



# The Semantic Basis of Dative Case Making in Japanese

Kishimoto, Hideki

---

(Citation)

神戸言語学論叢, 7:19-39

(Issue Date)

2010-01

(Resource Type)

departmental bulletin paper

(Version)

Version of Record

(JaLCD0I)

<https://doi.org/10.24546/81001856>

(URL)

<https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14094/81001856>



## THE SEMANTIC BASIS OF DATIVE CASE MARKING IN JAPANESE

Hideki Kishimoto

*Kobe University*

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Regularities governing the morphological realization of arguments are captured differently in different grammatical theories (see e.g. Anderson 1977, Croft 1990, Goldberg 1995, 2006, Pinker 1989, Pustejovsky 1991, 1995). Nevertheless, it is widely accepted that nominative and accusative case can represent a variety of semantic relations, whereas other cases tend to be semantically constrained. In the case of dative case, the mapping between morphology and semantic relations is thought to be fairly regular, closely tied to a certain semantic content. As often discussed (see e.g. Blake 1994, Blansit 1988, Maling 2001, Haspelmath 2003, Malchukov, Haspelmath & Comrie 2007), dative arguments can represent recipient, experiencer, or beneficiary, all of which fall under the general cover term of ‘goal’. Indeed, marking the goal argument of a three-place predicate with dative case is a very common cross-linguistic option. At the same time, however, it is sometimes observed that the dative case can be assigned to the source argument of a three-place verb (see Van Belle and Van Langendonck 1996).

In Japanese, the same type of behavior is observed with regard to the dative case marking *ni* found in three-place predicate constructions, in that this marker is sometimes used to indicate a source, as well as a goal. Goal and source are usually taken to represent opposite thematic notions, so the fact immediately raises the question of what motivates the morphological dative marking. In this article, we suggest that there is a semantic regularity on the basis of which we can predict the distribution of *ni* marking. More specifically, we suggest that if three-place verbs fall into the class of change-of-possession verbs where the meaning of transfer of possession is expressed, the dative case can be assigned to a goal or a source argument.

This article is organized as follows. Section 2 presents some basic facts of three-place predicates, and provides the generalization that three-place verbs that assign *ni* marking to their indirect internal arguments fall into the class of change-of-possession verbs, while other types of three-place predicates assign an oblique marker to the indirect internal arguments. Section 3 provides a summary of the observation presented in this paper.

## 2. THE DISTRIBUTION OF DATIVE CASE MARKING

### 2.1. Basic Patterns

Cross-linguistically, we can find two variants of three-place predicates which describe ‘transfer’ events—one where the external argument (i.e. the subject) counts as a source, and the other where the external argument serves as a goal. In the former case, the indirect internal argument counts as a goal, and in the latter, as a source. Interestingly, it is often observed cross-linguistically that the indirect internal argument of a three-place predicate is marked with dative case, regardless of whether it represents as a goal or a source thematically. Even though morphological dative case is most typically used to designate a goal argument, a source argument can sometimes be assigned a dative case as well (see also Janda (1993) and a number of descriptive works in Van Belle and Van Langendonck (1996)).

Exactly the same phenomenon is observed in Japanese. In descriptive studies of Japanese grammar (Martin 1975, Shimizu 1977, and others), it is often mentioned that the indirect internal argument of a three-place predicate receives dative *ni* marking irrespective of whether it is construed as a goal or a source. This is illustrated by the examples in (1).

- (1) a. Eri-ga                      tomodati-ni              manga-o              age-ta.  
       Eri-NOM                  friend-DAT              comic-ACC              give-PAST  
       ‘Eri gave her friend the comics.’  
       b. Tomodati-ga        Eri-ni                      manga-o              morat-ta.  
       Friend-NOM        Eri-DAT                  comic-ACC              get-PAST  
       ‘Her friends got the comics from Eri.’

In (1a), the verb *ageru* ‘give’ expresses transfer of possession from *Eri* to *tomodati* ‘friend’, so the *ni*-marked argument is construed as a goal. In (1b), the verb *morau* ‘get’ describes reverse transfer, so the *ni*-marked argument *Eri* is taken as a source, and the subject a goal. Both indirect internal arguments in (1) receive the identical *ni* marking, even though they are the participants of events representing different orientations of transfer. This does not always happen, however, because source arguments often cannot receive *ni* marking (Miyajima 1972, Sugimoto 1986).

- (2) a. Eri-ga                      sensei-ni              tegami-o              todoke-ta.  
       Eri-NOM                  teacher-DAT              letter-ACC              deliver-PAST  
       ‘Eri delivered the letter to the teacher.’  
       b. Sensei-ga              { \*Eri-ni/Eri-kara }              tegami-o              uketot-ta.  
       teacher-NOM        Eri-DAT/Eri-from              letter-ACC              receive-PAST  
       ‘The teacher received the letter from Eri.’

