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1. Introduction

The articles in this volume examine the division of labor and interaction between syntactic structure and lexical roots in determining the interpretations of verb phrases. By doing so, these works attempt to explore the range of possible interpretation verb phrases may have, and thereby explain the range of possible sentence patterns and possible alternations each verb may participate in. Of special interest here are the Aktionsart of the verb phrase and the thematic roles of the internal and external arguments. Some of the works make crucial uses of data from languages other than English to present evidence that is not found, or at least not apparent on the surface form in English.

Many of the articles discuss the possibility of decomposing what
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appears to be a single verb, not only into v and V, but also, for example, into a verbal host and its complement (or its modifier as discussed below). Some authors pursue the roles of grammatical features such as [plural] in the interpretation of verb phrases, making resort to cross-categorial parallelisms between nouns and verbs to explain Aktionsart of various types of verb phrases. These possibilities are among the foci of recent studies in the field of syntax, and the authors explore those possibilities to construct a very restrictive theory of human language with a small number of primitives and ways they combine with each other, or examine the descriptive adequacy of such attempts.

In the present article, I will discuss two of the issues focused in those articles: (i) the constructional approach vs. the decompositional approach to the relationship between meaning and sentence structure, and (ii) how lexical roots and syntactic structures/categories are combined so that they jointly determine the meanings of the verb phrase. After briefly describing each of the articles in Section 2, I will examine some of the views on those issues presented in the volume in Section 3. I will then present an analysis of the double object construction in English and the dative benefactive construction in Japanese in Section 4 as a case study to further explore those two issues. This is an attempt to demonstrate how insights presented in some of the articles in the volume under review shed light on some puzzling properties that these constructions exhibit.

2. An Overview of the Volume

Part I “From Lexical Roots to Syntax” contains three articles. Hale and Keyser’s “Aspect and the Syntax of Argument Structure” elaborates their view that argument structure is the syntactic configuration projected by a lexical item. They argue that while English denominal verbs have a verbal host taking a complement with a nominal in it, they are related by selection, rather than by movement as they have argued in their previous works. Verbs like dance have rich semantic features that restrict the content of their complement, so that an empty category in the complement position can be identified as a member of a narrowly defined set (for instance, a dance if the verb is dance). They also examine the relations between argument structure and the meaning of the root. They argue that verb roots may have manner features linked either to the external argument or to the internal argument. Since the
root requires an external argument in the former case, the range of verbs that allow the transitive alternation and the middle formation can be determined without complicating the theory of argument structure, or 1-syntax. Hale and Keyser also argue that stativity is not determined by category or argument structure.

Heidi Harley’s “How Do Verbs Get Their Names? Denominal Verbs, Manner Incorporation and the Ontology of Verb Roots in English” examines the correspondences between the boundedness of nouns/adjectives and the telicity of the corresponding verbs. Assuming Hale and Keyser’s earlier view that denominal verbs are derived by incorporation, she concludes that the complement of the verb determines the Aktionsart of the predicate, as well as the phonological form of the verb. She points out that there are denominal verbs, such as hammer and brush, whose telicity is not determined by the boundedness of the nominal root. She argues that in such cases the root is not in the complement of the verb but serves as an adjunct of v.

Nomi Erteschik-Shir and Tova Rapoport’s “Path Predicates” proposes that verb meanings are composed of atomic meaning components of Manner, State, and Location, and these meaning components are responsible for the syntactic categories, aspect, and thematic roles. According to the proposed theory, each meaning component either projects its syntactic category or serves as a modifier. The theory explains their observation that predicates describing a sequential change all allow an atelic reading and participate in the transitive alternation, as well as the observation that verbs of manner of progression allow somewhat idiomatic interpretations only when they are accompanied by a PP specifying the path. For example, ran can be understood as ‘go quickly’ in Jane ran to the store, but not in Jane ran. This is because the path PP occupies the complement position of the verb, and therefore the meaning component of manner (of progress) of ran can only serve as a modifier.

Part II “Event Structure and Feature Projections” contains five articles. Jacqueline Guéron’s “Tense, Person, and Transitivity” pursues the view that the v-phase and the CP/TP-phase make contributions to the spatial and temporal interpretation, respectively. She proposes that every lexical item bears an abstract number feature [±plural], which determines the Aktionsart of the predicate. She reexamines the notions of thematic roles, especially those of the external argument, to which she ascribes the responsibility to organize and locate the elements in
their phase in space and time. She proposes that the notion of agent actually covers three different roles assigned to different phases or occurring with different Aktionsarts.

Miriam Butt and Gillian Ramchand’s “Complex Aspectual Structure in Hindi/Urdu” demonstrates that forms appearing in some complex predicates in Hindi/Urdu reflect aspectual and eventive structures of the sentence. They propose that an event of accomplishment can be decomposed into three sub-events: the causing event described by the projection of v, the process described by VP, and the caused result state. They argue that some of the light verbs can be analyzed as the overt realization of v or of V, with the accompanying verb describing the result. The decomposition also allows them to refine the notions of thematic roles.

Edit Doron’s “The Aspect of Agency” presents an analysis of Hebrew verbal templates. His analysis also supports the view that actor and cause should be distinguished as two different roles licensed by different templates.

Lisa Travis’s “Agents and Causes in Malagasy and Tagalog” similarly shows that different morphemes license agent and cause/non-volitional agent. She presents a syntactic analysis in which the morpheme licensing agent is in v, and the one licensing cause/non-volitional agent is in a position lower than v. The latter element also encodes telicity.

