

Verb Sensitivity in Altaic Ditransitive Sentences

Beth Levin
Stanford University
(beth.levin@stanford.edu)

1 Introduction: The context for research on Altaic ditransitives

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

(1) 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.’

(2) Korean:

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

(3) Turkish:

- a. ACC-DAT: Ali kitab-ı Hasan-a ver-di.
 Ali book-ACC Hasan-DAT give-PST
 ‘Ali gave the book to Hasan.’ (Kornfilt 2003:140, (30a))
- b. DAT-ACC: Ali Hasan-a kitab-ı ver-di.
 Ali Hasan-DAT book-ACC give-PST
 ‘Ali gave the book to Hasan.’ (‘book’ is focused; Kornfilt 2003:141, (30b))

(NOTE: glosses and transliterations have sometimes been slightly modified for consistency; throughout, 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.)

- Korean also shows an ACC-ACC order with a handful of verbs, as in (4) (cf. Kittilä 2006).

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

- Although the availability of DAT-ACC and ACC-DAT orders has been attributed to scrambling (Kornfilt 2003 on Turkish; Hoji 1985, Takano 1998, Yatsushiro 2003 on Japanese), recent work on Japanese and Korean argues that they reflect distinct syntactic—and, hence, semantic—structures.

- Such analyses are inspired by analyses of the English dative alternation, characteristic of verbs with agent, recipient (possessional goal), and theme arguments, such as *give*, *send*, and *throw*.

- (5) a. Terry gave Sam an apple. (double object construction)
b. Terry gave an apple to Sam. (*to* construction)

- Concomitantly, analyses of Altaic ditransitives have borrowed the argumentation and evidence used to support analyses of the English dative alternation, adjusting as necessary.

- Specifically, the relevant analyses are founded on the prevalent “uniform multiple meaning” approach to the English dative alternation, which takes all dative verbs to have two distinct meanings, each giving rise to its own realization of arguments.

- Nevertheless, there is a certain lack of consensus about how the morphosyntactic frames characteristic of the Altaic languages should be aligned with those of the English dative alternation.

- In contrast, RH&L (2008) argue for a “verb sensitive” account of the English alternation: semantic distinctions among dative verbs must also be recognized in a satisfactory analysis.

In supporting their account, RH&L reassess the English facts used to support the uniform multiple meaning account and show that they are better understood from a verb sensitive perspective. This approach is extended to Russian (Levin 2008) and Hebrew (Francez 2006, Levin 2008).

- Thus, Altaic ditransitives should receive a second look too.

- (6) Recent work on ditransitives . . . is beginning to suggest that different ditransitive verbs may project different underlying structures within a single language. It is therefore crucial that conclusions about the underlying structure of ditransitives as a group are not reached in a ‘mix-and-match’ investigative way . . . This has sometimes been the tendency in past work where it has been assumed that all the ditransitive verbs in a single language necessarily share a unique underlying structure. (Simpson et al. 2009:42)

Goals of this talk: To begin such a reassessment of Altaic ditransitive verbs, arguing for a meaning sensitive approach to Japanese and Korean, while clarifying the foundations for continued work.

(NOTE: The focus is on ditransitive verbs that may take a recipient argument—DATIVE VERBS; thus, verbs of putting will largely be excluded from consideration, even though in Altaic 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).)

Types of evidence previously considered in the analysis of Altaic ditransitives:

- hierarchically sensitive: binding, quantifier scope, quantifier float
- meaning sensitive: various verb–argument and idiom asymmetries, successful transfer inference
- other: honorification, passivization, topic marking, word order, . . .

Types of evidence considered here: As the goal is to support a verb sensitive approach, a subset of meaning sensitive phenomena: primarily, verb–argument and idiom asymmetries.