The paired verbs like *todokeru* ‘deliver’ and *uketoru* ‘receive’ behave differently from *ataeru* ‘give’ and *morau* ‘get’; the verb *todokeru* permits *ni* marking for its goal argument, whereas the source argument of *uketoru* cannot be marked with *ni* (and can only be marked with *kara* ‘from’).

The fact that dative *ni* marking can be used to specify both goal and source, which are often taken to represent opposite location-related relations immediately raises the question of what motivates the dative marking of three-place predicates. We will attempt to provide a semantic account for the facts. At first blush, it looks as though they are not easy to account for semantically, given that source arguments do not always bear *ni* marking. Nevertheless, the facts can be offered an account if some aspects of lexical meanings of verbs are taken into account, and we argue that an indirect internal argument may be marked with dative case when construed as some kind of possessor.

Before proceeding, two remarks are in order. First, the terms ‘direct internal argument’ and ‘indirect internal argument’ are used for the purpose of identifying the types of arguments selected by three-place predicates (Williams 1981, Levin and Rappaport Hovav 2005). In this paper, we do not make use of the terms ‘direct object’ and ‘indirect object,’ which are often used ambiguously in some syntactic theories, referring to both surface and underlying grammatical relations.

Second, we take dative case to be a type of grammatical marker associated with a noun phrase (see e.g. Blake 1994). In Japanese, dative case is realized as a particle *ni* that immediately follows a noun, but should be distinguished from a postposition categorically. As we will argue below, *ni* is the Japanese exponent of dative case, but can serve as a postposition as well. While languages often have dative markers that are distinct from adpositions, case markers in Japanese are not always distinguishable from postpositional particles by looking at their forms in isolation (e.g. other case markers such as nominative *ga* and accusative *o* also have the same forms as postpositional conjunction markers).<sup>1</sup> For our purposes, the ‘case marker’ and ‘postposition’ uses of *ni* particles need to be distinguished accurately, and we will turn to this discussion in the next section.

## 2.2. Case Marker versus Postposition

In the Japanese literature, it is often claimed that the *ni* marking assigned to nominals could be construed as a case marker or a postposition (see Sadakane and Koizumi 1995, Takezawa and Whitman 1998, among others). As discussed by some researchers (see e.g. Miyagawa 1989), we can assume that postpositions project postpositional phrases (PP), whereas case particles do not, serving as a grammatical marker associated with a noun phrase. Note that the difference in the syntactic category emerges with indirect internal arguments of the three-place predicates as well: that is, the *ni* marking used for indirect internal arguments can represent either a dative case marker or a postposition (see Kishimoto 2001). These two uses of *ni* need to be distinguished accurately in order to provide a proper characterization of dative case marking. We suggest that the difference can be discerned by looking at the possibility of direct passivization.

As discussed in Kishimoto (2001), Japanese has two major classes of three-place verbs— ‘change-of-possession’ and ‘change-of-location’ verbs. These two major types of three-place predicates have identical surface frames, as seen in the representative examples in (3), which involve the verb *ataeru* ‘give’ and the verb *okuru* ‘send’.

- (3) a. Ano-hito-ga      kyonen      kodomo-ni      tukue-o      atae-ta.  
          that-man-NOM   last.year   child-DAT   desk-ACC   give-PAST  
          ‘That man gave his child a desk last year.’

- b. Eri-ga                      sensei-ni                      tegami-o                      okut-ta.  
 Eri-NOM                      teacher-to                      letter-ACC                      send-PAST  
 ‘Eri sent a letter to the teacher.’

The verb *ataeru* ‘give’ in (3a) describes abstract transfer of ownership, so the act of ‘giving a desk to the child’ can be successful even if no spatial change takes place. By contrast, the verb *okuru* ‘send’ in (3b) describes a physical change of location, with no change of possession implied.<sup>2</sup> The action described by *okuru*, unlike *ageru*, involves spatial movement of an entity. The two classes of three-place predicates—i.e. change-of-possession and change-of-location verbs—convey distinct meanings, and thus can be distinguished easily in semantic terms.<sup>3</sup>

Direct passivization is possible with the *ni*-marked indirect internal arguments of change-of-possession verbs, but not of change-of-location verbs. Observe that the passive sentence (4a) formed with *ataeru* ‘give’ can have a neutral direct passive interpretation, whereas the passive clause (4b) with *okuru* ‘send’ cannot. (The symbol # indicates that the intended interpretation—in this case, the direct passive interpretation—is not available.)

