) and (41b) most likely is attributable to givenness and heaviness considerations (Bresnan et al. 2007, RH&L 2008, Snyder2003); these are known to sometimes preclude one of the two realizations of the caused possession event type.

— Once these are controlled for, the verb–argument combinations in (40b) and (41b) improve.

(42)   a.   This can give a headache even to a Tylenol. (http://www.dilbert.com/)

         b.   Nixon's behavior gave an idea for a book to every journalist living in New York City in the 1970s. (Snyder 2003: 35, (48))

● Why is it appealing to associate *give*-type verbs with the caused motion event type?

Most likely, the appeal stems from taking the real world context of the prototypical caused possession event to be part of the meaning of the verb (root) and/or construction (event type).

In the real world, when one person causes another to have possession of a physical object,
     the first person usually physically transfers it to the second person.
Such a transfer, however, cannot be effected unless the first person has physical control over the
     object and, thus, is perceived as the source of a path from the giver to the recipient.

In contrast, abstract entities such as custody, ideas, or headaches need not be possessed by the giver or even exist prior to the event.

10

• Thus, caused possession may be effected even in the absence of a source of transfer; events of caused possession should be separated from their possible instantiation via physical transfer.

5.2 Evidence from Japanese and Korean

Although instances of caused possession with abstract themes are less prevalent in Japanese and Korean than in English, their existence nonetheless further supports the claim that *give*-type verbs are not associated with the caused motion event type in these languages, despite claims to the contrary.

• SUPPORT FROM JAPANESE: Although they are proponents of the uniform multiple meaning approach, Miyagawa & Tsujioka note that grammaticality contrasts attributed to caused possession with abstract themes such as English (40) are not found in Japanese (2004:33, n. 15).

— Miyagawa & Tsujioka's own examples are not cited here, as those I consulted find them slightly unnatural, but other examples are possible.

(43) Saibanchoo-ga Mary-ni kodomo-no yooikuken-o atae-ta.
      judge-NOM Mary-DAT child-GEN custody-ACC give-PST
      'The judge gave Mary custody of the child.'

(44) John-wa Mary-ni yoi inshoo-o atae-ta.
      John-TOP Mary-DAT good impression-ACC give-PST
      'John made a good impression on Mary.' [lit. John gave Mary a good impression]

(45) John-no kotoba-ga/ Sono shiken-no kekka-ga Mary-ni kiboo-o atae-ta.
      John-GEN word-NOM/ that exam-GEN result-NOM Mary-DAT hope-ACC give-PST
      'John's words/That exam's results gave Mary hope.'

— Although (43)-(45) have DAT-ACC order, ACC-DAT counterparts are possible; however, slight modifications may be necessary: e.g., a slightly simplified form of (43) is fine with either order.

(46) a. DAT-ACC: Saibanchoo-ga Mary-ni yooikuken-o atae-ta.
                    judge-NOM Mary-DAT custody-ACC give-PST
                    'The judge gave Mary custody.'
      b. ACC-DAT: Saibanchoo-ga yooikuken-o Mary-ni atae-ta.
                    judge-NOM custody-ACC Mary-DAT give-PST
                    'The judge gave Mary custody.'

• SUPPORT FROM KOREAN: Instances of caused possession with abstract themes are attested; they are illustrated with DAT-ACC order, but ACC-DAT order is possible, but not given here.

(47) phansa-ka Mary-eykey ku ai-uy yangyukkwen-ul cwu-ess-ta.
      judge-NOM Mary-DAT that child-GEN custody-ACC give-PST-DCL
      'The judge gave Mary custody of the child.'

(48) John-i Mary-eykey cohun insang-ul cwu-ess-ta.
      John-NOM Mary-DAT good impression-ACC give-PST-DCL
      'John made a good impression on Mary.' [lit. John gave Mary a good impression]

(49) John-i Mary-eykey huymang/casinkam-ul cwu-ess-ta.
      John-NOM Mary-DAT hope/self.confidence-ACC give-PST-DCL
      'John gave Mary hope/self-confidence.'