Carlota S. Smith’s “Event Structure and Morphosyntax in Navajo” examines event structure conveyed by Navajo verbs. She demonstrates that the surface order of prefixes does not necessarily reflect scope relations, and argues that in this language, morphemes encoding information on event structure do not have corresponding syntactic categories.

The final part, Part III “Lexical Restrictions on Syntax” includes four articles. Adele E. Goldberg’s “Constructions, Lexical Semantics, and the Correspondence Principle: Accounting for Generalizations and Subregularities in Realization of Arguments” argues against decompositional analyses of predicates. She argues that the omission of unspecificied object is better accounted for by positing two constructions, each of which specifies the semantics and syntactic forms of the cases that allow omission.

Anita Mittwoch’s “Unspecified Arguments in Episodic and Habitual Sentences” also examines cases of object omission. She argues that omission is possible in certain contexts in which the activity part of the verbal meaning is focused, with the object being not only indefinite/
non-specific but also unquantized. Habitual sentences allow omission more readily because they are construed with a generic operator which allows the omitted argument to be in the restrictor and therefore be backgrounded.

Stephen Wechsler's "Resultatives under the 'Event-Argument Homomorphism' Model of Telicity" argues that resultatives involve an abstract path argument which corresponds to degrees along the scale denoted by the resultative predicate. His analysis explains lexical variations and differences between APs and PPs in the resultative constructions, and also provides an alternative account of the Direct Object Restriction (Levin and Rappaport-Hovav (1995)).

Finally, Malka Rappaport Hovav and Beth Levin's "Change-of-State Verbs: Implications for Theories of Argument Projection" examines the argument expression properties of change-of-state verbs, and argues against the hypothesis that argument projection is aspectually driven, and the hypothesis that argument expression is not lexically determined.

The book contains abstracts of the articles as well as an introduction by the editors, which compares the approaches and the outcomes of the researches reported in this volume.

3. Two Issues

3.1. Constructions vs. Decomposition

As described above, the contributors to this volume have different views on how the relation between meaning and sentence structure should be captured: whether in terms of constructions or by decomposing words and phrases. Furthermore, those who take the latter view advance different views on the basic elements for decomposition. Still, all the articles make it clear that the decision hinges on the explanatory power that the proposed analyses attain.

Goldberg claims that the constructional approach achieves explanatory adequacy to the extent that the proposed constructions are well-motivated by, for example, semantic or pragmatic considerations. This is, however, a puzzling notion of explanatory adequacy. To the extent that there is a natural account for their existence, the proposed constructions become redundant. That is, they can be reduced to other properties of human language or human thought, and therefore lose motivation for their independent existence. Explanatory adequacy can be attained only by searching for the primitive notions and mechanisms that make
human language possible and that cannot be reduced to other factors.

The other articles in the volume present decompositional analyses of verb phrases. While their analyses are not always mutually compatible, they successfully demonstrate that the decompositional approach can achieve more than representing paraphrases of predicates in syntactic configurations. As briefly described in Section 2 above, their results show that very restrictive theories of human language can make predictions on lexical variations, cross-linguistic differences, and subtle but persistent differences in interpretation between alternative forms.

3.2. How Roots Are Related to the Verbal Head

As mentioned at the outset of the present article, the book under review explores the roles lexical roots and syntactic structure play in determining the meaning of verb phrases. One of the insights of the decompositional analyses presented in the volume is that where a lexical root is integrated into the syntactic structure of the verb phrase, it may enter either head-complement relation or head-modifier relation to the verbal head.

The head-complement relation is observed in verbs such as cough and dance. Among the articles in the volume under review, Harley’s work pursues the view that syntactic incorporation (head-movement) is involved in such cases. Hale and Keyser, on the other hand, point out that verbs like dance may take a direct object, as in dance a jig, and argue that the relation should be understood as selectional properties of the verb.

The hypothesis that a single verb may also be decomposed into a verbal head and its modifier is pursued in the contributions by Harley and by Erteschik-Shir and Rapoport. They propose decompositional theories from which this hypothesis follows.

This hypothesis is one of the outcomes of research that has been inspired by Talmy’s (1985) work on typological variations in lexicalization. He points out that English verb roots like roll and float which do not themselves describe motion or a change of location may still serve as verbs of motion, and take a goal phrase directly. In The ball rolled to the door, roll subsumes both the meanings of motion and of its manner. The sentence can be paraphrased as ‘The ball moved to the door, rolling,’ with the meaning of the root being understood as the manner of motion. Talmy calls this phenomenon ‘manner conflation,’ and also points out that it is not possible in Romance languages. Verbs in
Romance languages, he observes, can subsume the meanings of motion and its path. He calls this phenomenon ‘path conflation.’ In terms of the present discussion, this means that (native) English verb roots may be adjoined to the verbal head, while verb roots in Romance languages and in English loanwords from Romance languages cannot. See Mateu and Rigau (2002) for another attempt to capture Talmy’s (1985) insights in syntactic terms.

