

Conceptual Categories and Linguistic Categories VII: A Crosslinguistic Perspective on the Linguistic Encoding of Possession Events

1 Datives so far

- Possession is a grammatically relevant component of meaning.
- In English, the double object construction is a diagnostic for events of (caused) possession.
- Event descriptions using the double object construction typically have an entailment with *have/get*.

2 Lexicalized and derived possession

- Certain happenings in the world are construed as events of possession or caused possession—the topic of this lecture—although it is not obvious a priori which ones will be so construed.
- QUESTION: How to identify types of happenings construed as events of caused possession?

AN ANSWER: They are those happenings whose options for morphosyntactic expression parallel the argument realization options of verbs which lexicalize possession, such as *give*.

- HOWEVER, not all descriptions of caused possession events need involve a verb lexicalizing possession; instead, the understanding of possession may be contextually derived.

EXAMPLE: English dative verbs

— The verb *give* lexicalizes possession; no matter the choice of argument, the verb can appear in the double object construction.

— The verb *send* lexicalizes caused motion—causing a theme to move along a path to a spatial goal—and not caused possession, and, thus, lexically selects a spatial goal, as shown, for instance, by its ability to take a variety of path expressions.

The verb *send* may, nevertheless, be used in caused possession event descriptions when its spatial goal is animate due to the Animate Goal as Recipient Implicature. With an animate goal, then the verb can appear in the double object construction.

- (1) a. Pat sent some documents to Tracy.
b. Pat sent Tracy some documents.
- (2) Tracy got some documents.

Although the verb *send* does not lexically select a recipient, it does select a spatial goal, and all events of sending involve a goal, even if contextually understood.

— The verb *throw* differs from *send* in this respect: it lexicalizes two-participant events in which one entity instantaneously imparts a force on and launches a second entity.

Since a force is applied in a particular direction, throwing events often have an implied path, but such events, unlike sending events, do not have to have an intended goal.

- (3) a. I sent the letter. (a particular goal is contextually understood)
b. I threw the ball. (no goal needs to be understood)

Still, *throw*, like *send*, can be used in event descriptions which involve possession and, thus, it can show the argument realization properties of *give*. It appears that an animate goal can be interpreted as a recipient with *throw*, just as it can with *send*.

- (4) a. Tracy threw the ball to first base.
b. *Tracy threw first base the ball.
- (5) a. Tracy threw the ball to the catcher.
b. Tracy threw the catcher the ball.

• QUESTIONS TO BE ADDRESSED:

–Do languages agree on which happenings in the world are construed as caused possession events?

→ Typically, yes.

– Does it matter whether possession is lexically encoded or derived contextually? Specifically, are the differences in lexicalized meaning among *give*, *send* and *throw* reflected in argument realization?

→ Often yes, but an answer requires looking at languages other than English.

3 What qualifies as a possession event? A case study of ‘sending’ events across languages

Events descriptions with English *send* and its counterparts in other languages constitute a good domain for showing that languages tend to agree on what types of happenings are possession events.

THE REASON: Not all happenings in the world that can be named by the verb *send* and its translation equivalents qualify as possession events; thus, the event descriptions can be examined to see if languages treat the same types of sending events as events of caused possession.

3.1 The starting point: ‘Sending’ events in English

- Diagnosing what instances of sending are construed as caused possession events:

—Since the first object in the double object variant can only express recipients and not spatial goals, this variant can only be used in the description of caused possession events.

— Thus, if a happening in the world that is named by *send* can be expressed using the double object construction, it must be one that qualifies as an event of caused possession.

— Concomitantly, such events should be paraphrasable with *have* or *get*.

- Applying the diagnostics . . .

— Happenings with animate or inanimate themes and purely spatial goals cannot be expressed using the double object variant; thus, such happenings are not construable as caused possession events.

THE REASON: Spatial goals do not qualify as possessors.

- (6) a. We sent the package/the refugees to the border.
b. # We sent the border the package/the refugees.

- (7) # The border has/got the package/the refugees.

— Happenings with inanimate themes and animate goals named by *send* can be expressed with the double object variant; thus, such happenings are construable as caused possession events.

