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1. Introduction
The major goal of the present paper is to show that Japanese double object verbs are broadly divided into two classes, those which take dative arguments (*ni*-marked arguments) as indirect objects, and those which take them as *to*-datives, i.e. PPs. English double object verbs are generally allowed to appear in both double object and dative constructions, owing to the grammatical operation of ‘dative alternation’ which relates *to*-datives and indirect objects. In contrast, Japanese has no such grammatical operation. As a consequence, the syntactic frames of Japanese double object verbs are straightforwardly fixed on the basis of their lexical meanings. In this paper, I argue that the dative arguments of Japanese double object verbs are allowed to occur in double object forms when their lexical meanings specify a change of possession with

* I am thankful to Taro Kageyama, Yoko Yumoto, Seiji Ueno, Shinako Imazumi, Mitchiko Bando, Ikuko Matsuse, Nozomi Miki, Hiromi Matsumura, Hideki Kobayashi, Takayuki Touno, and other members of the Kansai Lexicon Project (KLP) for discussions that helped me sharpen the ideas presented in this paper. I am also grateful to two anonymous reviewers for comments and suggestions. I am solely responsible for any remaining errors and inadequacies.
no denotation of a locational change, and in to-dative constructions when a change of location is specified in their lexical meanings, irrespective of whether they express a change of possession or not.

For the purpose of this demonstration, I first show that Japanese double object verbs are divided into three groups, depending on whether they encode a change of location or a change of possession. One class of verbs, which I call verbs of change of possession, includes verbs of giving and future having, which necessarily encode a change of possession with no denotation of a locational change. The second class of verbs, referred to as verbs of transfer, consists of verbs of sending and carrying, which express a change of location with no reference to a change of possession. The last class of verbs, referred to as verbs of transaction, includes verbs of selling, and they present a hybrid case of the first two, in that they encode both changes of possession and location. I argue that these three classes of ditransitive verbs provide empirical evidence that double object forms are available with verbs denoting a change of possession, but not of location.

The discussion proceeds as follows. In Section 2, I contend, by comparing verbs of change of possession with verbs of transfer, that some constraints pertaining to the dative arguments of double object verbs are derived from their inherent lexical meanings. I also argue that verbs encoding a change of possession are associated with double object constructions, whereas verbs expressing a locational change are associated with to-dative constructions. In Section 3, I argue, making crucial use of verbs of transaction, that verbs encoding a change of possession, but not a change of location, consistently appear in double object constructions, whereas verbs expressing a locational change appear in to-dative constructions irrespective of whether they denote a change of possession or not. The conclusion is presented in Section 4.

2. The Dual Nature of Double Object Constructions
At the outset, it should be mentioned that, as discussed by many
researchers (e.g. Green 1974, Gropen et al. 1989, Pinker 1989, Levin 1993), English double object verbs invoking the so-called to-dative alternation consist of several distinct classes of verbs having some differences in their lexical meanings. Gropen et al. (1989), for instance, note that the inventory of English double object verbs includes (i) verbs of giving (*give, hand, offer, rent, sell*, etc.), (ii) verbs of communication (*ask, tell, write, show, teach*, etc.), (iii) verbs of future having (*promise, guarantee*, etc.), (iv) verbs of sending (*send, ship, mail*, etc.), (v) verbs of ballistic motion (*throw, toss*, etc.), and (vi) verbs of accompanied motion (i.e. verbs of carrying) (*bring, take*).


---

1) Besides the classes of verbs mentioned here, verbs including oku ‘put’, tukeru ‘attach’ and the like take “nominative-dative-accusative” case patterns. These verbs are, however, not construed as double object verbs, since their dative argument is a locative, but not a goal or a recipient. They differ from double object verbs, in that they can take a variety of locative expressions (in lieu of dative phrases).

(i) John-wa tukue-ni/tukue-no-ue-ni/tukue-no-soba-ni hon-o
oi-ta.
put-PAST
‘John put the book on the table/on the top of the table/near the table.’
One notable fact about English double object verbs is that they can generally participate in the so-called dative alternation (cf. Jackendoff and Culicover 1971, Dowty 1979, Czepluch 1982, Pinker 1989, Baker 1997). Thus, in English, typical double object verbs are allowed to appear in two different case frames, as shown in (1).

(1)  a. John sent Mary a letter/John sent a letter to Mary.
    b. John gave Mary the book/John gave the book to Mary.

Japanese double object verbs stand in contrast to English double object verbs in this respect, since they invariably take nominative-dative-accusative case patterns on the surface, with no conceivable case alternations available\(^3\).

(2)  a. John-ga Mary-ni tegami-o okut-ta.
     John-NOM Mary-DAT letter-ACC send-PAST
     \(' John sent a letter to Mary. ')
    b. John-ga Mary-ni hon-o atae-ta.
     John-NOM Mary-DAT book-ACC give-PAST
     \(' John gave Mary a book. ')

At first blush, it looks as though the syntactic frames of double object

---

2) The list of double object verbs here is far from exhaustive, and the classifications are not necessarily consistent with regard to the semantic factor governing the syntactic realization of dative arguments, at least in Japanese. In any case, the crucial fact here is that many Japanese double object verbs correspond in meaning to English double object verbs.