2 Introducing the two approaches to the English dative alternation

KEY ASSUMPTION: Verb meanings are bipartite consisting of an association between:

- one of a small set of event types (possibly defined in terms of primitive predicates)
- one of an open-ended set of typed “roots” representing a verb’s core lexicalized meaning (e.g., Grimshaw 2005, Jackendoff 1990, Lieber 2006, Pesetsky 1995, Pinker 1989, RH&L 1998)

REPRESENTATIONS RELEVANT TO AN ACCOUNT OF DATIVE VERBS:

— a verb’s core meaning (i.e. its root)

(7) *hand*_V: ‘use the hand for transfer’

— the event types this meaning can be associated with:

- (8) 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:

- (9) 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

2.1 The uniform multiple meaning approach for English

(Beck & Johnson 2004, Harley 2003, Krifka 1999, 2004, Oehrle 1976, Pinker 1989, ...)

• VERB ⇒ EVENT TYPE IN ENGLISH:

— all dative verbs: caused motion **and** caused possession event types.

• EVENT TYPE ⇒ MORPHOSYNTACTIC FRAME IN ENGLISH:

— CAUSED POSSESSION: double object construction **only**.

— CAUSED MOTION: *to* construction **only**.

2.2 The verb sensitive approach for English (RH&L 2008; see 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.

— CAUSED MOTION: *to* construction **only**.

2.2.1 The lexicalized meanings of dative verbs

- (10) a. *give*-type verbs: *give, lend, loan, offer, promise, rent, sell, ...*; includes verbs of future having: *assign, award, bequeath, guarantee, offer, promise, ...*
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:
inherently lexicalize causing a change of possession, i.e. lexically select a recipient: e.g., (8a).

Their meanings could be schematized as in (11), 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.

- (11) [[x ACT] CAUSE [BECOME [y HAVE_{<POSS-TYPE>} z]]]

— *Give*: As made explicit in Goldberg (1995, 2006), this verb's root does not contribute anything beyond what is already encoded in the caused possession event type in (11).

— VERBS OF FUTURE HAVING: Their roots contribute a "sublexical modality" (Koenig & Davis 2001; also Croft 2003): a modal, negation, or temporal operator that modifies the "situational core" shared by certain verbs: i.e. the verb *promise* which "entails a transfer of possession in models in which the set of circumstances is restricted to those in which people honor their promises" (Koenig & Davis 2001:85).

— OTHER VERBS OF GIVING: Their roots contribute further meaning components which refine on what is encoded in the caused possession event type: e.g., *rent* and *lend* specify that the possession is temporary in some sense.

- NONCORE DATIVE VERBS or, henceforth, *send*-type verbs:
do not lexicalize caused possession; many are said to lexically select a spatial goal, e.g., (8b).

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

- (12) [[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.

- (13) [x ACT_{<THROW>}]

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

2.2.2 Dative verb ⇒ 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 (e.g., Goldberg 1992, 1995, Harley 2003; see section 3.1).

- *send*-type roots are inherently associated with the caused motion event type, as in (12).
- *throw*-type roots are associatable with the caused motion event type because events of imparting force may cause the force recipient to move along a path to a goal.

(14) [[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)

(15) [[x ACT<*SEND/THROW*>] CAUSE [y HAVE z]]

2.2.3 Event type ⇒ morphosyntactic frame (in English)

- Caused motion event type ⇒ *to* construction; that is, spatial goals are marked by *to*.
- Caused possession event type ⇒ double object construction **or** *to* construction; that is, recipients meet the semantic characterizations for two syntactic realizations:

— THE FIRST OBJECT IN THE DOUBLE OBJECT CONSTRUCTION: It is dedicated to the expression of a “projected possessor” (Goldsmith 1980:429; also Goldberg 1995, Green 1974, Oehrle 1976, Pinker 1989). Applicable to a recipient, as a generally animate entity capable of possession.

— THE OBJECT OF *to*: It is much less semantically restricted than the first object and indicates a wide range of argument types, broadly falling under semantic categories covered by the dative and allative cases in other languages, including spatial goals, recipients, and some arguments with less clear categorizations (e.g., *yield to*, *submit to*, *surrender to*, *subject to*).