THE REASON: Animate goals can be understood as recipients via the Animate Goal as Recipient Implicature.

- (8) a. We sent the package to the boarder.
b. We sent the boarder the package.

- (9) The boarder had/got the package.

— When happenings nameable by *send* have animate themes, they are occasionally expressible with the double object construction, but most often are not; thus, they are only sometimes construed as caused possession events.

THE REASON: An animate entity typically CANNOT exert the type of control over another animate entity necessary to possess this second entity; therefore, if there is an animate goal, the Animate Goal as Recipient Implicature does not apply, so this goal cannot be understood as a recipient.

- (10) a. The teacher sent the students to the principal.
b. # The teacher sent the principal the students.

- (11) a. Professor Smith sent her best graduate student to Professor Jones.
b. Professor Smith sent Professor Jones her best graduate student.

When the double object variant is available as a description of a sending events with an animate theme and animate goal, the event must be one that is construable as an event of caused possession, while when it is not available, the event cannot be so construed; that is, there is a relation of possession between the theme and the goal in only some instances.

The (un)availability of a relation of possession is further confirmed by the (un)availability of paraphrases with *have* or *get*.

- (12) a. Jones has/got the graduate student.
b. # The principal has/got the students.

If a teacher sends some students to the principal, the principal does not, as a result, have the students, while if one professor sends a second a graduate student, the second professor is considered to ‘have’ a graduate student.

- (13) a. How many graduate students do you have?
b. # How many students does the principal have?
(cf. How many students does the principal have in his school?)

In fact, (10a), which lacks the relation of possession, has a paraphrase with a clear spatial goal.

- (14) The teacher sent the students to the principal’s office.

Usually, sending events with animate themes are caused motion events; (11) is the exception.

3.2 ‘Sending’ events in Russian (Levin 2008)

- Russian agrees with English in the sending happenings that it treats as events of caused possession.
- Specifically, the argument choices that preclude the double object variant for English *send* also preclude use of the Russian dative construction—the construction used in the description of caused possession—with its Russian translation equivalent.
- The Russian counterpart of *give* may express its recipient with dative case, but not with another case marker or preposition—e.g., the preposition *k*, used elsewhere with animates as spatial goals.

- (15) Ja dal Ivanu knigu.
I.NOM gave Ivan.DAT book.ACC
‘I gave Ivan a book.’

- (16) *Ja dal knigu k Ivanu.
I.NOM gave book.ACC K Ivan.DAT
‘I gave a book to Ivan.’ (intended meaning)

As this verb lexicalizes caused possession, this data suggests that the dative case is used to express recipients in Russian, but *k* is not.

- In Russian, the dative construction is never found when *poslat’* ‘send’ is used in the description of caused motion events, e.g., when it takes an inanimate theme and a purely spatial goal.

- (17) *Ja poslal knigu Moskve.
 I.NOM sent book.ACC Moscow.DAT
 'I sent the book to Moscow.'
- (18) Ja poslal knigu v Moskvu.
 I.NOM sent book.ACC in Moscow.ACC
 'I sent the book to Moscow.'

NOTE: As in many languages (cf. Aristar 1996), Russian does not indicate animate spatial goals in the same way as typical, place spatial goals.

- The dative construction may be found with *poslat* 'send', but only in describing caused possession events, where the theme is inanimate and the dative indicates a recipient.

- (19) Ja poslal Ivanu knigu.
 I.NOM sent Ivan.DAT book.ACC
 'I sent him a book.'

- Dative case, then, expresses possessors, including recipients, while *k* expresses spatial goals.
- The dative construction is not found when *poslat* takes an animate theme, consistent with the proposal that as in English these are caused motion event descriptions, with no recipient involved.

- (20) *Ja poslal učenikov direktoru.
 I.NOM sent students.ACC director.DAT
 'I sent the children to the director.'

In Russian, the intended meaning is expressed using the preposition *k*, as expected if these are caused motion event descriptions.

- (21) Ja poslal učenikov k direktoru.
 I.NOM sent students.ACC K director.DAT
 'I sent the children to the director.'
- (22) Ja poslal učenikov v Moskvu.
 I.NOM sent students.ACC in Moscow.ACC
 'I sent the students to Moscow.'