The hypothesis that verbal roots may enter either head-complement relation or head-modifier relation to the verbal head predicts that manner conflation and path conflation, in Talmy’s sense, are mutually exclusive. That is, it predicts that a simple verb cannot describe both manner and path. This prediction is born out by the observation reported in Senghas et al. (2004). According to their report, when a new community was formed by deaf children in Nicaragua, they first used iconic gestures describing a motion, its manner, and its path simultaneously. As a new sign language emerged among younger generations of this community, those iconic gestures disappeared, and were replaced by less iconic and more complex expressions consisting of hand movement describing motion and its path and hand movement describing the manner. As Senghas et al. emphasize, the observed change provides evidence of the innate mechanism for human language which forces manner conflation and path conflation to be mutually exclusive even if it is physically possible to express them in a single word.

In pursuing the decompositional approach, it is essential to carefully examine the semantic and syntactic nature of the components involved, and the relationships among them. In the following section, I will explore consequences of a decompositional analysis of the double object construction in English and the dative benefactive (or applicative) construction in Japanese. I will argue that decomposing ditransitive verbs into $v$ and the head that underlies the main verb $have$ leads to new predictions on thematic interpretations of the constructions, once some semantic and syntactic properties of the main verb $have$ are taken into account. I will then argue that the double object construction in English involves manner conflation, while in the dative benefactive construction in Japanese, the verbal root appears in the complement of the ditransitive verb. This latter hypothesis accounts for the range of lexical roots that may appear in the double object construction in English, as well as a cross-linguistic difference in semantic properties of the verbs that may participate in those constructions.
4. The Double Object Construction and the Dative Benefactive Construction

4.1. Decomposition of Ditransitive Verbs

Hale and Keyser (1993) and Harley (1995) pursue the hypothesis that ditransitive predicates have a syntactic structure with the abstract element underlying the verb *have* (henceforth, HAVE) in the complement of the verbal head that introduces the external argument (which I will identify with the little "v" proposed in other recent research). If decomposing ditransitive verbs into v and HAVE is on the right track, the double object construction is expected to exhibit the properties observed with the main verb *have*. To see if the analysis goes beyond accounting for the obvious observation that *give* can be paraphrased as 'cause to have,' I will first discuss the interpretations that the main verb *have* has in 4.2. It will provide a basis for the discussion in 4.3, where I will examine some of the consequences of decomposing ditransitive verbs into v and HAVE. In 4.4 and 4.5, I will discuss the relationships between the root and the verbal head (v + HAVE) in English and Japanese.

4.2. HAVE

Let us first examine the main verb *have*. Washio (1993) examines constructions in various languages which exhibit the alternation between causative and experiential readings. His work includes sentences with *have* taking a clausal complement. He points out that the experiential reading is possible only if the complement clause contains an argument to which the matrix subject is syntactically or pragmatically related. Consider, for instance, the following examples.

(1) a. The teacher had his article severely criticized by the students.
    b. I had a book stolen.
    c. John had the students walk out of class.

These sentences allow the experiential reading only if *his* is coreferential with *the teacher* in (1a), the stolen book belonged to the speaker in (1b), and the students walked out of John's class in (1c). Ritter and Rosen (1993: fn. 6) note the same fact, saying that the experiential reading requires an ethical dative coreferential with the matrix subject or a relation of possession between the matrix subject and some argument of the complement.
Belvin (1993) examines sentences in which *have* takes a nominal or clausal complement. His analysis shows that the pattern observed above is more pervasive. He classifies sentences with *have* into two cases, i.e. Option A and Option B in (2).

(2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Have</em> with a</td>
<td>Alienable possession</td>
<td>Inalienable possession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nominal</td>
<td><em>John has five bucks.</em></td>
<td><em>John has blue eyes.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complement</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>The car has a flat tire.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Experiential/Locative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>John had a good time.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>John has a cold.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>The drawer has five bucks in it.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Have</em> with a</td>
<td>Causative</td>
<td>Experiential/Locative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clausal</td>
<td><em>Lou had Charlie dance with Mary.</em></td>
<td><em>Sal had a bee sting him on the nose.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complement</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>The ice had the car sliding around on it.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In sentences in Group B, the complement of *have* contains, or at least implies, an argument that is coreferential with the subject. For example, noun phrases such as *a good time* and *a cold*, which he calls dependent nominals, do not have a referent independent of the subject. Dependent nominals and inalienably possessed nominals can be analyzed as taking an implicit argument corresponding to the subject/possessor. As the examples in the table indicate, the subject of *have* of this type, which Belvin calls ‘internally interpreted *have,*’ may be animate or inanimate.

The complement of *have* in Group A does not contain/imply an argument coreferential with the subject. Belvin calls *have* in such cases ‘externally interpreted *have.*’ He argues that the subject of externally interpreted *have* is understood to have control over the entity designated by the complement, where CONTROL over something is to be understood as the ability to cancel/discard it. In alienable possession, the subject has the ability to discard the object, and in causative sentences the subject (the causer) has the ability to cancel the event, or to prevent it from taking place. The subject of such sentences cannot be inanimate as the following sentences illustrate, because inanimate entities are not capable of having control.

(3)  a. *The drawer has five bucks.*
b. *The peace-talks had the rebels burning flags about the invasion.

Belvin argues that where the complement of *have* does not contain an argument linked to the subject, the subject can only be understood as having control over the complement.