Recipients may be realized as spatial goals are—as objects of the allative preposition *to*—since by the Localist Hypothesis (Gruber 1965, Jackendoff 1972, 1983) they may be seen as a kind of goal.

2.2.4 Noteworthy properties of the verb sensitive approach to the English dative alternation

- 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.

THE UPSHOT: The English dative alternation is not monolithic, arising because:

- The caused possession event type is associated with two argument realizations.
- *send*-type verbs are associated with two event types.

3 Key evidence for the verb sensitive approach from English and beyond

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 take spatial goals.

This assumption goes counter to the uniform multiple meaning approach, which takes the expression of the recipient in a *to* phrase as evidence that *give*-type verbs are associated with the caused motion event type and, hence, select a spatial goal.

SECTION GOALS: Review relevant English data, and introduce comparable Japanese and Korean data, showing they too do not associate *give*-type verbs with the caused motion event type.

3.1 English evidence

give-type verbs lack precisely those basic properties of *send*-type verbs in the *to* construction that are attributable to selecting a spatial goal (Jackendoff 1990, Levinson 2005, RH&L 2008).

- (16) Ability to select spatial prepositions beside *to*:
- Fred threw/kicked/sent the ball under the porch/behind the tree/over the fence.
 - *Fred gave the ball at/behind/over Mary.
- (17) Inability to take a source phrase (even in conjunction with a *to* phrase):
- Jill threw/kicked/sent the ball from home plate to third base.
 - *Josie gave/offered the tickets from Marla to Bill.

3.2 Japanese evidence

Like English *to*, Japanese *-ni* can mark a spatial goal or recipient (Sadakane & Koizumi 1995). Thus, the question arises whether *give*-type verbs in Japanese can select spatial goals.

Recent work (e.g., Kishimoto 2001, Miyagawa & Tsujioka 2004) suggests *give*-type verbs do not, 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.

- (18) 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.

- (19) 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.

- (20) 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))
- (21) 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))
- (22) 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 are *-made* or a ‘from-to’ combination possible.
- (23) ?? John-wa Mary-e zyoo-hoo-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))
- (24) * 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))
- (25) * 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).
- (26) 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))
- (27) * 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).
- (28) *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’, ...
- (29) *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.
 - In fact, *send*-type verbs may even be found with both spatial goals and recipients, unexpected if recipients are spatial goals.

- (30) 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))

• Furthermore, some studies of Japanese ditransitives examine the behavior of clear recipient vs. spatial goal *-ni* phrases more closely and argue that there are differences in their syntactic position, which reflect their different semantics (Ito 2007, Matsuoka 2003, Miyagawa & Tsujioka 2004, Sadakane & Koizumi 1995, Takano 2008, among others.)

3.3 Korean evidence

Korean shows comparable evidence that *give*-type verbs are not associated with the caused motion event type, as reflected in their not taking a spatial goal.

• *-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.

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

- (32) 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*).

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

- (34) 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’.

- (35) a. DAT-ACC: 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.’
 b. ACC-DAT: na-nun sopho-lul Swuni-eykey-lo ponay-ss-ta.
 I-TOP package-ACC Swuni-DAT-LO send-PST-DCL
 ‘I sent the package to Swuni.’

- (36) a. DAT-ACC: * 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.'
- b. ACC-DAT: * na-nun sopho-lul Swuni-eykey-lo cwu-ess-ta.
 I-TOP package-ACC Swuni-DAT-LO 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 would then select for spatial goals, as well as recipients, and, thus, only they would 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* allow a comparable distinction to be made in Korean.

- These observations suggest that Korean distinguishes *give*-type verbs from *send*-type verbs, with only the latter being associated with the caused motion event type.

(37) *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', ...

(38) *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.

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

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

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

- (41) 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)

- *ponay* 'send' may also take a spatial goal and a recipient simultaneously, though some speakers much prefer directional *-lo* to *-ey* in such instances; see also Hwang (2005:170).