3.3 'Sending' events in German

- In German too, only some happenings that can be described with *schicken*, the German translation equivalent of English *send*, qualify as caused possession events.
- In German, the verb *geben* 'give', which like its English translation equivalent, lexicalizes caused possession, expresses its theme in the accusative case and its recipient in the dative case—the dative construction.

- (23) Oli gab Peter das Buch.
 Oli gave Peter.DAT the.ACC book.ACC
 'Oli gave the book to Peter.'

- The verb *schicken* ‘send’, when found with an inanimate theme, shows at least two argument realization options: the dative variant, which is available to *geben*, and the *zu* variant, which is not.

- (24) a. Oli schickte Peter den Brief.
 Oli sent Peter.DAT the.ACC letter.ACC
 ‘Oli sent the letter to Peter’ (Dative variant)
- b. Oli schickte den Brief zu Peter.
 Oli sent the.ACC letter.ACC ZU Peter.DAT
 ‘Oli sent the letter to Peter’ (*zu* variant)
- (25) *Oli gab das Buch zu Peter.
 Oli gave the.ACC book.ACC ZU Peter.DAT
 ‘Oli gave the book to Peter.’

Thus, when *schicken* appears with a dative argument it is being used in a caused possession event description only.

- With an animate theme, *schicken* only occurs in the *zu* variant, and no possessive paraphrase is available.

- (26) a. *Er schickte die Schüler dem Direktor.
 he sent the.ACC students.ACC the.DAT principal.DAT
 ‘He sent the students to the principal.’
- b. Er schickte die Schüler zum Direktor.
 he sent the.ACC students.ACC ZU.the.DAT principal.DAT
 ‘He sent the students to the principal.’
- (27) *Der Direktor bekam die Schüler.
 ‘The principal got the students.’

- In conclusion, German, like English and Russian, does not construe such sending events as caused possession events.

4 Distinguishing lexicalized from contextually derived possession

- The verbs *give*, *send*, and *throw* can all be used in the description of caused possession events in English, although only *give* lexicalizes caused possession. Some languages are sensitive to the differences in lexicalized meaning and do not treat these three types of verbs in the same way.

- As discussed in Lecture VI, an argument for the verb-sensitive approach to English dative verbs is that *give*, *send* and *throw* lexicalize different types of meaning.

— *give*-type verbs: They lexicalize causing a change of possession in a theme, possibly also lexicalizing further meaning components that elaborate on the form of possession.

— *send*-TYPE VERBS: They lexicalize caused motion.

—*throw*-TYPE VERBS: They lexicalize two-participant events in which one entity instantaneously imparts a force on and launches a second entity.

- These differences were shown through an examination of the lexical entailments of the three verbs, and further supported by their differing behavior with respect to the successful transfer inference.
- Nevertheless, it is not easy to find any differences in their argument realization properties in English, where all three show the dative alternation.
- Moving beyond English, these verbs do show differences in their argument realization properties.

4.1 An argument realization hierarchy for dative verbs

- Based on an examination of English, Icelandic, German, Dutch, Croft et al. (2010) propose a ditransitivity hierarchy involving three verbs chosen from major dative verb classes.

(28) Ditransitivity Hierarchy: ‘give’ < ‘send’ < ‘throw’

- (i) If there are constraints on the distribution of a ditransitive [= double object or dative] construction the construction will be associated with the higher end of the Ditransitivity Hierarchy;
- (ii) If there are constraints on the distribution of an oblique construction, especially a spatial oblique [allative] construction, the construction will be associated with the lower end of a Ditransitivity Hierarchy.
(Croft et al. 2010)

(Kittilä (2006:23) can also be read as suggesting something like a ditransitivity hierarchy based on the morphosyntactic frames verbs are found in, with the order of verbs on the hierarchy taken to reflect their distance from a ditransitive prototype.)

- The ditransitivity hierarchy suggests that there is constrained crosslinguistic variation in the types of happenings verbs can describe, on the assumption that a verb’s occurrence in the double object or dative construction can be taken as a proxy for its being able to describe events of caused possession.