3) There are no Japanese double object verbs that strictly correspond to English double object verbs that invoke an alternation between double object and for-dative forms. In Japanese, similar forms are expressed by benefactive constructions. The analysis of benefactive constructions, however, goes beyond the scope of the present paper, and this topic is not pursued here. See Inoue (1976), Shibatani (1994, 1996), Miyake (1996) and Kishimoto (2001).
verbs were uniform across the entire classes in Japanese. This is not the case, however. In the following discussion, I would like to point out that there are systematic differences between verbs of change of possession and verbs of transfer, which I argue are attributable to the nature of the dative arguments, which is determined by the verbs' lexical meanings. I also argue that the dative arguments of verbs of change of possession are realized as indirect objects, while those of verbs of transfer are construed as to-datives.

To start with, note that verbs of transfer and verbs of change of possession differ in the entailment they express. For instance, a transfer verb like okuru ‘send’ specifies movement of an entity, but it is generally neutral with respect to whether or not the moved entity reaches the goal. Accordingly, (3) is not felt contradictory.

(3) John-wa Mary-ni tegami-o okut-ta-ga, Mary-wa mada uketot-te i-nai.
    John-TOP Mary-DAT letter-ACC send-PAST-but Mary-TOP yet receive be-NEG
    ‘John sent a letter to Mary, but Mary has not received it yet.’

In general, verbs of sending and carrying such as okuru ‘send’, nageru ‘throw’ and hakobu ‘carry’ fall into this class, specifying that the theme is a moved entity, with no entailment of a change of possession. With this class of verb, how an entity is moved is often specified as part of its lexical meaning.

(4) John-wa Mary-ni tegami-o yuusoo-si-ta.
    John-TOP Mary-DAT letter-ACC mail-PAST
    ‘John mailed a letter to Mary.’

For the verb yuusoo-suru ‘mail’, a particular means of sending, i.e. sending by mail, is specified in its lexical meaning, but it does not
include any specification as to whether the recipient actually received it or not. In view of this fact, it is reasonable to assume that verbs of transfer generally have the lexical representation \([ x \text{ causes } y \text{ to move toward } z ]\).

The next class of double object verbs, which I call verbs of change of possession, encode the meaning of coming into possession, but not of a locational change. A verb of change of possession like *ataeru* ‘give’, unlike *okuru* ‘send’, comprises the meaning of coming into possession, so the statement in (5) is contradictory.

\[(5) \# \text{John-wa Mary-ni hon-o atae-ta-ga, Mary-wa John-TOP Mary-DAT book-ACC give-PAST-but Mary-TOP mada morat-te i-nai.} \]
\[\text{yet get be-NEG} \]
\[\text{‘John gave Mary a book, but Mary has not gotten it yet.’} \]

The inventory of verbs which inherently encode a change of possession includes verbs like *watasu* ‘hand’, *ageru* ‘give’, and *wariateru* ‘assign’. Verbs of change of possession generally do not specify how an entity is transferred, and mention merely that a change of ownership takes place. Thus, the act of giving a book in (6) is successful insofar as Mary comes into possession of the book.

\[(6) \text{John-wa Mary-ni hon-o atae-ta.} \]
\[\text{John-TOP Mary-DAT book-ACC give-PAST} \]
\[\text{‘John gave Mary a book.’} \]

Since the process of giving does not necessarily involve actual movement, we can reasonably assume that verbs of change of possession just carry the sense of a change of possession, having the lexical representation \([ x \text{ causes } y \text{ to possess } z ]\).

Verbs of transfer have the lexical representation \([ x \text{ causes } y \text{ to move} \).
toward \( z \) ], where arguments filling in the variables \( x \), \( y \) and \( z \) are construed as 'causer', 'theme', and 'goal'. Verbs of transfer therefore have the argument structure \( < \text{causer}, \text{goal}, \text{theme}> \). The causer, the goal, and the theme are marked with nominative case, dative case, and accusative case, respectively, when they are realized in the syntax.\(^4\) In contrast, verbs of change of possession have the lexical representation \([ x \text{ causes } y \text{ to possess } z ]\), and the arguments \( x \), \( y \) and \( z \) are construed as 'causer', 'recipient' and 'theme'. They have the argument structure \( < \text{causer}, \text{recipient}, \text{theme}> \), and in the syntax, the causer receives nominative case marking, and the recipient, dative case marking. Further, the theme receives accusative case marking. Notice that both types of verbs involve the "nominative-dative-accusative" case frames, despite the difference in their thematic relations.

One important constraint that pertains to verbs of change of possession like *ataeru* 'give' and *teikyoo-suru* 'offer' is that their dative arguments must be animate entities (i.e. the animacy constraint). This is illustrated by (7).

(7) John-wa Mary-ni/*zitaku-ni zyoohoo-o
John-TOP Mary-DAT/home-DAT information-ACC
atae-ta/teikyoo-si-ta.
give-PAST/offer-PAST
‘John gave/offered Mary/his home information.’