11

6 Evidence from idioms (and conventional collocations)

• RH&L (2008) show that distributional facts concerning the realization of the "fixed" arguments of English idioms conform to the verb sensitive approach and, thus, support it; they also show that the facts are not as assumed by proponents of the uniform multiple meaning approach.

• Comparable data cited in the Japanese/Korean literature will be revisited.

• The verb sensitive approach predicts a previously unobserved asymmetry in dative verb distribution in idioms; RH&L show it holds in English, and it turns out to hold in Japanese and Korean.

6.1 Evidence from English (RH&L 2008)

• Dative verb idioms are classified according to whether the theme or the goal is fixed, where the term 'goal' is used to refer to the non-agent, non-theme argument.

(50)   a.   FIXED GOAL IDIOMS: send x to the showers, send x to the devil, take x to the cleaners, push x to the edge, carry x to extremes, throw x to the wolves, . . .

          b.   FIXED THEME IDIOMS: read x the riot act, lend x an ear, show x the ropes, promise x the moon, give x the cold shoulder, give x the creeps, give x the boot, . . .

• The verb sensitive approach requires determining whether 'goal' means 'spatial goal' or 'recipient'; this will be clarified.

• The English idiom facts are as expected on the verb sensitive analysis

— FIXED GOAL IDIOMS as in (50a) involve caused motion and, hence, a spatial goal, rather than a recipient; as expected, they are found only in the *to* construction, though their verbs can alternate.

(51)   a.   The employee sent his boss to the devil.

          b.   ∗ The employee sent the devil his boss.

— FIXED THEME IDIOMS as in (50b) involve a caused possession meaning and, hence, a recipient, rather than a purely spatial goal; as expected, they are found in both constructions.

(52)   a.   Oscar will give that employee the boot.

          b.   Oscar will give the boot **to** any employee that shows up late.
(Harley 2003:43, (19c); based on Larson 1988:341, (11))

(53)   a.   The president gave the senator the cold shoulder.

          b.   Even the Argentine president, known for his weakness for women, was giving the cold shoulder **to** the flamboyant American singer . . . (COBUILD)

(54)   a.   The candidate gave his opponent a wide berth.

          b.   ". . . You want to give a wide berth **to** political discussion." (*The Columbus Dispatch*, October 23, 2001, p. 02B; Nexis)

• A NOTE ON DISTRIBUTION: Previous work (e.g., Harley 2003) takes fixed theme idioms to be restricted to the double object construction, contrary to fact.

This apparent asymmetry, like the verb–abstract theme asymmetry, is attributable to factors such as givenness and heaviness.

However, it seems to support the uniform multiple meaning approach because on the surface it appears as if each idiom type is associated with a distinct construction:

(55) a.   Fixed theme idioms with the double object construction.

  b.   Fixed goal idioms with the *to* construction.

• A NEW OBSERVATION: There are apparently no fixed recipient idioms.

A REASON: Recipients by their very nature are animate NPs, but there is a constraint against fixed animate NPs in idioms, as they are not good inputs to metaphors (Nunberg et al. 1994).
INDEPENDENT EVIDENCE: The rarity of agents as fixed parts of idioms (Marantz 1997).

6.2 Evidence from Japanese and Korean

Idioms involving dative verbs have been used to reach varied conclusions about Japanese and Korean dative verbs, all within the confines of the uniform multiple meaning approach (Kim 2008, Miyagawa & Tsujioka 2004, Oh & Zubizarreta (2009).

THE REPORTED OBSERVATION: In Japanese and Korean idioms headed by dative verbs (cf. (55)):
  — Fixed theme idioms: theme immediately to the left of the verb; i.e. have ACC-V order.
  — Fixed goal idioms: goal immediately to the left of the verb; i.e. have DAT-V order.