- (4) a. Kodomo-ga                      kyonen                      tukue-o                      atae-rare-ta.  
 child-NOM                      last.year                      desk-ACC                      give-PASS-PAST  
 ‘The child was given the desk last year.’  
 b. #Sensei-ga                      kinoo                      tegami-o                      okur-rare-ta.  
 teacher-NOM                      yesterday                      letter-ACC                      send-PASS-PAST  
 ‘The teacher was adversely affected by sending a letter yesterday.’

The passive clause (4b) is only interpreted as an adversity (*or* indirect) passive, where the subject is interpreted as emotionally affected—most typically ‘adversely’.<sup>4</sup> As often discussed in the Japanese literature, the ‘affectee’ argument of an adversity passive is conceived as being added to the clause with no promotion of an argument (see e.g. Kageyama 2006, Takezawa and Whitman 1998).<sup>5</sup> This view is plausible enough, since adversity passives based on intransitive verbs do not have active counterparts, as seen in (5) (see Kuno 1973, and others).

- (5) a. John-ga                      kodomo-ni                      nak-are-ta.  
 John-NOM                      child-DAT                      cry-PASS-PAST  
 ‘John got affected by the child’s crying.’  
 b. \*Kodomo-ga                      John-o/John-ni                      nai-ta.  
 child-NOM                      John-ACC/John-DAT                      cry-PAST  
 ‘The child cried on John.’

The passive clause (4b), unlike (4a), is coerced into receiving an ‘adversity’ interpretation. Thus, we can state that the indirect internal argument of the change-of-possession verb *ataeru* ‘give’ can be promoted under direct passivization, whereas the change-of-location verb *okuru* ‘send’ does not allow its indirect internal argument to be promoted to a direct-passive subject.

The difference in the interpretations of the two sentences in (4) cannot be attributed to the possibility or impossibility of applying direct passivization to the clauses at issue,

since the accusative arguments can be turned into passive subjects without problem.

- (6) a. Tukue-ga           kyonen           kodomo-ni       atae-rare-ta.  
       desk-NOM       last.year       child-DAT       give-PASS-PAST  
       ‘The desk was given to the child last year.’  
       b. Tegami-ga   kinoo           sensei-ni       okur-are-ta.  
       letter-NOM   yesterday   teacher-to       send-PASS-PAST  
       ‘The letter was sent to the teacher yesterday.’

Both sentences in (6) can be interpreted as direct passives, suggesting that accusative arguments can be promoted to subjects under direct passivization. Nevertheless, we observe a difference in passivizability with regard to the *ni*-marked arguments, as seen in (4).

The *ni*-marked argument of a change-of-location verb like *okuru* ‘send’ patterns with locative adjuncts. The passive clauses in (7) formed with the verb *hikidasu* ‘withdraw’, which takes a locative-source PP as well as a theme NP (accusative argument), illustrate the point.

- (7) a. Okane-ga           kono-ginkoo-kara       hikidas-are-ta.  
       money-NOM       this-bank-from       withdraw-PASS-PAST  
       ‘Money was withdrawn from this bank.’  
       b. #Kono-ginkoo-ga       okane-o       hikidas-rare-ta.  
       this-bank-NOM       money-ACC       withdraw-PASS-PAST  
       ‘The bank was adversely affected by withdrawing money from there.’

As shown in (7a), the accusative argument of *hikidasu* can be promoted to a direct passive subject. By contrast, *kono-ginkoo* ‘this bank’ in (7b) only counts as an affectee, showing that it cannot be promoted to a subject by direct passivization.

Provided NPs, but not PPs, can be promoted by direct passivization, as (7), we can postulate that the indirect internal argument of *ataeru* ‘give’ is realized as an NP, where *ni* is construed as a dative case marker, whereas *okuru* ‘send’ selects an indirect internal argument realized as a PP, where *ni* represents a postposition.<sup>6</sup> This suggests that the three-place predicate construction headed by a change-possession verb like *ataeru* is construed as a double object construction (equivalent to *John gave Mary a book*), and the other one headed by a change-of-location verb like *okuru* is a postpositional object construction (which is comparable to the prepositional *to*-dative construction *John gave a book to Mary*).

In connection with the distinction of ‘dative case’ versus ‘postposition’, note that the subject of an indirect passive like (4b) does not necessarily have to count as a goal inasmuch as it is regarded as getting emotionally affected. Thus, the goal can be realized as an independent argument in the adversity passive, as in (8).

- (8) #Sensei-wa   zitaku-ni   tegami-o   okur-are-ta.  
      teacher-TOP   home-to   letter-ACC   send-PASS-PAST  
      ‘The teacher was adversely affected by a letter sent to his home.’