Since the dative argument of a verb of change of possession corresponds to the variable \( y \) in \([ x \text{ causes } y \text{ to possess } z ]\), it must serve as a recipient (or a possessor), which must be an animate entity.

No such animacy restriction applies to the dative phrases of verbs of

---

\(^{4}\) When passivization is involved, the linking relations are altered accordingly. For reasons of space, I will not go into this discussion, and limit my discussion to cases in which no grammatical relation changing rules apply.
transfer like *okuru* 'send' and *yuusoo-suru* 'mail', which do not denote a change of possession. Thus, their dative phrases can be either animate or inanimate entities.

(8) John-wa Mary-ni/zitaku-ni tegami-o okut-ta/
    John-TOP Mary-DAT/home-DAT letter-ACC send-PAST/
    yuusoo-si-ta.
    mail-PAST
    'John sent/mailed a letter to Mary/his home.'

Broadly speaking, due to the fact that verbs of transfer do not encode a change of possession, their dative phrase is construed as a goal, rather than a recipient. A goal phrase can, in principle, be an animate or inanimate entity, so that (8) is well-formed regardless of the animacy of the *ni*-marked phrase.

There is another difference in the status of *ni*-phrases between verbs of transfer and verbs of change of possession. To be concrete, with a verb of transfer like *okuru* 'send', the dative marker *ni* is allowed to be replaced with the postposition *e* 'to', which designates an 'intended destination'.

(9) John-wa Mary-e tegami-o okut-ta/yuusoo-si-ta.
    John-TOP Mary-to letter-ACC send-PAST/mail-PAST
    'John sent/mailed a letter to Mary.'

With verbs like *ataeru* or *teikyoo-suru*, in contrast, the change of *ni* to *e* 'to' results in unacceptability.

(10) ?? John-wa Mary-e zyoohoo-o atae-ta/teikyoo-si-ta.
    John-TOP Mary-to information-ACC give-PAST/offer-PAST
    'John gave/offered information to Mary.'
The dative phrases of verbs like *ataeru* 'give' and *teikyoo-suru* 'offer' are construed as recipients. Since *e* only designates an intended destination and implies that the theme is in transition, the relevant postpositional object cannot be designated as a recipient. The impossibility of replacing *ni* with *e* for verbs of change of possession straightforwardly follows from the thematic status of their dative phrases.

The same type of difference can also be discerned, for instance, by looking at the distribution of *made* 'to, up to', which can designate 'the limit of motion' as one of its uses.

(11) John-wa Mary-no uti-made nimotu-o okut-ta/
    John-TOP Mary-GEN home-to luggage-ACC send-PAST/
    hakon-da.
carry-PAST

'John sent/carried luggage to Mary’s home.'

As shown in (11), *made*-phrases are compatible with verbs carrying the sense of a change of location. But they cannot occur with verbs expressing a change of possession, including verbs of giving and future having, so (12) results in ungrammaticality.

(12) * John-wa Mary-no uti-made nimotu-o teikyoo-si-ta/
      John-TOP Mary-GEN home-to luggage-ACC offer-PAST/
      wariate-ta.
      assign-PAST

'John offered/assigned luggage to Mary’s home.'

A *made*-phrase is not compatible with verbs of change of possession, because it only refers to the limit of motion and cannot designate a recipient. The 'e-phrase' and 'made-phrase' tests can serve to diagnose whether a given verb is categorized as a verb of change of possession or a verb of transfer.
A further difference between the two classes of verbs obtains in the possibility of adding a source argument. With a verb of change of possession like ageru ‘give’, it is generally not possible to have a source phrase in addition to a dative phrase, which is regarded as a recipient, as illustrated below.

(13) *John-wa zitaku-kara Mary-ni hon-o age-ta.
    John-TOP home-from Mary-DAT book-ACC give-PAST
    ‘John gave a book from his home to Mary.’

Verbs of change of possession cannot have a source phrase because a source variable does not fit into the lexical representation \[ x \text{ causes } y \text{ to possess } z \]. A verb of transfer like okuru ‘send’, on the other hand, tolerates the addition of a source phrase besides the dative phrase which counts as a goal.

(14) John-wa zitaku-kara Mary-ni tegami-o okut-ta.
    John-TOP home-from Mary-DAT letter-ACC send-PAST
    ‘John sent a letter to Mary from his home.’

Verbs of transfer can easily designate an independent end point as well as a starting point, and can have the lexical representation \[ x \text{ causes } y \text{ to move from } w \text{ toward } z \] (insofar as the subject is conceived of as causing the transfer event).

In essence, the difference in the behavior of ni-phrases between verbs of change of possession and verbs of transfer may largely be reduced to the question of whether a given verb denotes a change of possession or a change of location. When a dative phrase is construed as a recipient, but not as a goal, the dative phrase is subject to the animacy restriction, and hence, only an animate entity is allowed. Moreover, in such a case, the dative phrase cannot be changed into a postpositional object that occurs with e ‘to’ or made ‘up to’. Since this
type of postpositional object is not usable to indicate that the theme is located at the end point, it cannot be designated as a recipient to whom ownership is transferred.