(56) a.   Taroo-wa   sainoo-o   *hana-ni*   kaketeiru.
      Taro-TOP   talent-ACC   nose-DAT   hanging
      'Taro always boasts of his talent.'
      *… *hana-ni* sainoo-o kaketeiru

  b.   Taroo-wa   sono   giron-ni   *hakusya-o*   kaketa.
      Taro-TOP   that   controversy-DAT   spur-ACC   hang
      'Taro added fresh fuel to the controversy.'
      *… *hakusya-o* sono giron-ni kaketa

  (Miyagawa & Tsujioka 2004:21, (53))

6.2.1 Fixed goal idioms

• On the verb sensitive approach, English fixed goal idioms necessarily involve a spatial goal and, thus, the caused motion event type; hence, they are only found in the *to* construction.

• Japanese and Korean fixed goal idioms too should only instantiate the caused motion event type and involve a spatial goal and not a recipient.

• SUPPORT FROM JAPANESE: In many idioms, the fixed NP, which is marked with *–ni*, may also be marked with *–e*, like other spatial goals (Tsujioka 2009:10-11; contra Kishimoto 2008).

(57) a.   sono   jijitu-o   mune-ni/-e   simau
          that   fact-ACC   chest-DAT/-ALL   put away
          'keep the fact as a secret' (Tsujioka 2009:10, (20b))

     b.   uwasa-o   mimi-ni/-e   ireru
          rumor-ACC   ear-DAT/-ALL   put in
          'hear the rumor' (Tsujioka 2009:10, (20c))

NOTE: According to Tsujioka, only some fixed –*ni* phrase idioms allow such an alternation, though which varies across speakers as well as over time (2009:11, 36, n. 5). She proposes that the idioms that resist the alternation are more "frozen" (18-20); if so, lack of alternation is not in itself a reason to take these idioms to involve recipients.

• SUPPORT FROM KOREAN: Few true fixed goal idioms are cited, but one such idiom allows its fixed NP, which is marked with –*ey*, also to be marked with –*lo*, as expected of a spatial goal.

(58)   In the context: Bring me $10,000 by tomorrow . . .

        an kulemyen   (nay-ka)   (ne-lul)   cesung-ey/-ulo   ponay-keyss-ta.
        if not do   (I-NOM)   (you-ACC)   other.world-DAT/-LO   send-FUT-DCL
        'if not, I'll send you to the other world (i.e. kill you).'

6.2.2   Fixed theme idioms

• As fixed theme idioms in English are found in both dative alternation constructions, comparable Japanese and Korean idioms might not be expected to show rigid ACC-V order.

• In fact, the Korean idiom *olipal-ul naymil* [=duck.foot-ACC thrust.out] 'feign innocence', cited by Kim (2008) as showing rigid ACC-V order, is attested in an ACC-DAT-V structure.

(59)   DAT-ACC: Sue-nun   emma-**eykey**   *olipal*-**ul**   naymil-ess-ta.
                 Sue-TOP   mother-**DAT**   *duck.foot*-**ACC**   thrust.out-PST-DCL
                 'Sue feigned innocence to her mother.' (Kim 2008:123, (30a))

(60)   ACC-DAT?? Sue-nun   *olipal*-**ul**   emma-**eykey**   naymil-ess-ta.
                 Sue-TOP   *duck.foot*-**ACC**   mother-**DAT**   thrust.out-PST-DCL
                 'Sue feigned innocence to her mother.' (Kim 2008:123, (30b))

(61)   kutul-un   mwuchaykim-uy   ip-ul   olaycen-ey   ssis-ko,
        they-TOP   irresponsibility-GEN   mouth-ACC   long.ago-LOC   wipe-and

        olipal-**ul**   swuncinhan   kwukmintul-**eykey**   naymil-myense,
        duck.foot-**ACC**   naive   people-**DAT**   thrust.out-while

        cangoythwucayng-uy   kkwulmas-ey   cec-ko mal-ass-ta.
        off.stage.fight-GEN   honey.taste-LOC   soak-end.up-PST-DCL