In what follows, I will assume that the main verb *have* is a realization of the syntactic category HAVE, which takes a specifier and a complement, and projects a phrase I call ‘HAVE-phrase (HAVE-P).’ For the semantic interpretation of HAVE, I assume the notion of ‘central coincidence’ discussed in Hale (1986). According to Hale, two entities are in central coincidence if they coincide in their centers. It is in contrast with the relation of ‘terminal coincidence,’ expressed for example in such English prepositions as from and to, where one entity coincides with another at one of its ends. Suppose the complement of *have* contains an argument coreferential with the subject as in the following structure.

(4)    HAVE-P
       /     \      
      DP_i   HAVE'
           / \    \    
          HAVE DP_j
               /   \   
             DP_i

If the referent of this argument is understood to be the center of the referent of the complement, the entities denoted by the subject and the complement are in central coincidence.

It is possible to ensure that the complement of *have* contains an argument coreferential with the subject, if one assumes that the subject of *have* is moved out of the complement as proposed by Freeze (1992). There are, however, cases where only a pragmatic relation holds between the subject and the complement of *have* as in (1) above. I will therefore assume that the interpretation of HAVE for the internally interpreted *have* requires an argument in the complement to be coreferential with or pragmatically related to the subject.

Belvin’s observation shows that there is another possibility for *have*, namely the externally interpreted *have*. In this case, HAVE does not license a specifier because the relation of central coincidence does not hold. HAVE takes a complement and projects HAVE’, which can serve as a predicate, and form a proposition if an external argument is added.
Kratzer (1996) proposes that stative predicates such as own the dog merge with a functional category which adds an external argument with the role of 'Holder' instead of 'Agent.' Suppose that HAVE merges with this functional category as in the following structure (in which the functional category is designated as $v_{\text{static}}$).

\[
(5) \quad v_{\text{static}}P
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
DP_i \quad v_{\text{static}}' \\
(\text{holder})
\end{array}
\quad
\begin{array}{c}
v_{\text{static}} \\
\quad \text{HAVE}'
\end{array}
\quad
\begin{array}{c}
\text{HAVE} \quad DP_j
\end{array}
\]

HAVE still needs its complement to contain an element related to the external argument. I will assume that sentences in such cases are construed with an implied adjunct meaning 'under X's control,' where X is taken to be coreferential with the external argument.

4.3. Thematic Interpretation in the Double Object Construction

Now let us go back to the double object construction. Suppose now (i) that ditransitive verbs are decomposed into $v$ and HAVE; (ii) that the internally interpreted have is a realization of HAVE, and the externally interpreted have is a realization of HAVE in the complement of a functional category that introduces an external argument as proposed in the previous subsection; (iii) that the functional category involved in the externally interpreted have competes with $v$, which also brings in the external argument of agent. It then follows that only the internally interpreted have (that is, HAVE-P without $v_{\text{static}}$) can be involved in the formation of ditransitive predicates. Ditransitive verb phrases thus have the following structure.
This analysis predicts that the direct object of the double object construction should contain an argument related to the indirect object. Let us see if this prediction is correct.

Oehrle (1976) examines the ditransitive sentences with *give* which do not describe a transfer. Some examples of this type are cited below.

(7) a. The war years gave Mailer his first big success.
    (Oehrle (1976: 27))

b. *The war years gave his first big success to Mailer.
    (Pesetsky (1995: 193))

(8) a. John gave Mary a hard time.
    b. *John gave a hard time to Mary.

Oehrle (1976: 44–67) points out that in such examples, the direct object typically lacks an independent reference, and reports the following generalizations.

(9) a. Where the direct object has two implicit arguments, the subject of *give* serves as the value of the outer argument, and the indirect object serves as the value of the inner argument.
    Example: *Nixon gave his press secretary a shove/thrill.*

b. Where the direct object has only one implicit argument, the indirect object must serve as its value.
    Example: *Gibson gave Smith a look at the samples.*

The second example entails that Smith looked at the samples (Oehrle (1976: 47)). Combined together, these generalizations entail that where the double object construction with *give* does not describe a transfer, the subject may or may not serve as the value of an argument of the direct object, but the indirect object must.

This observation suggests that where the double object construction
does not describe a transfer, its interpretation requires that of the internally interpreted *have* as predicted. Without this requirement, the implicit agent of *look* should be allowed to be related to the subject of the sentence, for such a relation is actually allowed in cases with two implicit arguments.

Let us pursue the view that the double object construction contains *have* directly under *v*, and consider the cases where the sentences describe a transfer of an object. Since the theme argument does not contain an implicit argument coreferential with the indirect object, it cannot serve as the complement of *have* as it is. There are two possible remedies to ensure the central coincidence relation. One is to accommodate the direct object with an implication that its referent has some inherent relationship to the recipient, for example, that it is intended to be possessed by the recipient. The other is for *have* to take a PP complement with a phonologically null P as in the following structure.

(10)

Here *TO* is the covert counterpart of *to*, designating ‘terminal coincidence.’ (See 4.2 above.) It takes the theme argument (which shows

---

1 One of the reviewers raised the question of whether *have* allows a PP complement with an overt preposition. Examples like *I have a pain in the stomach* and *John gave Mary a kiss on the cheek* may be cases of this kind, although the overt *to* seems to prefer *get to have.*
up as the direct object) in its Spec, and a phonologically null DP coreferential with the recipient DP (i.e. the indirect object). This is akin to the structures proposed in Hale and Keyser (2002) and Oba (2005) in that the recipient argument occupies two positions, one higher and one lower than the theme argument. In this case, the recipient is understood to be in the central coincidence relation not with the theme object but with the situation described by the PP, namely the situation in which the theme argument is heading for the recipient.