4.2 An interpretation of the hierarchy

- THE PLACEMENT OF *give*: If a language has a dedicated morphosyntactic frame for caused possession, *give*, which lexicalizes caused possession, will necessarily appear in this frame. Thus, its placement at the left edge of the hierarchy.
- THE PLACEMENT OF *send*: This verb lexicalizes caused motion only, though like *give*, it lexicalizes a three-participant event. Since an animate goal may be construed as a recipient, some languages allow an animate goal to be realized morphosyntactically as a recipient.
- THE PLACEMENT OF *throw*: This verb lexicalizes neither caused motion, nor caused possession: rather it lexicalizes a two-participant event in which one entity imparts a force and launches a second entity. Thus, it is more sharply distinguished from *give* than *send* is. Since, a force is applied on the second entity in a particular direction, its movement along a particular path may be inferred and a path phrase may be expressed. An animate goal may still be interpreted as a recipient, but not all languages will allow it to be realized morphosyntactically as a recipient.

5 Evidence from idioms (and conventional collocations)

- Lecture VI contrasted two approaches to the dative alternation: the verb-sensitive approach and the uniform multiple meaning approach.
- The uniform multiple meaning approach has received support from the ways in which different types of English idioms involving dative verbs are associated with the dative alternation variants.
- HOWEVER, 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.
- The verb-sensitive approach predicts a previously unobserved, but real asymmetry in dative verb distribution in idioms.
- Comparable data cited in the Japanese literature is also revisited in Section 6.5 and shown to support the verb-sensitive approach.

5.1 The basic evidence from English (RH&L 2008)

- In previous work, 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.

- (29) a. FIXED GOAL IDIOMS: send x to the showers, send x to the devil, send x to Coventry, 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 key observations about idioms with dative verbs conform to the verb-sensitive analysis.

FIXED GOAL IDIOMS as in (29a) involve caused motion and, hence, a spatial goal, rather than a recipient (O’Grady 1998); as expected, they are found only in the *to* variant, though their verbs can alternate.

- (30) a. The employee sent his boss to the devil.
b. * The employee sent the devil his boss.

— FIXED THEME IDIOMS as in (29b) involve a caused possession meaning and, hence, a recipient, rather than a purely spatial goal; as expected, they are found in both variants.

- (31) 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))

- (32) 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)
- (33) 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)

5.2 Previous interpretations of the idiom data

- Previous work assumes that fixed theme idioms are restricted to the double object variant, contrary to fact (i.e. (31)–(33); see also Bresnan et al. 2007).
- This apparent asymmetry, like the verb–abstract theme asymmetry, is actually 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 variant:

- (34) a. Fixed theme idioms with the double object variant.
 b. Fixed goal idioms with the *to* variant

- Harley (2003:46) argues that these idiom type–variant associations support the assignment of two distinct underlying syntactic structures to the variants, reflecting their distinct meanings.

These structures assume “lexical decomposition” in the syntax, à la Hale & Keyser (2002), as well as preposition-raising to V.

- (35) a. Double object variant: change of possession meaning
 [_{VP} Agent [_{V'} CAUSE [_{PP} Goal [_{P'} P_{HAVE} [_{DP} Theme]]]]]]
 b. *to* variant: change of location meaning
 [_{VP} Agent [_{V'} CAUSE [_{PP} Theme [_{P'} P_{LOC} [_{PP} to Goal]]]]]]

- Harley assumes all fixed pieces of an idiom must form an underlying syntactic constituent (Marantz 1996, but see Nunberg et al. 1994); thus, if an idiom has a single fixed DP, this DP must be the sister of the head of P' in (35).

- Therefore, the following distributional properties should hold:

- An idiom with a fixed theme should **ONLY** appear in the double object variant; cf. (35a).
- An idiom with a fixed goal should **ONLY** appear in the *to* variant; cf. (35b).
- **NO** idiom with a single fixed NP should show both variants as each requires a distinct argument to be fixed, so one variant would not meet the constituency requirement.

However, the data presented show that these distributional properties do not hold.

5.3 Fixed recipient idioms

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

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).

5.4 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, which involve a spatial goal, but not *give*-type verbs, which do not.