        'They [the opposition party] ignored their responsibility a long time ago, feigned innocence to naive citizens, and ended up indulging themselves in the sweet taste of the off-stage fight (i.e. outside the Assembly).'
        (*Dailian News*, 6/10/2008; http://buk.dailian.co.kr/news/articleView.html?idxno=13473)

• Nevertheless, there is a very strong preference for a fixed theme to be verb-adjacent in Japanese and Korean idioms, so word order in idioms is less flexible than in English.

• This difference in idiom rigidity might be attributed to independent factors that affect word order, interacting with the lack of determiners in Japanese and Korean.

Factors determining word order in Korean ditransitives (Choi 2007, 2008):
— A given-before-new preference
— A long-before-short preference (also in Japanese; Yamashita & Chang 2001, Yamashita 2002);
     this preference holds particularly strongly in ACC-DAT-V order (Choi 2008);
     contrast with the reverse short-before-long preference in English!

A POTENTIAL EXPLANATION OF WORD ORDER RIGIDITY:
Due to the given-before-new preference, earlier material is typically taken to be referential
     despite the lack of a determiner and, hence, given.
Thus, in ACC-DAT-V order the theme of a fixed theme idiom would be typically understood as
     referential, making the idiomatic interpretation impossible.
In fact, the theme of a fixed theme idiom in ACC-DAT-V order is usually understood literally (Kim
     2008 for Korean; Kishimoto 2008 for Japanese), though there are rare exceptions, as in (61).

6.3 A newly attested idiom asymmetry predicted by the verb sensitive approach

• PREDICTION: Due to the lack of recipient idioms, fixed goal idioms must involve *send*-type verbs or verbs of putting, which like them take spatial goals, but not *give*-type verbs, which do not.

• SUPPORT FROM ENGLISH: No verb in (50a) is a *give*-type verb (RH&L 2008).

• SUPPORT FROM JAPANESE: No clear *give*-type verbs figure in the many idioms with fixed –*ni* phrases cited in Miyagawa & Tsujioka (2004:20-22), Kishimoto (2008:145, 148), Tsujioka (2009:11, (21)), and especially Endo (2007:137-143).

(62)   *ageru* 'raise', *dasu* 'let out', *huru* 'swing', *ireru* 'put in/enter', *kakeru* 'hang', *mawasu* 'turn', *noseru* 'place', *oku* 'put', *tomeru* 'fix', *tukeru* 'attach', . . .

• SUPPORT FROM KOREAN: Less information is readily available. Although Kim (2008) cites a study of ditransitive verb idioms by Hong (1998), this study only gives aggregate figures, which suggests a paucity of fixed goal idioms. Furthermore, the examples cited suggest Hong's notion of idiom is overly broad, encompassing sayings and adages.

However, the Korean fixed goal idiom cited in (58) does satisfy the prediction regarding verb type:
     cesung-ey ponay '**send** to the other world' [i.e. kill]

7 Taking stock and looking forward

• The meaning of each dative verb contributes to the morphosyntactic realization of its arguments.

• The contribution is mediated by the distinct associations of semantic verb classes with event types.

• With the verb type–event type associations clarified, it should become easier to resolve the lack of consensus about how the morphosyntactic frames characteristic of Japanese and Korean dative verbs should be aligned with those of the English dative alternation.

References

Beck, S. and K. Johnson (2003) "Double Objects Again", *Linguistic Inquiry* 34, 97-123.

Bresnan, J., A. Cueni, T. Nikitina, and H. Baayen (2007) "Predicting the Dative Alternation", in G. Bouma, I. Krämer, and J. Zwarts, eds., *Cognitive Foundations of Interpretation*, Royal Netherlands Academy of Science, Amsterdam, 69-94.