In either case, it follows that recipient (the referent of the indirect object) need not actually receive the theme object. This prediction is in fact borne out. With verbs like send, the agent must initiate the transfer of the theme object, but the object need not reach the recipient not only when the recipient is expressed by a to-phrase but also in the double object construction. (# indicates that the examples are anomalous.)

(11) a. #John sent a book to Mary, but he has kept it.
    b. John sent a book to Mary, but she never got it.

(12) a. #John sent Mary a book, but he has kept it.
    b. John sent Bill the letter but he never got it.

(Pylkkänen (2002: 20))

I will present an analysis below in which a lexical root such as send is adjoined to v in the double object construction, and is interpreted as the manner or cause of transfer. Unlike the double object construction, however, ‘John caused Bill to have the letter, by sending it’ does entail that Bill received the letter. This subtle difference between the paraphrases should be difficult for children to detect if they are to learn the structure-meaning relations as constructions. On the other hand, if the theory of human language is so restricted that each head can take up to two arguments, children automatically decompose ditransitive predicates into two syntactic heads. They also have a limited set of elements that may serve as syntactic heads, two of them being HAVE and a functional category that licenses the external argument. The decompositional analysis of the double object construction presented here predicts that the indirect object can be the intended, but not necessarily actual recipient of the theme object.

4.4. Manner Conflation in the Double Object Construction

In this subsection, I will discuss ditransitive predicates other than give. Talmy (1985: 67) points out that English allows manner/cause
conflation not only in sentences describing motion but also in other constructions including the double object construction. For example, he points out the paraphrase relation between the following pair.

(13)  
a. I slid him another beer.
b. I gave him another beer, sliding it.

This explains why verbs of transfer and verbs of creation can participate in this construction. These verbal roots can be interpreted as manner or cause of giving. In syntactic terms, the lexical root serves as an adjunct to the verbal head, as argued in Mateu and Rigau (2002). I will assume that the verbal root is adjoined to \( v \).

Talmy (1985) further notes that a uniform lexicalization pattern can be found in a language only if one examines its native vocabulary, carefully excluding loanwords. This observation suggests that children observe word classes, distinguishing native vocabulary from loanwords, and do not generalize lexicalization patterns found in one word class to another. While there is no reason to suspect that children have knowledge of language history or etymology, it is possible that they can identify word classes that behave differently with respect to phonological and morphological restrictions. For example, verbs of Germanic origin are generally monosyllabic or have stress on the first syllable (Gropen et al. (1989), Pinker (1989: 45ff)). This accounts for the observation that Latinate verbs (or verbs of Romance origin) such as *remit, return,* and *donate* are not allowed in the double object construction (Levin (1993: 46)). If verbs (other than *give*) can participate in the double object construction as a result of the verb root being adjoined to \( v \), and construed as the manner of action designated by \( v + \text{HAVE} \), and if children generalize lexicalization patterns only within word classes, it is expected that Latinate verbs should be excluded from this construction.²

Suppose that manner conflation and path conflation are mutually exclusive, as observed with the Nicaraguan Sign Language as discussed

² This is on the lines of Pinker (1989), where he proposes that children generalize grammatical patterns only within word classes. Though he claims that children also observe word classes based on such semantic distinction as ballistic vs. accompanied motion when they generalize grammatical patterns among verbs, I believe that such cases should be reduced to a deeper explanation than the partially conservative learning mechanism that he proposes. See Gropen et al. (1989) for a review of previous research on the acquisition of the double object construction and observational and experimental research of their own.
above. Then, remit, return, and submit should again be excluded from the double object construction because those verbs contain the path in their meaning. Similarly, Levin (1993: 47) reports that verbs of putting with a specified direction do not allow the dative alternation, citing hoist, lift, lower, and raise in this category. These are verbs of Germanic origin, mostly from Old Norse.

There is in fact a set of Latinate roots that may serve as ditransitive predicates. Denominal verbs of Latinate origin may participate in the double object construction, as in He telegraphed/telephoned/satellited me the message (Pinker (1989: 17, 119, 123), Levin (1993: 46)). This is not surprising because denominal verbs of Latinate origin permit manner conflation in other constructions. In He telegraphed/telephoned/satellited the message to me, the meaning of the root is construed as the instrument of communication, so that the sentences can be paraphrased as ‘He transferred the message to me via telegraph/telephone/satellite.’

There are still counterexamples like repay and refund, which contain a prefix designating path, and the proposed analysis captures only the tendency reported in the literature, but at least it provides an answer to the long-standing puzzle of why something like Germanic-Latinate distinction should matter in the double object construction. On hearing double object sentences with native verbs, children do not generalize the pattern to all the verbs of transfer/creation, because they, as well as adult speakers, observe the lexicalization pattern each root is likely to fit into.

4.5. The Dative Benefactive Construction in Japanese

Now let us turn to the dative benefactive construction in Japanese. The construction is exemplified by the following examples.

Taro-Nom son-Dat house-Acc build-te yar-Past
‘Taro built his son a house.’

---

3 Levin (1993) also includes drop in this category. However, other speakers seem to accept this verb in the double object construction (Baker (1997: 95)). Drop can clearly be used in the double object construction when it does not imply downward motion as in Drop me a line.
As shown in the following examples, a dative argument is not fully acceptable with verbs of creation/acquisition like tukur- 'to make' kaw- 'to buy,' when the verb is not accompanied by -te, which makes it non-finite, and yarl/age 'give' as in the dative benefactive construction.