Let us now turn to the discussion of a difference in syntactic forms between the two types of double object verbs. Here, I argue, on the basis of passivization, that Japanese double object verbs appear in the double object forms if they are construed as verbs of change of possession, and in the to-dative forms if they are construed as verbs of transfer. First, verbs of change of possession allow their dative arguments to be promoted to the subjects of passive sentences.

(15) Mary-wa John-ni zyoohoo-o atae-rare-ta/
     Mary-TOP John-DAT information-ACC give-PASS-PAST/
     teikyoo-s-are-ta.
     offer-PASS-PAST
     ‘Mary was given/offered information by John.’

(15) can be construed as a direct passive, where the dative phrase of the base verb is realized as the passive subject, which shows that the dative phrase of a verb of change of possession is passivizable.

By contrast, verbs of transfer do not allow their dative arguments to be promoted to subjects by passivization.

(16) #Mary-wa John-ni hon-o okur-are-ta/
     Mary-TOP John-by book-ACC send-PASS-PAST/
     yuusoo-s-are-ta.
     mail-PASS-PAST
     ‘Mary was sent/mailed a book by John.’

The only interpretation available in (16) is the one in which Mary is adversely affected by John’s action of sending or mailing a book, indicating that (16) is an adversative passive, but not a direct passive.
(Note that when okuru means ‘present, give’, it is construed as a verb of change of possession, and the sentence is acceptable as a direct passive.) As often discussed (see e.g. Kuno 1973), the subject of an adversative passive, i.e. the affectee argument, is an extra argument. This suggests that the dative phrase of a verb of transfer cannot be promoted to the subject under passivization.

It should be noted here that with both types of verbs, the accusative argument can be turned into the passive subject, as shown in (17).

   that-book-NOM John-by Mary-DAT give-PASS-PAST
   ‘That book was given to Mary by John.’

b. Sono-hon-ga John-ni-yotte Mary-ni okur-are-ta.
   that-book-NOM John-by Mary-DAT send-PASS-PAST
   ‘That book was sent to Mary by John.’

The availability of direct passive clauses in which the erstwhile accusative argument is realized as the subject shows that both types of double object verbs can in principle be subject to direct passivization. Since the difference between two types of verbs emerges only when the dative phrases are passivized, the discrepancy in acceptability between (15) and (16) must come from the status of the dative phrases5).

In Japanese, a dative phrase can be construed either as an argument, which is syntactically realized as an NP, or as an adjunct, which

5) Some ditransitive verbs, in particular, verbs which incorporate deictic meanings, are not allowed to undergo passivization.

(i) a. *John-wa Mary-ni hon-o age-rare-ta.
   John-TOP Mary-by book-ACC give-PASS-PAST
   ‘John was given a book by Mary.’

   book-TOP Mary-by John-DAT give-PASS-PAST
   ‘A book was given to John by Mary.’
is realized as a PP. If only NPs are passivizable in Japanese (cf. Kuno 1973), the difference in passivizability between (15) and (16) is akin to the contrast in (18) (see Fillmore 1965, Czepluch 1982, den Dikken 1995, Pesetsky 1995).

(18) a. Mary was given a book.
    b. *Mary was given a book to.

The contrast in acceptability between the two sentences in (18), in effect, suggests that while the dative phrase of a verb of transfer is realized as a PP, i.e. to-phrase, the dative phrase of a verb of change of possession is an NP, i.e. indirect object.

In English, most double object verbs may occur in both double object and dative constructions, regardless of whether they count as verbs of transfer or verbs of change of possession, but notably, we can often detect a difference in meaning, which is accompanied by the change of construction type.

(19) a. John sent a package to Mary/Los Angeles.
    b. John sent Mary/*Los Angeles a package.

The verb of transfer send does not encode a change of possession as part of its inherent lexical meaning. However, when this verb is coerced into the double object frame, it carries an extra implication of a change of possession. As a consequence, the indirect object in (19b) is construed as a recipient (or a possessor), which is subject to the animacy restriction, rather than a goal.

In (i), neither the dative nor the accusative arguments can be passivized by virtue of a conflict in viewpoint. This fact suggests that we need to check whether accusative arguments can be passivized in order to ensure that the impossibility of turning dative arguments to subjects under passivization stems from the categorical status of the dative arguments.
A verb like give, in contrast, inherently expresses a change of possession, so it is particularly consonant with the double object construction. But it can also occur in the to-dative construction.

(20)  
   a. John gave Mary a book.  
   b. John gave a book to Mary.

When the verb give appears in the to-dative construction, it carries the extra implication of a change of location, although its implication is sometimes very weak (see Oehrle 1976, Goldsmith 1980, Hudson 1992, Baker 1997, and many others). Clearly, the verbs' meanings are altered by the dative shift in English. The dative alternation, which may operate on English double object verbs, is therefore seen as an operation that adds the extra meaning \[ x \text{ causes } y \text{ to move toward } z \] or \[ x \text{ causes } y \text{ to possess } z \] to the original meanings of the verbs (cf. Goldberg 1992, 1995).