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

4 Reassessing further Altaic evidence bearing on the analysis of ditransitive verbs

- Given the prevalence of the uniform multiple meaning approach for English, it is not surprising that it has been extended to Japanese and Korean and used to account for their counterparts of meaning sensitive asymmetries involving dative verbs.
- RH&L (2008) show how the English instantiation of these asymmetries can receive an explanation in terms of the verb sensitive approach and thus support it.
- Sections 5-6 reexamine their Japanese and Korean instantiations from a verb sensitive perspective.

5 Evidence from verb–argument combinations conveying pure caused possession

- Various researchers point to certain purportedly impossible English verb–argument combinations in support of the uniform multiple meaning approach; their argument crucially assumes that *give*-type verbs in the *to* construction instantiate the caused motion event type.
- Having argued against this assumption, RH&L (2008) show that the empirical base for this argument is flawed and explain the relevant data via the verb sensitive approach.
- As comparable data figure in the Japanese/Korean literature, it is then reviewed.

5.1 The argument from English (RH&L 2008)

- Proponents of the uniform multiple meaning approach (Goldberg 1992, Harley 2003, Krifka 2004) claim that the *to* construction is unavailable for certain verb–argument combinations.

- (43) a. The kids gave me a headache.
 b. ?? The kids gave a headache to me.
- (44) a. Interviewing Richard Nixon gave Norman Mailer a book. (Oehrle 1976:44)
 b. * Interviewing Nixon gave a book to Norman Mailer.

- They propose the relevant use of *give* involves a ‘cause to come into existence’ reading, which necessarily lacks a source of transfer; thus, this use is incompatible with the *to* construction.

They assume that the *to* construction always encodes caused motion, and thus must involve a path of motion, but this requirement cannot be met in these uses: without a source of transfer, there can be no path constituent for the *to* phrase to denote.

- These data, however, require another explanation: there are impeccable instances of *to* constructions which simply convey causation of possession, as in (45), and with manipulation even the verb–argument combinations in (43b) and (44b) improve, as in (46)

- (45) a. We gave a fresh coat of paint to the house.
 b. The music lent a festive air to the party.
 c. The judge gave/awarded custody to the child’s uncle.
 d. The new spray cleaner gave a streaked appearance to the mirror in the bedroom.
 e. The critic gave a good review/a liberal bias to the new political thriller.
- (46) 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, certain abstract entities such as ideas or headaches need not be possessed by the giver or even exist prior to the event.

CONCLUSION: Caused possession may be effected even in the absence of a source of transfer.

5.2 Consequences for Japanese and Korean

Although less prevalent than in English, instances of pure caused possession in Japanese and Korean further support the claim that *give*-type verbs are never associated with the caused motion event type, despite claims to the contrary.

- JAPANESE: Miyagawa & Tsujioka (2004), who take DAT-ACC order to correspond to the English double object construction and ACC-DAT order to the *to* construction, note that grammaticality contrasts attributed to pure caused possession such as (43) are not found (2004:33, n. 15).

As evidence, they cite the DAT-ACC vs. ACC-DAT pair in (47), noting that the ACC-DAT version may be improved as in (48).

- (47) a. Ano kozin-koogeki-no ronbun-ga boku-ni zutuu-o atae-ta.
 that personal-attack-GEN article-NOM I-DAT headache-ACC give-PST
 ‘That personal-attack article gave me a headache.’

- b. ? Ano kozin-koogeki-no ronbun-ga zutuu-o boku-ni atae-ta.
 that personal-attack-GEN article-NOM headache-ACC I-DAT give-PST
 ‘That personal-attack article gave me a headache.’
- (48) Ano kozin-koogeki-no ronbun-ga zutuu-no tane-o boku-ni atae-ta.
 that personal-attack-GEN article-NOM headache-GEN seed-ACC I-DAT give-PST
 ‘That personal-attack article gave me a seed for a headache.’

Although those I consulted find (47)-(48) slightly unnatural, instances of pure caused possession are attested in Japanese.