EVIDENCE: NO verb in (29a) is a *give*-type verb (RH&L 2008).

6 Even outside English, *give*-type verbs simply lexicalize caused possession

PREDICTION: The analogues of *give*- and *send*-type verbs in languages beyond English should lexicalize the same basic meaning components and, thus, the differences in behavior of the two verb types which are tied to differences in their lexicalized meanings which were observed in English should also be observed in other languages.

This prediction, indeed, receives support from other languages, as illustrated with Japanese, another language where *give* has previously been argued to be associated with a spatial goal in at least some constructions.

6.1 The basics of Japanese dative verbs

- Japanese dative verbs express their non-agent arguments using dative and accusative case, with either order of these arguments usually possible.

- (36) a. DAT-ACC variant: ‘recipient–theme’ order; cf. the English double object variant
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 variant: ‘theme–recipient’ order; cf. the English *to* variant
John-wa hon-o Mary-ni atae-ta.
John-TOP book-ACC Mary-DAT give-PST
‘John gave a book to Mary.’

NOTE: In cited data, glosses and transliterations have sometimes been modified for consistency; Japanese *-ni* is glossed ‘DATive’, as is usual in the literature on dative verbs, though it is a locative marker as well.

- 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 (e.g., Miyagawa & Tsujioka 2004; rather than, say, as scrambling; see Hoji 1985, Takano 1998, Yatsushiro 2003).

- Despite this, closer investigation suggests the Japanese 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.

6.2 Distributional evidence (Levin 2009, 2010)

- 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 this issue is revisited here from a somewhat different perspective.

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

(37) Taro-wa eki-ni it-ta.
 Taro-TOP station-DAT go-PST
 ‘Taro went to the station.’

- Directed 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.

(38) 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.

(39) 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))

(40) 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))

(41) 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.

(42) ?? 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))

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

(44) * 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 lexically select recipients (Kishimoto 2001:48, Miyagawa & Tsujioka 2004:9).

(45) 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))

(46) * Taroo-ga Tokyo-ni nimotu-o atae-ta.
 Taroo-NOM Tokyo-DAT package-ACC give-PST
 ‘Taro gave a package to Tokyo.’ (intended)

- As in English (see Lecture VI), *okuru* ‘send’ may be found with both a spatial goal and recipient.

(47) Taroo-ga Hanako-ni Tokyo-ni nimotu-o okut-ta.
 Taroo-NOM Hanako-DAT Tokyo-DAT package-ACC send-PST
 ‘Taro sent Hanako a package to Tokyo.’ (Miyagawa & Tsujioka 2004:9, (21))

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

(48) *give*-type verbs: *ataeru* ‘give’, *azukeru* ‘entrust/deposit’, *kasu* ‘rent/lend’, *uru* ‘sell’, *harau* ‘pay’, ...; include verbs of future having: *yakusoku-suru* ‘promise’, *wariate* ‘assign’, *tamawu* ‘grant’, *teikyoo-suru* ‘offer’, ...

(49) *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’, ...

- All these observations support the more general proposal that Japanese *give*-type verbs lexicalize caused possession and, thus, lexically select recipients, but not spatial goals.

Summary: The verb-sensitive approach to Japanese

- *give*-type verbs: lexicalize caused possession **only**.
- *send*-type verbs: lexicalize caused motion, but can be used in the description of events of caused possession.

6.3 Evidence from instances of pure caused possession (Levin 2009, 2010)

- Instances of caused possession with abstract themes are less prevalent in Japanese than in English; however, 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.

- 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 *give someone a headache* are not found in Japanese (2004:33, n. 15).

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

(50) 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.’

(51) 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]

(52) 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 (50)-(52) have DAT-ACC order, ACC-DAT counterparts are possible; however, slight modifications may be necessary: e.g., a slightly simplified form of (50) is fine with either order.

(53) 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.’

6.4 Evidence from the successful transfer inference

The reassessment of the English data suggests that claims that there are asymmetries between the Japanese DAT-ACC and ACC-DAT variants with respect to the successful transfer inference need to be reexamined.

PREDICTION: The successful transfer interpretation in Japanese too should depend on the verb.