Japanese lacks a grammatical operation that changes a semantic interpretation in a manner comparable to the dative alternation in English. In Japanese, the animacy restriction always does not apply to a verb like okuru 'send'.

(21)  
       John-TOP Mary-DAT/Tokyo-DAT book-ACC send-PAST  
       'John sent a book to Mary/Tokyo.'  
       'John sent a book to Mary/Tokyo.'

(21b) involves permutation of the two objects by virtue of scrambling, and no change of interpretation is detected. In Japanese, since there is no such grammatical operation that adds extra implications to double object verbs, their inherent lexical meanings are always preserved.
The distinction drawn between verbs of giving and verbs of sending with regard to the status of the dative arguments may also be found within the class of verbs of communication. For verbs of communication, we find that some verbs are compatible with made-phrases, while others are not. For one thing, verbs like renraku-suru ‘report’ and siraseru ‘notify’ permit the occurrence of a made-phrase.

(22) Zizitu-ga wakat-tara watasi-no uti-made/watasi-made
    fact-NOM know-if my home-to/me-to
    renraku-si-te kudasai.
    report please
    ‘If you come to know the fact, please report it to my home/me.’

For another, verbs like osieru ‘teach’ and tutaeru ‘inform’ do not tolerate the occurrence of made.

(23) * Zizitu-ga wakat-tara watasi-no uti-made/watasi-made
    fact-NOM know-if my home-to/me-to
    osie-te kudasai.
    teach please
    ‘If you come to know the fact, please tell my home/me about it.’

The difference in acceptability between (22) and (23) accrues from the verb’s lexical meaning that determines the nature of dative arguments. In effect, the data in (22) and (23) suggest that while a verb like renraku-suru ‘report’ has the lexical meaning \[ x \text{ causes } y \text{ to move toward } z \], a verb like osieru ‘teach’ has the lexical meaning \[ x \text{ causes } y \text{ to possess } z \].

These two types of verbs show a difference in the possibility of passivizing dative arguments as well. For instance, verbs like renraku-suru ‘report’ and hookoku-suru ‘report’, which express a loca-
tional change of messages, do not allow the dative arguments to be turned into the passive subjects.

(24) #John-wa Mary-ni sono-zizitu-o renraku-s-are-ta.
    John-TOP Mary-DAT that-fact-ACC report-PASS-PAST
    'John was reported that fact by Mary.'

In (24), no direct passive interpretation is available, which suggests that the dative argument is a PP, i.e. to-dative. In contrast, verbs like osieru 'teach', tugeru 'tell', and tazuneru 'ask', which entail that the recipient comes into possession of messages, can have their dative arguments as the subjects of the direct passive clauses.

    John-TOP Mary-DAT that-fact-ACC teach-PASS-PAST
    'John was taught the fact by Mary.'

The fact that renraku-suru patterns with verbs of transfer, and osieru, with verbs of change of possession provides further confirmation that in Japanese, verbs encoding a change of possession are associated with double object constructions, while verbs expressing a locational change are associated with to-dative constructions.

The data considered so far indicate that the dative arguments of Japanese double object verbs are realized as indirect objects or to-datives, depending on whether they express a change of possession or a change of location. A verb of transfer expresses a change of location, and has its dative argument realized as a to-dative, so the following mapping relations are obtained.
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(26) lexical representation: \[ x \text{ causes } y \text{ to move toward } z \]

argument structure: \hspace{1cm}\text{causer} \hspace{1cm}\text{goal} \hspace{1cm}\text{theme}

grammatical category: \hspace{1cm}\text{subject} \hspace{1cm} to-dative \hspace{1cm}\text{direct object}

case marking: \hspace{1cm}\text{nominative} \hspace{1cm}\text{dative} \hspace{1cm}\text{accusative}

The dative phrase of a verb of change of possession, on the other hand, is construed as an indirect object, since it denotes that ownership is transferred, thereby suggesting the following mapping relations.

(27) lexical representation: \[ x \text{ causes } y \text{ to possess } z \]

argument structure: \hspace{1cm}\text{causer} \hspace{1cm}\text{recipient} \hspace{1cm}\text{theme}

grammatical category: \hspace{1cm}\text{subject} \hspace{1cm}\text{indirect object} \hspace{1cm}\text{direct object}

case marking: \hspace{1cm}\text{nominative} \hspace{1cm}\text{dative} \hspace{1cm}\text{accusative}

Recall here that in Japanese both indirect object and to-dative receive the same dative case marking, but have different syntactic functions, the result of which is that the two classes of double object verbs display a difference in the passivization of the dative arguments.

At this point, it should be noted that since the meanings of a change of location and a change of possession are not mutually exclusive, there are two possible ways of accounting for the syntactic realization of dative arguments. One is to say that the component of meaning that expresses a change of possession is relevant, and that when a double object verb denotes a change of possession, the dative argument is realized as an argument. Another possibility is to say that if a double object verb carries the sense of a change of location, the dative argument is construed as a to-dative, rather than an indirect object.

If we look at only verbs of transfer and change of possession, it is not easy to choose one analysis over the other. But a closer inspection of another class of verbs, i.e. verbs of transaction, reveals that the
relevant factor conditioning the syntactic realization of *ni*-marked arguments is the verb’s lexical meaning of a change of location (rather than a change of possession). I will turn to this topic in the next section.