- (49) 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.’
- (50) 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]
- (51) 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 (49)-(51) have DAT-ACC order, ACC-DAT counterparts are also possible; however, just as Miyagawa & Tsujioka found with (47)-(48), slight modifications are sometimes necessary. Thus, the slightly simplified version of (49) in (52) is fine with either word order.

- (52) 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.’

The fact that pure caused possession interpretations are available with both orders of ACC and DAT NPs is problematic for the uniform multiple meaning account.

• KOREAN: There are instances of caused possession lacking a path that can be expressed using the DAT-ACC construction, as well as the ACC-DAT construction, though it is not given here.

- (53) 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.’
- (54) 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]
- (55) 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.’

The ACC-ACC counterparts of (53)-(55) are considered degraded or unacceptable, although Jung & Miyagawa (2004:108) suggest that the Korean ACC-ACC construction represents caused possession and the DAT-ACC construction represents caused motion; they take caused motion to mean ‘located at’ even with *cwu* ‘give’. (Speakers I consulted do not perceive a difference in meaning in their examples (12)-(13), nor do they find their examples (14), also intended to support the point, natural.)

6 Evidence from idioms (and conventional collocations)

- Asymmetries in the realization of the “fixed” arguments of English idioms with dative verbs have been used to support the uniform multiple meaning approach.
- RH&L (2008) show that the distributional facts are not as assumed and that the actual facts conform to the verb sensitive approach, and thus support it.
- Comparable data cited in the Japanese/Korean literature is then revisited.
- The verb sensitive approach predicts a previously unobserved asymmetry in dative verb distribution in idioms; RH&L show it is found in English, and it turns out to hold of Japanese and Korean.

6.1 Reassessing the English idiom data and its significance (RH&L 2008)

- Harley (2003:46) uses idiom facts to support the uniform multiple meaning approach: she instantiates it syntactically in that the dative alternation variants have distinct underlying syntactic structures, reflecting distinct meanings.

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

- Harley assumes fixed pieces of an idiom form an underlying syntactic constituent (Marantz 1996); thus, if an idiom has a single fixed NP, it must be the sister of the head of P' [=v'] in (56).

IDIOM ASYMMETRIES PREDICTED BY HARLEY:

- An idiom with a fixed theme should only appear in the double object construction.
- An idiom with a fixed goal should only appear in the *to* construction.
- NO idiom with a single fixed NP should show both constructions.

- Harley suggests attested idioms with dative verbs conform to these predictions:
 - Those with fixed themes are restricted to the double object construction: (57a).
 - Those with fixed goals are restricted to the *to* construction: (57b).

- (57) a. 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, give x a headache, ...
- b. send x to the showers, take x to the cleaners, push x to the edge, carry x to extremes, send x to the devil, throw x to the wolves, ...

6.1.1 The actual distribution of the idiom data is not as predicted and reported

- Fixed theme idioms occur in the *to* construction, contra Harley's prediction (Bresnan et al. 2007).

- (58) a. Oscar will give the boot **to** any employee that shows up late.
(Harley 2003:43, (19c); based on Larson 1988:341, (11))
- b. Even the Argentine president, known for his weakness for women, was giving the cold shoulder **to** the flamboyant American singer ... (COBUILD)
- c. "... You want to give a wide berth **to** political discussion." (*The Columbus Dispatch*, October 23, 2001, p. 02B; Nexis)

- Harley (2003:47) acknowledges such idioms, but takes them to arise from "heavy NP-shift". Yet, such examples are more problematic than Harley takes them to be, as RH&L (2008) discuss; for example, fixed theme idioms may appear in the *to* construction even with light goals.