(15) a. ??Taroo-ga Hanako-ni karee-o tsukut-ta.
   Taro-Nom Hanako-Dat curry-Acc make-Past
   ‘Taro cooked Hanako curry.’
   b. ??Taroo-ga Hanako-ni hon-o kat-ta.
   Taro-Nom Hanako-Dat book-Acc buy-Past
   ‘Taro bought Hanako a book.’

This observation has been pointed out by Ohso (1983). In (14), the created object is understood to come into the possession of the benefactee. She also observes that verbs of destruction or consumption do not allow a dative benefactee even where the verb is accompanied with -te age.

   Taro-Nom Hanako-Dat wine-Acc drink-te yar-Past
   ‘Taro drank (the) wine for Hanako.’
   b. *Taroo-ga Hanako-ni kompyuutaa-o shobun-shi-te age-ta age-Past
   Taro-Nom Hanako-Dat computer-Acc dispose.of-te age-Past
   ‘Taro disposed of the/a computer for Hanako.’

Ohso further points out that intransitive verbs do not allow a dative benefactive in the dative benefactive construction.

   Hanako-Nom Taro-Dat library-to go-te yar-Past
   ‘Hanako went to the library for Taro.’
   Taro-Nom Hanako-Dat stop.walking-te age-Past
   ‘Taro stopped walking for Hanako.’

Based on these observations, Ohso proposes that the dative benefactive construction is possible only when some concrete or abstract entity is understood to be transferred to the benefactee. This restriction is observed only when V-te yarl/age is accompanied by a dative benefactive argument. Where the benefactee is expressed by an adjunct, V-te
yarage with verbs of destruction, consumption or removal and intransitive verbs is possible, as the following examples show.

(18) a. Taroo-ga Hanako-no tame-ni wain-o non-de
    Taro-Nom Hanako-Gen sake-Dat wine-Acc drink-te
    yat-ta.
    yar-Past
    ‘Taro drank (the) wine for Hanako.’

b. Taroo-ga Hanako-no tame-ni kompyuutaa-o
    Taro-Nom Hanako-Gen sake-Dat computer-Acc
    shobun-shi-te age-ta.
    dispose.of-te age-Past
    ‘Taro disposed of the/a computer for Hanako.’

(19) a. Hanako-ga Taroo-no tame-ni toshokan-e it-te
    Hanako-Nom Taro-Gen sake-Dat library-to go-te
    yat-ta.
    yar-Past
    ‘Hanako went to the library for Taro.’

b. Taroo-ga Hanako-no tame-ni tachidomat-te
    Taro-Nom Hanako-Gen sake-Dat stop.walking-te
    age-ta.
    age-Past
    ‘Taro stopped walking for Hanako.’

Shibatani (1996) makes similar observations and argues that the benefactive construction with a dative benefactive is possible if it describes an event in which an object comes into the possession of the benefactee. He claims that this requirement is observed because the dative benefactive construction is based on the syntactic and semantic schema of the verb give, according to which the agent is understood to bring about the possessive relation between the benefactee and the object, i.e., the agent causes the benefactee to come to have the object.

Nakamura (1991) points out the following contrast, and proposes that the benefactee in this construction need only be an intended recipient.

(20) a. Eriko-wa Ken-ni mafuraa-o an-de
    Eriko-Top Ken-Dat muffler-Acc knit-te
    age-ta-ga wasatu-no-o wasureteshimat-ta.
    age-Past-but hand-COMP-Acc forget-Past
    ‘Eriko knitted Ken a muffler, but she forgot to hand it to him.’
b. #Eriko-wa [mafuraa-o an-de] Ken-ni
   Eriko-Top muffler-Acc knit-te Ken-Dat
   age-ta-ga wasatsu-no-o wasureteshimat-ta.
   give-Past-but hand-COMP-Acc forget-Past
   ‘Eriko knitted a muffler and gave it to Ken, but forgot to hand it to him.’

In (20b), age serves as the main verb of transfer, and the bracketed phrase is not its complement. The dative phrase must be the actual recipient, and hence the sentence is anomalous. (20a) has no inconsistency, that is, the benefactee in the dative benefactive construction need not be the actual recipient, which shows that these are different constructions. So far, the dative benefactive construction exhibits patterns very similar to those observed in the double object construction in English.

There is, however, one difference between the two constructions. Verbs of change of state do not themselves denote a transfer, and do not take a dative argument. Kaga (1997) cites the following examples and claims that these verbs allow a dative benefactive when they appear with yar/age, as long as the transfer of a theme can be assumed to accompany the event described by these verbs.

\[(21) \begin{align*}
   \text{a. Boku-wa Hanako-ni enpitsu-o kezut-te yat-ta.} \\
   \text{I-Top Hanako-Dat pencil-Acc sharpen-te yar-Past} \\
   \text{‘I sharpened the/a pencil for Hanako.’}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
   \text{b. Boku-wa Hanako-ni kutsu-o migai-te yat-ta.} \\
   \text{I-Top Hanako-Dat shoe-Acc polish-te yar-Past} \\
   \text{‘I polished (the) shoes for Hanako.’}
\end{align*}\]

In these examples, however, the pencil and the shoes can be Hanako’s from the very beginning. (22) is a similar example, which contrasts with (16b) above.

\[(22) \begin{align*}
   \text{?Taroo-ga Hanako-ni kompyuutaa-o shuuri-shi-te age-ta.} \\
   \text{Taro-Nom Hanako-Dat computer-Acc fix-te age-Past} \\
   \text{‘Taro fixed the/a computer for Hanako.’}
\end{align*}\]

There is some fluctuation in speakers’ judgments on such examples, but they are certainly better if the referent of the accusative object is understood to belong to the benefactee than otherwise. On the other hand, the examples in (16) are not possible even if the wine and the computer belonged to Hanako. The contrast between (21) and (22) on the one hand and (16) on the other suggests that the theme object needs to be intended to be in the possession of the benefactee upon the completion
of the event.\textsuperscript{4}

Verbs of change of state are not allowed in the double object construction in English.