3. Verbs of Transaction: A Hybrid Type
The foregoing section has shown that double object verbs denoting a change of possession occur in double object forms, where the dative phrase is construed as an indirect object, and that double object verbs denoting a change of location occur in *to*-dative constructions, where the dative phrase is an unpassivizable PP, i.e. *to*-dative. In this section, drawing on data on verbs encoding both changes of possession and location, I argue that the *ni*-marked argument of a double object verb is realized as a *to*-dative when it incorporates the meaning of a change of location in its lexical representation.

Let us begin by noting that verbs of transaction, including *uru* ‘sell’, *kasu* ‘rent’, and *harau* ‘pay’, constitute a class of verbs that pattern with verbs of change of possession in some respects, but with verbs of transfer in other respects. First, these verbs are understood to denote a change of possession, since the following statement is contradictory.

\[(28) \#\text{John-wa Mary-ni kuruma-o ut-ta-ga, Mary-wa John-TOP Mary-DAT car-ACC sell-PAST-but Mary-TOP kat-te i-nai. buy be-NEG}\]

‘John sold Mary a car, but Mary has not bought it.’

This fact indicates that by the act of selling, the car comes into Mary’s possession. Given that the verb *uru* ‘sell’ specifies a change of

---

6) According to the classifications provided by Gropen et al. (1989), verbs of transaction fall into the class of verbs of giving.
possession, it is predicted that the dative phrase of this verb should be amenable to the animacy restriction. This is in fact the case.

(29) * John-wa zitaku-ni kuruma-o ut-ta.
    John-TOP home-DAT car-ACC sell-PAST
    'John sold his home a car.'

The view that verbs of transaction incorporate the meaning of a change of possession receives further support from the incompatibility of a made-phrase with the verb uru.

(30) * John-wa Mary-made/Mary-no tokoro-made kuruma-o
    John-TOP Mary-to/Mary-GEN place-to car-ACC
    ut-ta.
    sell-PAST
    'John sold a car to Mary/Mary's place.'

These facts suggest that the verb uru 'sell' has the lexical meaning \([x \text{ causes } y \text{ to possess } z]\) as its lexical meaning, just like ordinary verbs of change of possession. By the criteria given above, verbs of transaction are conceived of as falling into the same class as verbs of change of possession.

Verbs of transaction sometimes pattern with verbs of transfer, however. To see this, observe first that verbs of sending and carrying can be readily compounded with verbs indicating directional movement such as dasu 'get out', ireru 'get in', tukeru 'attach', ageru 'go up', and komu 'get into'\(^7\).

\(^7\) This type of compounding is not possible with Sino-Japanese verbs. Note also that we are only dealing with lexical compounds, but not syntactic compounds which do not show any restrictions of our concern here (see Kageyama 1993, Himeno 1999). The second verb dasu 'get out' may appear in a syntactic compound, in which case the verb designates an aspectual meaning, rather than a directional sense. For our purposes, this use is irrelevant.
With regard to lexical verb compounding, verbs of transaction show a distribution similar to verbs of sending and carrying, since they can be readily compounded with verbs expressing directional movement, as illustrated by (32).

(32) a. John-wa Mary-ni okane-o kasi-dasi-ta/
John-TOP Mary-DAT money-ACC lend-get.out-PAST/
kasi-tuke-ta.
lend-attach-PAST
‘John lent Mary money.’

b. John-wa Mary-ni sono-kaban-o uri-tuke-ta/
John-TOP Mary-DAT that-bag-ACC sell-attach-PAST/
uri-kon-da.
sell-get.into-PAST
‘John sold Mary that bag.’

The acceptability of compound verbs differs significantly depending on what kind of movement can be associated with the first verb, but the addition of a directional motion verb as a second verb is generally allowed when the main verb expresses some kind of motion or activity\(^8\).
In some cases, compound verbs having verbs of transfer as their left
member do not retain the case patterns of the main verbs by virtue of
the Righthand Head Rule (see Kageyama 1993), as illustrated by (33).

(33) John-wa uti-kara/*uti-ni nimotu-o
   John-TOP home-from/home-DAT luggage-ACC
   hakobi-dasi-ta.
   carry-get.out-PAST
   ‘John took luggage out of/into his home.’

The same holds true for verbs of transaction, since their case patterns
are sometimes altered in the presence of second verbs.

   John-TOP Mary-DAT that-bag-ACC sell-get.out-PAST
   ‘John put that bag on sale (to Mary).’

The significant fact is that verbs of transaction pattern with verbs of
transfer, in that they can be productively compounded with verbs of
directional movement.

In contrast, verbs of change of possession (including verbs of future
having) like _ataeru_ ‘give’, _yuzuru_ ‘offer’, and _yurusu_ ‘allow’ cannot be
compounded with verbs of directional movement.