- (59) Gordie Gillespie still can give a piece of his mind **to** the umps ...
(*Milwaukee Journal Sentinel*, April 21, 1996, p. 1; Nexis)

6.1.2 A verb sensitive explanation of the distributional facts involving idioms

- In the idiom literature the term 'goal' is used to refer to the non-agent, non-theme argument. On the verb sensitive approach, it is important to know whether 'goal' means 'spatial goal' or 'recipient'; it turns out that clarifying this point allows a better description of idiom distribution.
- Under the verb sensitive analysis, the English idioms facts are as predicted:

— FIXED THEME IDIOMS as in (57a) are found in both constructions as they involve a caused possession meaning and, hence, involve a recipient, rather than a purely spatial goal, and their recipient, like any recipient, has two possible realizations.

— FIXED GOAL IDIOMS as in (57b) are found only in the *to* construction, though their verbs can alternate, because these idioms involve a spatial goal and not a recipient. A spatial goal can be expressed in a *to* phrase in English, but not as a first object.

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

However, this lack cannot be attributed to a constraint on the syntactic constituency of idioms. An alternative: 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

Harley's analysis is extended to Japanese and Korean idioms based on ditransitive verbs and used to reach varied conclusions:

- For Japanese, Miyagawa & Tsujioka (2004:8) take the availability of both fixed goal and fixed theme idioms with certain ditransitive verbs as evidence for the uniform multiple meaning approach: these verbs are found in two morphosyntactic frames, each associated with its own event type.

- (60) 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))

- (61) a. Japanese fixed theme idioms correspond to English fixed theme idioms, so Japanese DAT-ACC-V corresponds to the English double object construction.
- b. Japanese fixed goal idioms correspond to English fixed goal idioms, so Japanese ACC-DAT-V corresponds to the English *to* construction.

• Oh & Zubizarreta (in press:6) take the existence of Korean verb plus fixed theme argument combinations, expressed as DAT-ACC(fixed)-V, as evidence that Korean DAT-ACC-V corresponds to the English double object construction.

(62) *aitie-lul cwu* ‘idea-ACC give’, *twuthong-ul cwu* ‘headache-ACC give’

• Kim (2008:122f) takes the availability of DAT-ACC-V and not ACC-DAT-V order for Korean fixed theme idioms as evidence ditransitives are underlyingly DAT-ACC-V (contra Baek & Lee 2004); yet, due to other properties of ditransitives she takes this structure to represent caused motion.

(63) 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))

(64) 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))

(NOTE: Kim translates the idiom as ‘lie’, but ‘feign innocence’ may better capture its sense.)

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF RH&L’S REEXAMINATION OF ENGLISH IDIOMS:

The Japanese and Korean idiom data cannot be taken as evidence that the constraints on idioms must be syntactically instantiated and, thus, they may not bear on underlying syntactic structure.

THE NEXT STEP: Reassessing the significance of Japanese and Korean idiom data.

6.2.1 Fixed theme idioms

THE REPORTED OBSERVATION: In Japanese and Korean idioms headed by ditransitive verbs:

- Fixed theme idioms require the theme to be to the left of the verb; i.e. have ACC-V order.
- Fixed goal idioms require the goal to be to the left of the verb; i.e. have DAT-V order.

• 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 as showing rigid ACC-V order, has been attested in an ACC-DAT-V structure.

(65) 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 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 (65).

6.2.2 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 alternately be marked with *-e*, like other spatial goals (Tsujioka 2009:10-11; contra Kishimoto 2008).

(66) 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*, to alternately be marked with *-lo*, as expected of a spatial goal.

(67) 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).'				

- A QUESTION FOR FUTURE INVESTIGATION: As spatial goals are marked with the dative, is the caused motion event type instantiated only via ACC-DAT-V order or also by DAT-ACC-V order, and if so, do fixed goal idioms show comparable flexibility?

Despite the greater word order flexibility in Japanese and Korean 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).

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

- PREDICTION: 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.

THE REASON: As animate NPs are not good inputs to idioms, fixed goal idioms must involve spatial goals and, thus, the caused motion event type; thus, the verbs in such idioms are constrained.

- SUPPORT FROM ENGLISH: NO verb in (57b) 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).