(23) a. *John polished Mary the shoes.
    b. *John sharpened Mary the pencils.

Kaga (1997) attributes this cross-linguistic difference to the fact that the double object construction in English has a simplex structure with a single verb while the dative benefactive construction in Japanese involves clausal complementation. I would like to follow his insight, but offer a slightly different account.

Under the present analysis, the unacceptable double object sentences in (23) should have the following structure. It has basically the same configuration as (10) above. **FOR** is the covert counterpart of for, designating intended possession, which I assume to be involved in the double object construction with verbs of creation/acquisition.

\begin{equation}
(24)
\begin{array}{c}
\text{vP} \\
\text{DP} & \text{v} \\
(\text{agent}) & \text{HAVE-P} \\
\text{\textit{polish}} & \text{v} \\
\text{\textit{sharpen}} & \text{DP}_i \\
(\text{recipient}) & \text{HAVE'} \\
\text{HAVE} & \text{PP} \\
\text{DP}_j \\
(\text{theme}) & \text{P'} \\
\text{P} & \text{DP}_i \\
\text{FOR}
\end{array}
\end{equation}

The structure receives the interpretation that the agent causes the indi-

\textsuperscript{4} Native speakers find some of the cases with change of state verbs somewhat less acceptable. The tendency seems to be that verbs of change of state are more acceptable in this construction if the possessive relation assumed between the dative argument and the accusative argument is reaffirmed on the completion of the event. This may be what Kaga (1997) had in mind in his description of the data in this class.
rect object to have the situation described by the PP. The above examples should mean that, by polishing the shoes or sharpening the pencils, John caused Mary to have a situation in which Mary and the shoes/pencils are in the relation designated by the preposition FOR. However, this is not possible because one cannot generally affect possessive relationship (intended or actual) by changing the state of the object. Replacing the covert for with other prepositions would not make the situation any better. Such examples are not ungrammatical but semantically anomalous. This analysis predicts that change of state verbs can show up in the double object construction to the extent that the action they describe can create a situation appropriate for for, i.e. to the extent that the verbs can be conceived as verbs of creation. For example, the analysis predicts that the following examples should be more acceptable than (23), which seems to be correct.

(25) a. Since she didn’t have anything to write with, John sharpened Mary a new pencil.
    b. Because all the dishes in the house were dirty, Mary washed Mr. Brown a plate (so that he could eat dinner).
Sharpening a new pencil can be regarded as creating a pencil that one can use, and washing a dirty plate can be regarded as creating a usable plate. To the extent that such interpretation is possible, the present analysis predicts that verbs of change of state can show up in the double object construction.5

The Japanese dative benefactive construction, on the other hand, has the structure in (26). The combination of HAVE and v is realized as yar/age. While the lexical root in the double object construction in English is an adjunct to v, the corresponding part in Japanese is in the complement of HAVE.

The making of verbs and verb phrases

The embedded clause contains the part that is interpreted as ‘PRO has polished her shoes’ or ‘PRO has sharpened her pencils.’ The whole sentence receives the coherent interpretation that John caused Mary to have a situation in which he has polished her shoes or sharpened her pencil. Since this situation is newly created, the verbs of change of state may participate in this construction without being reinterpreted as verbs of creation. The difference between English and Japanese stems from whether the root is in the complement of HAVE.6

6 Shibatani (1996) and Kaga (1997) discuss the contrast between (i) in English and (ii) in Japanese.

(i) *John opened Mary the door.
(ii) John-ga Mary-ni doa-o ake-te age-ta.
    John-Nom Mary-Dat door-Acc open-te age-Past
    ‘John opened the door for/to Mary.’

While the contrast seems to be very clear, it is not certain if it reflects a difference between the two constructions under discussion. Shibatani (1996) points out that the example in (iii) below is less acceptable than (ii). The contrast is between the case where John opened the door for Mary so that she can enter the room and the case where John opened the window for Mary to let the breeze in. A similar contrast is actually observed in cases where ake ‘to open’ is not accompanied by age as in (iv) and (v), though here the better example is much less acceptable than (ii).

(iii) *John-ga Mary-ni mado-o ake-te age-ta.
    John-Nom Mary-Dat window-Acc open-te age-Past
    ‘John opened the window for Mary.’
(iv) ???John-ga Mary-ni doa-o ake-ta.
    John-Nom Mary-Dat door-Acc open-Past
    ‘John opened the door to Mary.’
(v) *John-ga Mary-ni mado-o ake-ta.
    John-Nom Mary-Dat window-Acc open-Past
    ‘John opened the window for Mary.’