There is much data in Kishimoto (2001) that shows this is indeed so; see also Ito (2007:147).

- Thus, while *ateru* ‘give’ shows successful transfer, *okuru* ‘send’ and *nageru* ‘throw’ do not.

(54) #John-wa Mary-ni hon-o atae-ta-ga, Mary-wa mada morat-te i-nai.
 John-TOP Mary-DAT book-ACC give-PST-but Mary-TOP yet get-GER be-NEG
 ‘John gave Mary a book, but Mary has not gotten it yet.’ (Kishimoto 2001:40, (5))

- (55) John-wa Mary-ni tegami-o okut-ta-ga, Mary-wa mada uketot-te i-nai.
 John-TOP Mary-DAT letter-ACC send-PST-but Mary-TOP yet receive-GER be-NEG
 ‘John sent a letter to Mary, but Mary has not received it yet.’ (Kishimoto 2001:39, (3))
- (56) John-wa Mary-ni booru-o nage-ta-ga, kanojo-wa tori-sokonat-ta.
 John-TOP Mary-DAT ball-ACC throw-PST-but she-TOP catch-fail-PAST
 ‘John threw the ball to Mary, but she failed to catch it.’

• The behavior of verbs of future having, as well as the verb *oshieru* ‘teach’ further confirm this.

- (57) Watashi-wa kare-ni dinaa-o yakusoku-shi-ta-ga, kekkyoku ika-nakat-ta.
 I-TOP he-DAT dinner-ACC promise-do-PST-but eventually go-NEG-PST
 ‘I promised him dinner, but he decided not to go.’
- (58) Sam-wa Pat-ni Nihongo-o oshie-ta-ga, kanojo-wa nani mo manan-de i-nai.
 Sam-TOP Pat-DAT Japanese-ACC teach-PST-but she-TOP what.even learn-GER be-NEG
 ‘Sam taught Pat Japanese, but she hasn’t learned anything.’

Conclusion: In Japanese, as well as English, the presence of a successful transfer entailment/inference depends on a verb’s lexicalized meaning and not on the particular construction that the verb is in.

6.5 Evidence from idioms (and conventional collocations) (Levin 2009, 2010)

Idioms involving dative verbs are used to reach varied conclusions about Japanese dative verbs, all within the confines of the uniform multiple meaning approach (Miyagawa & Tsujioka 2004).

THE REPORTED OBSERVATION: In Japanese idioms headed by dative verbs (cf. (34)):

— Fixed theme idioms: theme immediately to the left of the verb; i.e. have ACC-V order; cf. (59).

— Fixed goal idioms: goal immediately to the left of the verb; i.e. have DAT-V order; cf. (60).

- (59) Fixed theme idioms: DAT-ACC-V, but *ACC-DAT-V

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

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

- (60) Fixed goal idioms: ACC-DAT-V, but *DAT-ACC-V

- a. Taroo-wa sainoo-o *hana-ni* kaketeiru.
 Taro-TOP talent-ACC nose-DAT hanging
 ‘Taro always boasts of his talent.’
- b. *... *hana-ni* sainoo-o kaketeiru

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

6.5.1 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* variant.
- Japanese fixed goal idioms too should only instantiate the caused motion event type and involve a spatial goal and not a recipient.

In fact, in many idioms, a fixed NP which is marked with *-ni* may also be marked with *-e*, like other spatial goals (Tsujioka 2009:10-11; contra Kishimoto 2008).

- (61) 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))

- According to Tsujioka, only some fixed *-ni* phrase idioms allow an alternation between *-ni/-e*, 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.
- Despite the greater word order flexibility in Japanese ditransitives, it appears that even outside idioms, spatial goals are preferred close to the verb. This preference is most clearly evident in examples with *send*-type verbs with cooccurring recipients and spatial goals; see Miyagawa & Tsujioka (2004:9f) and Ito (2007:139f).