Choi, H.-W. (2007) "Length and Order: A Corpus Study of Korean Dative-Accusative Construction", *Discourse and Cognition* 14, 207-227.

Choi, H.-W. (2008) "Beyond Grammatical Weight: A Corpus Study of Information Structure Effect On Dative-Accusative Order in Korean", *Discourse and Cognition* 15, 127-152.

Croft, W., J. Barddal, W. Hollmann, M. Nielsen, V. Sotirova, and C. Taoka (2001) "Discriminating Verb Meanings: The Case of Transfer Verbs", handout, LAGB Autumn Meeting, Reading.

Endo, Y. (2007) *Locality and Information Structure: A Cartographic Approach to Japanese*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam.

Francez, I. (2006) "Possessors, Goals, and the Classification of Ditransitive Predicates: Evidence from Hebrew", in O. Bonami and P. Cabredo Hofherr, eds., *Empirical Issues in Syntax and Semantics 6: Selected Papers from CSSP 2005*, 137-154. (http://www.cssp.cnrs.fr/eiss6/index_en.html)

Goldberg, A.E. (1992) "The Inherent Semantics of Argument Structure: The Case of the English Ditransitive Construction", *Cognitive Linguistics* 3, 37-74.

Goldberg, A.E. (1995) *Constructions*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL.

Goldberg, A.E. (2006) *Constructions at Work: The Nature of Generalization in Language*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK.

Goldsmith, J. (1980) "Meaning and Mechanism in Grammar", in S. Kuno, ed., *Harvard Studies in Syntax and Semantics*, 423-449.

Green, G. (1974) *Semantics and Syntactic Regularity*, Indiana University Press.

Grimshaw, J. (2005) *Words and Structure*, CSLI Publications, Stanford, CA.

Gruber, J.S. (1965) *Studies in Lexical Relations*, Doctoral dissertation, MIT.

Harley, H. (2003) "Possession and the Double Object Construction", in P. Pica and J. Rooryck, eds., *Linguistic Variation Yearbook 2*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam, 31-70.

Hoji, H. (1985) *Logical Form Constraints and Configurational Structures in Japanese*, Doctoral dissertation, University of Washington, Seattle, WA.

Hong, K.-S. (1998) "Idiomatic Expressions in Korean and Argument Structure", *Language Research* 34, 547-573.

Ito, A. (2007) "Argument Structure of Japanese Ditransitives", in K. Takita and C. Fuji, eds., *Nanzan Linguistics Special Issue 3: Papers from the Consortium Workshops on Linguistic Theory*, Graduate Program in Linguistic Science, Nanzan University, Nagoya, Japan, 127-150.

Jackendoff, R.S. (1983) *Semantics and Cognition*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

Jackendoff, R.S. (1990) *Semantic Structures*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

Jung, Y.-J. and S. Miyagawa (2004) "Decomposing Ditransitive Verbs", *Proceedings of SICGG*, 101-120.

Kim, L. (2008) "On the Ditransitive Construction in Korean", in S. Blaho, C. Constantinescu, and E. Schoorlemmer, eds., *Proceedings of ConSOLE* XV, 111-133.

Kishimoto, H. (2001) "The Role of Lexical Meanings in Argument Encoding: Double Object Verbs in Japanese", *Gengo Kenkyu* 120, 35-65.

Kishimoto, H. (2008) "Ditransitive Idioms and Argument Structure", *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 17, 141-179.

Kittilä, S. (2006) "The Anomaly of the Verb 'give' Explained by its High (Formal and Semantic) Transitivity", *Linguistics* 44, 569-612.

Koenig, J.-P. and A.R. Davis (2001) "Sublexical Modality and the Structure of Lexical Semantic Representations", *Linguistics and Philosophy* 24, 71-124.

Krifka, M. (1999) "Manner in Dative Alternation", *WCCFL* 18, 260-271.