(68) *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: Unfortunately, less information is readily available. Although Kim (2008) cites a study of ditransitive verb idioms by Hong (1998), this study only gives aggregate figures, suggesting at best a paucity of fixed goal idioms. Furthermore, the examples cited suggest Hong’s notion of idiom is overly broad, also encompassing sayings and adages.

However, the Korean fixed goal idiom cited in (67) does satisfy the prediction regarding verb type:
cesung-ey ponay ‘send to the other world’ [i.e. kill]

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

7 Taking stock and looking forward

- Across languages the inherent meaning of an individual dative verb has a greater contribution to make to the morphosyntactic expression of its arguments than many current accounts typically assume (Jackendoff 1990, Kishimoto 2001, RH&L 2008 being exceptions).

- Members of different semantic verb classes show distinct associations with event types: *give*-type verbs with the caused possession event type, while *send*-type verbs with caused motion and, in many languages (Croft et al. 2001, Levin 2008, L&RH 2007), caused possession event types.

- ‘Event type \Rightarrow morphosyntactic frame’ associations depend on the morphosyntactic devices available to a language; the following associations appear to hold in Japanese and Korean:

- Korean ACC-ACC: caused possession

- Japanese and Korean ACC-DAT, DAT-ACC: caused possession, caused motion;
more refined analyses for Japanese distinguish:

- prepositional *-ni* (the *-ni* that alternates with *-e*): caused motion

- case-marker *-ni* (the *-ni* that does not alternate with *-e*): caused possession

Acknowledgments: I am extremely grateful to Hye-Won Choi, Shin-Sook Kim, and Chigusa Kurumada for their generous help with the Japanese and Korean data. I also thank Tanya Nikitina, Malka Rappaport Hovav, and Peter Sells for valuable discussion.

References

- Baek, J.Y.-K. and J.-M. Lee (2004) “Double Object Constructions in Korean: Asymmetry between Theme and Goal”, *Language Research* 40, 669-679.
- Baker, M.C. (1997) “Thematic Roles and Syntactic Structure” in L. Haegeman, ed., *Elements of Grammar. Handbook of Generative Syntax*, Kluwer, Dordrecht, 73-137.
- Beavers, J. (2008) “On the Nature of Goal Marking and Delimitation: Evidence from Japanese”, *Journal of Linguistics* 44, 283-316.
- 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. (2003) “Lexical Rules vs. Constructions: A False Dichotomy”, in H. Cuyckens, T. Berg, R. Dirven, K.-U. Panther, eds., *Motivation in Language: Studies in Honor of Günter Radden*, Benjamins, Amsterdam, 49-68.
- 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.
- Hwang, J. (2005) "The High Goal Argument in Korean Ditransitive Constructions", *CLS 41: The Main Session*, Chicago Linguistic Society, Chicago, IL, 165-178.
- 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. (1972) *Semantic Interpretation in Generative Grammar*, MIT Press.
- 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.
- Kornfilt, J. (2003) "Scrambling, Subscrambling, and Case in Turkish", *Word Order and Scrambling*, Blackwell, Oxford, UK, 127-155.
- 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", *Linguisticae Investigationes* 31, 285-312.
- Levin, B. and M. Rappaport Hovav (2007) "The Crosslinguistic Study of Dative Alternations: A Verb Sensitive Perspective", handout, Conference on Ditransitive Constructions, Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, Leipzig.
- 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.
- Lieber, R. (2006) "The Category of Roots and the Roots of Categories: What We Learn from Selection in Derivation", *Morphology* 16, 247-272.
- 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 (in press) "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.
- 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.
- Simpson, A., H. Hwang, and C. Ipek (2009) "The Comparative Syntax of Double Object Constructions in Japanese, Korean, and Turkish", in R. Vermeulen and R. Shibagaki, eds., *Proceedings of the 5th Workshop on Altaic Formal Linguistics (WAFL5)*, MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 58, Department of Linguistics and Philosophy, MIT, Cambridge, MA, 41-62.
- 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: Tromsø Working 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.

<http://www.stanford.edu/~bclevin/>