8) When verbs of directional movement are devoid of their original meaning,
they can be compounded with verbs lacking an entailment of movement, as
exemplified by _osie-komu_ ‘teach-get.into’ and _ii-tukeru_ ‘say-attach’. Note here,
however, that since this type of compound is formed when the second verb is
devoid of its original meaning, its compound formation is not productive. For
some discussion of the degree of abstraction for compound verbs, see e.g.
Tagashira (1978) and Tagashira and Hoff (1986).
(35) a. *John-wa Mary-ni hon-o atae-kon-da/
   John-TOP Mary-DAT book-ACC give-get.into-PAST/
   atae-tuke-ta/atae-ire-ta.
   give-attach-PAST/give-get.in-PAST
   'John gave Mary books.'

b. *John-wa Mary-ni hon-o yuzuri-kon-da/
   John-TOP Mary-DAT book-ACC offer-get.into-PAST/
   yuzuri-tuke-ta/yuzuri-ire-ta.
   offer-attach-PAST/offer-get.in-PAST
   'John offered Mary books.'

c. *John-wa Mary-ni sono-koto-o yurusi-kon-da/
   John-TOP Mary-DAT that-thing-ACC allow-get.into-PAST/
   yurusi-tuke-ta/yurusi-ire-ta.
   allow-attach-PAST/allow-get.in-PAST
   'John allowed Mary that thing.'

Verbs of change of possession do not entail a locational change or
motion, so that they do not form lexical compounds with verbs
expressing directional motion. In effect, the impossibility of compound
verbs like *mati-tukeru 'wait-attach', *todomari-ireru 'stay-get.in' and
*nakusi-komu 'lose-get.into' confirms that verbs lacking the component
of meaning pertaining to motion are generally not compounded with
verbs expressing directional movement.

Notice that verbs that can be compounded with verbs of directional
movement are largely divided into two classes (cf. Kageyama and
Yumoto 1997). One class of verbs, represented by motu 'hold' and
tataku 'pound' and the like, do not have the sense of a locational change,
but they can form compounds like moti-ageru 'hold upward' and tataki-
tukeru 'fling into'. In this case, the second verb adds the sense of
transfer, which the first verb does not have. The second class of verbs,
which includes verbs like nagareru 'flow' and hairu 'enter', can have
compounds like nagare-deru 'flow out' and hairi-komu 'enter into'. With
compound verbs derived from these verbs, the first verb denotes a transfer, and the second verb provides a further specification of the transfer denoted by the first verb\(^9\).

It is beyond doubt that compound verbs having verbs of transfer as their first verb represent cases where a second verb is used to add a further specification of transfer. For compound verbs based on verbs of transaction, the situation is less clear, but there is good reason to believe that they also belong to the type where the second verb supplies an additional specification of transfer. Empirical evidence in support for this view can be adduced from the fact that the meanings conveyed by verbs of transaction or their derived verbs can often be replaced by simple verbs of directional movement like *deru/dasu* 'go out/get out' and *hairu/ireru* 'go into/get in', as exemplified by (36).

(36) a. Korerano-sinamono-wa subete ure-te/de-te simai-masi-ta.
   these-goods-TOP all sell/go.out finish-PAST
   'These goods were all sold out.'

   month.end-by rent-ACC pay/get.into please
   'Please pay the rent by the end of the month.'

In (36) the meanings expressed by the verbs of transaction are retained even if verbs of directional movement are substituted for them. This kind of substitution is often possible with verbs construed as possessing the sense of a change of location, as illustrated below.

9) The difference between verbs which denote a transfer and ones which do not can be checked, for instance, by adding a goal phrase, as in (i):

   John-TOP ground-DAT book-ACC hit-attach-PAST/hit-PAST
   'John flung the book into the ground.'

   John-NOM room-DAT enter-get.in-PAST/enter-PAST
   'John entered the room.'
In contradistinction, with verbs that do not denote a transfer, the equivalent meanings cannot be expressed by verbs of directional movement. This is the case with verbs of change of possession.

Verbs of change of possession do not denote a locational change, so that their meanings cannot be described by verbs of directional movement. The availability of paraphrases using verbs of directional movement indicates that the relevant verbs include the meaning of transfer as part of their lexical meaning.

It is clear from the discussion that verbs of transaction pattern like verbs of transfer in that they can often have equivalent expressions with verbs of directional movement. Since verbs of directional movement
express the meaning of a locational change, it is reasonable to state that verbs of transaction, just like verbs of transfer, include the notion of a change of location. If so, we can safely conclude that a verb of transaction like uru 'sell' includes \([ x \text{ causes } y \text{ to move toward } z ]\) as part of its lexical representation.

In essence, verbs of change of possession like ataeru 'give' specify a change of possession, but not a change of location in their lexical specification. Verbs of transfer like okuru 'send', on the other hand, express a change of location, but do not commit themselves to the question of whether or not a change of possession is involved. Verbs of transaction like uru 'sell' and kasu 'lend' differ from these two types of verbs, in that they conceptualize both changes of possession and location. These verbs have the mixed lexical representation \([ x \text{ causes } [ z \text{ to move toward } y ] \text{ and } [ y \text{ to possess } z ] ]\), incorporating the two different components of meaning\(^{10}\).