Krifka, M. (2004) "Semantic and Pragmatic Conditions for the Dative Alternation", *Korean Journal of English Language and Linguistics* 4, 1-32.

Larson, R.K. (1988) "On the Double Object Construction", *Linguistic Inquiry* 19, 335-391.

Levin, B. (2008) "Dative Verbs: A Crosslinguistic Perspective", *LingvisticæInvestigationes* 31, 285-312.

Levinson, L. (2005) "'To' in Two Places in the Dative Alternation", *Proceedings of the 28th Annual Penn Linguistics Colloquium*, Penn Working Papers in Linguistics 11.1, 155-168.

Maling, J. (2002) "Whether to Agree or Not: The Syntax of Inalienable Possession", in A. Kamio, J. Whitman and K. Takami, eds., *Syntactic and Functional Explorations: A Festschrift for Susumu Kuno*, Kuroshio, Tokyo, 345-370.

Marantz, A. (1997) "No Escape from Syntax: Don't Try Morphological Analysis in the Privacy of Your Own Lexicon", *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics* 4(2), University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, 201-225.

Matsuoka, M. (2003) "Two Types of Ditransitive Constructions in Japanese", *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 12, 171-203.

Miyagawa, S. and T. Tsujioka (2004) "Argument Structure and Ditransitive Verbs in Japanese", *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 13, 1-38.

Nunberg, G., I.A. Sag and T. Wasow (1994) "Idioms", *Language* 70, 491-538.

Oehrle, R.T. (1976) *The Grammatical Status of the English Dative Alternation*, Doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, MA.

Oh, E. and M.L. Zubizarreta (2009) "A Comparison of the English and Korean Double Object", in L.H. Wee and L. Uyechi, ed., *Reality Exploration and Discovery: Pattern Interaction in Language and Life*, CSLI Publications, Stanford, CA, 185-199.

Park, S.D. and J. Whitman (2003) "Direct Movement Passives in Korean and Japanese ", *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 12, 307-321.

Pesetsky, D. (1995) *Zero Syntax*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

Pinker, S. (1989) *Learnability and Cognition*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

Rappaport Hovav, M. and B. Levin (1998) "Building Verb Meanings", in M. Butt and W. Geuder, eds., *The Projection of Arguments*, CSLI Publications, Stanford, CA, 97-134.

Rappaport Hovav, M. and B. Levin (2008) "The English Dative Alternation: The Case for Verb Sensitivity", *Journal of Linguistics* 44, 129-167.

Sadakane, K. and M. Koizumi (1995) "On the Nature of the 'Dative' Particle *ni* in Japanese", *Linguistics* 33, 5-33.

Snyder, K.M. (2003) *The Relationship between Form and Function in Ditransitive Constructions*, Doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA.

Sohn, H.-M. (1994) *Korean*, Routledge, London.

Son, M. (2006) "Directed Motion and Non-Predicative Path P in Korean", *Nordlyd: TromsøWorking Papers in Linguistics* 33:2, 176-199.

Takano, Y. (1998) "Object Shift and Scrambling", *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 16, 817-889.

Takano, Y. (2008) "Ditransitive Constructions", in S. Miyagawa and M. Saito, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of Japanese Linguistics*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK, 423-455.

Tsujioka, T. (2009) "Idioms and the Base-generation Hypothesis for Ditransitives in Japanese", unpublished ms., George Washington University, Washington, DC.

Urushibara, S. (1991) "*ey/eykey*: A Postposition or a Case Marker?", *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics* 4, 421-431.

Yamashita, H. (2002) "Scrambled Sentences in Japanese: Linguistic Properties and Motivations for Production", *Text* 22, 597-633.

Yamashita, H. and F. Chang (2001) "'Long before Short' Preference in the Production of a Head-Final Language", *Cognition* 81, B45-B55.

Yatsushiro, K. (2003) "VP Internal Scrambling", *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 12, 141-170.