6.5.2 Fixed theme idioms

- The rigid DAT-ACC-V order in Japanese fixed theme idioms has been taken as evidence for the uniform multiple meaning approach, which takes DAT-ACC-V order to be the analogue of the English double object variant.
- However, the review of the argument realization properties of Japanese *give*-type verbs simply suggests that they realize their theme with accusative case and their recipient with *-ni*, with word order not playing a part in their basic argument realization properties.
- Nevertheless, the very strong preference for a fixed theme to be verb-adjacent in Japanese idioms, which makes word order less flexible than in comparable English idioms, deserves an explanation.
- This difference in idiom rigidity might be attributed to independent factors that affect word order, interacting with the lack of determiners in Japanese.

Factors determining word order in Japanese ditransitives:

- A given-before-new preference (Ferreira & Yoshita 2003);
- A long-before-short preference (Yamashita & Chang 2001, Yamashita 2002);
 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 (Kishimoto 2008 for Japanese), though there are rare exceptions.

6.6 Asymmetries in the verbs attested in idioms

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.

EVIDENCE: 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’, ...

Conclusion: The distribution of fixed pieces of idioms should receive further attention, but appears to be consistent with the verb-sensitive approach.

7 Conclusions

- The meaning lexicalized by an individual dative verb and the semantic properties of its arguments play a crucial role in determining the felicity of a particular variant of the English dative alternation.
- Verbs (e.g., *give*) which lexicalize caused possession need to be distinguished from those that do not (e.g., *send* and *throw*); further, the factors which license the use of verbs which do not lexicalize caused possession in caused possession event descriptions need to be determined.
- Members of different dative verb classes vary as to whether and how they may be used in the description of caused possession events across languages, with the attested options appearing to reflect a hierarchy of verb classes.

References

- Adler, J. (in prep.) *Dative-Preposition Alternations with Transfer Verbs in German*, Doctoral dissertation, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem.
- Aristar, A.R. (1996) “The Relationship between Dative and Locative: Kuryłowicz’s Argument from a Typological Perspective”, *Diachronica* 13, 207-224.
- Beavers, J. (2008) “On the Nature of Goal Marking and Delimitation: Evidence from Japanese”, *Journal of Linguistics* 44, 283-316.

- 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.
- Croft, W., J. Barðdal, W. Hollmann, V. Sotirova, and C. Taoka (2010) "Revising Talmy's Typological Classification of Complex Events", in H.C. Boas, ed., *Contrastive Construction Grammar*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam, 201-235.
- Endo, Y. (2007) *Locality and Information Structure: A Cartographic Approach to Japanese*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Ferreira V.S. and H. Yoshita (2003) "Given-New Ordering Effects on the Production of Scrambled Sentences in Japanese", *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research* 32, 669-692.
- Hale, K. and S.J. Keyser (2002) *Prelogemenon to a Theory of Argument Structure*, MIT Press.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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) "Object-, Animacy- and Role-based Strategies: A Typology of Object Marking", *Studies in Language* 30, 1-32.
- Larson, R.K. (1988) "On the Double Object Construction", *Linguistic Inquiry* 19, 335-391.
- Levin, B. (2008) "Dative Verbs: A Crosslinguistic Perspective", *Linguistic Investigations* 31, 285-312.
- Levin, B. (2009) "Verb Sensitivity in Altaic Ditransitive Sentences", handout, Sixth Workshop on Altaic Formal Linguistics, Nagoya University, Nagoya, Japan.
- Levin, B. (2010) "The Semantic Bases of Japanese and Korean Ditransitives", handout, 20th Japanese/Korean Linguistics Conference, Oxford University, Oxford, UK.
- Levin, B. (2011) "Verb Sensitivity and Argument Realization in Three-Participant Constructions: A Crosslinguistic Perspective", handout, Conference on Referential Hierarchies in Three-participant Constructions, Lancaster University.
- 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.
- O'Grady, W. (1998) "The Syntax of Idioms", *NLLT* 16, 279-312.
- 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.

- Takano, Y. (1998) "Object Shift and Scrambling", *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 16, 817-889.
- Tsujioka, T. (2009) "Idioms and the Base-generation Hypothesis for Ditransitives in Japanese", unpublished ms., George Washington University, Washington, the DC.
- 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 Production of a Head-Final Language", *Cognition* 81, B45-B55.
- Yatsushiro, K. (2003) "VP Internal Scrambling", *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 12, 141-170.