Given that verbs of transaction denote both changes of possession and location, we can check whether the status of the dative argument of a double object verb is determined depending on the meaning of a change of possession or a change of location. If the dative argument is realized as an indirect object when a change of possession is expressed, we predict that the dative argument of a verb of transaction may be passivized. On the other hand, if the relevant component of meaning is a change of location, it is predicted that the dative argument of a verb of transaction is realized as a to-dative, and that the dative argument cannot be passivized.

It turns out that the latter analysis is favored over the former analysis, since the dative arguments of verbs of transaction cannot be promoted to subjects under passivization, as illustrated by (39).

---

\(^{10}\) In English, this type of lexical representation obtains, for instance, when a verb like send occurs in the double object construction.
(39) #Mary-wa John-ni kuruma-o ur-are-ta.
   Mary-TOP John-by car-ACC sell-PASS-PAST
   ‘Mary was sold a car by John.’

Notice that for the verb uru ‘sell’, no difficulty arises as to promoting the accusative phrase into the subject of the passive sentence.

(40) Sono-kuruma-wa (John-ni-yotte) Mary-ni ur-are-ta.
    that-car-TOP John-by Mary-DAT sell-PASS-PAST
    ‘That car was sold to Mary (by John).’

Since the direct object can be turned into the subject under passivization, the unpassivizability of the dative phrase in (39) must be relegated to the fact that it is realized as a PP, i.e. to-dative.

The data show that the syntactic status of the dative arguments of double object verbs is determined depending on whether or not they denote a change of location. With regard to verbs of transaction, since both change of location and change of possession are expressed, the dative phrase is realized as a to-dative syntactically, and the following mapping relations are obtained.

(41)
lexical representation: [x causes [z to move toward y] and [y to possess z]]
argument structure: causer recipient/goal theme
grammatical relation: subject to-dative direct object
case marking: nominative dative accusative

I presume that the dative phrase of a verb of transaction possesses the dual role of recipient/goal, since the verb’s lexical representation specifies that it is a goal as well as a recipient.

Given this analysis, it is easy to see that the dative phrase of a verb
of transaction is susceptible to the animacy constraint. Verbs of
transaction denote a change of possession, as indicated by the "change
of possession" part of the lexical representation in (41), so that their
dative phrase must be an animate entity (to qualify as a recipient). In
this case, the dative phrase cannot be replaced by a postpositional phrase
like a made-phrase, which is not compatible with the sense of a change
of possession. On the other hand, since the lexical representation also
encodes a sense of transfer, as shown by the "transfer" part of the lex-
ical representation in (41), the dative phrase is syntactically realized as
a to-dative, i.e. PP.

All in all, verbs of transactions are similar to verbs of change of
possession, in that they incorporate the meaning of change of posses-
sion, and that the dative arguments are construed as recipients. They
are similar to verbs of transfer as well, since they also encode a change
of location in their lexical specification. What is notable about verbs of
transaction is that the dative arguments are realized as to-datives, even
though they denote a change of possession. The fact that verbs of
transaction are classed with verbs of transfer as to the possibility of the
passivization of dative arguments shows that if a double object verb
carries the meaning of a change of location, the dative argument is
construed as a to-dative, rather than an indirect object.

4. Conclusion
In this article, I have argued that Japanese double object verbs do not
form a uniform class, but rather they are divided into two major classes,
according to whether their dative arguments are realized as indirect
objects or to-datives. More specifically, I have argued that (i) verbs of
change of possession, which do not denote a transfer, occur in double
object constructions, where their dative arguments can be promoted to
subjects under passivization, and that (ii) verbs of transfer and verbs of
transaction, both of which denote a change of location, have their dative
arguments realized as to-datives, which cannot undergo passivization.
The data show that dative arguments of double object verbs are realized as *to*-datives when the verbs specify a change of location in their lexical specification, regardless of whether they denote a change of possession or not, and that they are realized as indirect objects when the lexical specification includes a change of possession, but not a change of location.
References


Himeno, Masako 1999 Hukugoodoosi-no koozoo-to imiyooohoo. Tokyo: Hituzi syobo.


The Role of Lexical Meanings in Argument Encoding

項の具現化に関する語彙的な意味の役割：日本語の二重目的動詞

岸 本 秀 樹

（神戸大学）

本論文では，日本語の二重目的語動詞の「に」格名詞が統語的に（項としての）間接目的語として具現化されるものと（付加詞としての）与格名詞として具現化されるものの二つに大きく分かれることが示し，その具現化は，動詞の語彙的な意味によって決定されると論じる。具体的には，日本語の二重目的語動詞が所有変化あるいは位置変化を表すか否かによって，三つのグループ（所有変化のみを表すもの，位置変化のみを表すもの，そして所有変化及び位置変化を表すもの）に分類し，これらの動詞の語彙の意味と「に」格名詞の受け身化に関する振る舞いから，二重目的語動詞が所有変化のみを表す場合には，「に」格名詞は間接目的語として具現化され，二重目的語動詞が位置変化を表す場合には，その動詞が所有変化を表しているか否かに関わらず，与格名詞として具現化されることを示す。
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