It is therefore more likely that (ii) corresponds to *John opened the door to Mary (for her) than to *John opened Mary the door.

---

\[(26)\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
vP \\
\downarrow \\
DP \\
\downarrow \\
(\text{agent}) \\
\downarrow \\
\text{HAVE-P} \\
\downarrow \\
v \\
\downarrow \\
\text{HAVE'} \\
\downarrow \\
(\text{benefactee}) \\
\downarrow \\
\text{Clause} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{HAVE}
\end{array}
\]
This difference itself is an instantiation of a more general difference between the two languages in the lexicalization patterns observed with verbs. As discussed above, Talmy (1985) points out that English, as well as many other languages, allow verbs of motion to have the semantic component of manner of motion conflated into them, while Romance languages resist manner conflation and employ path conflation. In Romance languages, motion and manner of motion must be expressed separately (Talmy (1985: 67)). Japanese verbs of manner of motion cannot subsume motion, but can be compounded with a verb of motion, as in *doa-ni korogar-u ‘roll to the door’ vs. doa-ni korogat-te ik-u ‘roll-go to the door’ (Kageyama (1996: 7)). A similar difference is found with change of state. In English, The tinman rusted stiff is possible with the meaning ‘The tinman became stiff from rusting’ (Talmy (1985: 68)). Japanese needs compounding as in *kataku sabiru ‘rust stiff’ vs. kataku sabi-tsuku ‘rust-stick stiff’. (See Washio (1997) on language variations in resultative sentences.)

Talmy (1985: 67) also points out that the same pattern is found in the double object construction in English. In terms of the present analysis, English verbs that may appear in the double object construction can subsume the meaning of action for v + HAVE, with the verb root adjoined to v as the modifier describing the manner of action. Japanese once again resorts to compounding, using the form V-te yarlage. In the syntactic configuration, the verbal root is in the complement of HAVE. In this specific case, the overarching lexicalization patterns in the two languages result in different acceptability patterns in the two constructions with respect to verbs of change of state. The lexicalization patterns themselves are very salient in the data children have access to. Once they have learned the lexicalization patterns, children learning English should not need negative evidence to know that verbs of change of state are excluded from the double object construction, and children learning Japanese do not need to wait until they hear verbs of change of state in the dative benefactive construction to figure out that such examples should be possible.7

7 This is actually too simple. It has been reported that children overgenerate sentences with double objects which do not describe change of possession, but seem to convey that the agent performed the action for the benefit, or to the inconvenience, of the referent of the first object (Gropen et al. (1989), Pinker (1989)).
5. Concluding Remarks

The decompositional approaches discussed in the book under review promise to open up different ways to more restrictive theories with more predictions on fine distinctions human language makes within and across languages. Such theories also help us understand how children find information necessary for knowing where to be productive and where to stop. The articles also show the significance of interactions among different approaches, as well as among neighboring areas of study such as syntax, morphology, semantics, phonology, typology, and language acquisition.

In this review article, I focused on two of the hypotheses discussed in the articles. (i) What appear to be simple verbs should be decomposed into multiple heads and also into structures and lexical roots, as pursued by the authors other than Goldberg. (ii) Lexical roots can be integrated into the structure either as the complement or as a modifier of the verbal head, as argued especially by Harley and Erteschik-Shir and

(i) I’ll brush him his hair (2;3)  
(ii) Button me the rest. (3;4)  
(iii) Mommy, fix me my tiger. (5;2)  
(iv) You ate me my cracker. (3;3)  

The first object seems to be taken as a benefactive or malefactive argument. One possible analysis of such examples is to have $v + \text{HAVE}$ above usual $vP$ or $VP$ as follows, and to move the root verb all the way up to the (higher) $v$.

(v) $[\text{VP (agent) } v [\text{HAVE } \text{P him } \text{HAVE } [\text{P PRO } v [\text{VP brush his hair}]])$

(vi) $[\text{VP (agent) } v [\text{HAVE } \text{P him } \text{HAVE } [\text{VP brush his hair}]])$

This is close to the analysis of the dative benefactive construction in Japanese presented above, except that the complement of HAVE does not contain an aspectual marker in (v) and (vi). Without the perfective aspect in the complement, the verbs of consumption or destruction should be possible. The validity of such an analysis and the question of how these children unlearn such overgeneration, along with its relation to the acquisition of lexical patterns of conflation, remain to be examined. For example, this analysis predicts that there must be a possessive relation between the first and the second objects in such overgenerations that children produce, a prediction that needs to be tested against a broader range of data.

The analysis proposed in the text cannot explain why give in English cannot take a clausal complement as in (vii).

(vii) *John gave Mary her car stolen.

If give consists of $v + \text{HAVE}$, as pursued here, such an example should be possible with the reading ‘John caused Mary to have her car stolen.’ I have to leave this question for future research.
Rapoport. The analysis of the double object construction in English and the dative benefactive construction in Japanese presented above provides support to both hypotheses. The former hypothesis explains Oehrle’s (1976) observation that where the double object construction does not describe a transfer, the direct object must contain an argument coreferential with the indirect object, as well as the observation that the indirect object need not be the actual recipient. Between the two options for lexical roots in the latter hypothesis, the adjunct (modifier) option is realized in English and the complement option is realized in Japanese, and the difference accounts for the cross-linguistic difference between the double object construction and the dative benefactive construction with respect to verbs of change of state, as well as lexical variations within each language.
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