In (4a), by contrast, a *ni*-marked argument designating the recipient of *ataeru* ‘give’

cannot be realized independently of the subject without changing its meaning.

- (9) #Kodomo-ga imooto-ni hon-o atae-rare-ta.  
 child-NOM sister-DAT book-ACC give-PASS-PAST  
 ‘The child was adversely affected by giving a book to his sister.’

(9) is interpreted as an adversity passive whose subject counts as an affectee, suggesting that the subject in (9) does not originate as the indirect internal argument of the verb.

As we saw above, three-place verbs behave differently, depending on whether a given verb denotes transfer of possession or a spatial change. The data suggest that the distribution of dative marking is rather limited in Japanese: Dative case marking can be found on the indirect internal arguments among the class of three-place verbs denoting a change of possession, but not a change of location. This conforms to a cross-linguistic tendency for the indirect internal arguments of verbs of transfer of possession to receive dative case, while change-of-location verbs more often taking indirect arguments marked with adpositions (see Van Belle and Van Langendonck 1996).

### 2.3. Goal-Subject Verbs and Source-Subject Verbs

Change-of-possession verbs (as well as change-of-location verbs) are further divided into two sub-classes—one in which the subject serves as a source (referred to as the ‘source-subject’ verb) and the other a goal (referred to as the ‘goal-subject’ verb)—depending on the directionality of described transfer.

- (10) a. Kanadazin-no sensei-ga Eri-ni eigo-o osie-ta.  
 Canadian-GEN teacher-NOM Eri-DAT English-ACC teach-PAST  
 ‘The Canadian teacher taught Eri English.’  
 b. Eri-wa kanadazin-no sensei-ni eigo-o {osowat-ta/narat-ta}.  
 Eri-TOP Canadian-GEN teacher-DAT English-ACC learn-PAST/learn-PAST  
 ‘Eri learned English from a Canadian teacher.’

In (10), *osieru* ‘teach’ is a source-subject verb, whereas *osowaru* ‘learn’ and *narau* ‘learn’ are goal-subject verbs. Japanese has a fairly large number of paired three-place predicates, where the dative case can be assigned to the goal and source that are realized as indirect internal arguments). A representative list of such predicates is provided in (11).<sup>7</sup>

- (11) *ageru/ataeru/kureru* ‘give’ ⇔ *morau* ‘get, receive’  
*sazukeru* ‘furnish’ ⇔ *sazukaru/tamawaru* ‘receive’  
*sasiageru* ‘give’ ⇔ *itadaku* ‘obtain’  
*osieru* ‘teach’ ⇔ *osowaru/narau* ‘learn’  
*tutaeru* ‘transmit’ ⇔ *kiku* ‘overhear’<sup>8</sup>  
*iitukeru* ‘order’ ⇔ *iitukaru* ‘be ordered’  
*ataeru* ‘give (a permission, etc.)’ ⇔ *eru/ukeru/toru* ‘get (a permission, etc.)’

*kariru* ‘borrow’ ( $\Leftrightarrow$  *kasu* ‘lend’/*kaesu* ‘return’);

The list in (11) might not be exhaustive, but we can grasp the overall sense of verbs allowing for dative case marking on indirect internal arguments.<sup>9</sup> Some verbs describe a change of possession that takes place permanently or temporally. Others describe transfer of knowledge (through the mediation of linguistic messages), where possession is conceptualized as involving an extended (metaphorical) use of transfer in possession. Broadly speaking, Japanese allows dative *ni* marking to appear on the goal argument of a source-subject verb expressing transfer of possession, as well as the source argument of its goal-subject counterpart.

In Japanese, many goal-subject verbs include the morpheme *-ar-* as part of verb stem, as in *osowar-u* ‘be taught’ (versus *osieru* ‘teach’), *kotozucar-u* ‘be ordered’ (versus *kotozucker-u* ‘order’), etc. As noted in the Japanese literature (see Okutsu 1967, Noda 1991, Kageyama 1996, 2002, Matsumoto 2000, and others), this morpheme often serves as an ‘intransitivizer’, which reduces the valence of the base verb, like a passive morpheme.<sup>10</sup> In the cases at hand, the morpheme *-ar* can be viewed as signaling the reversal of the thematic relations assigned to the external and indirect internal arguments of three-place predicates. The marked nature of the reversed thematic relations is reflected by a relatively small inventory of goal-subject verbs, for not all source-subject verbs have goal-subject counterparts.

In some cases, the possibility of dative marking assigned to a source argument cannot be determined by looking at verbs in isolation, and some verbs show distinct behavior, according to whether they denote a change in location or in possession. For instance, a verb like *ukeru* ‘receive’ can sometimes mark its source argument in the dative case, but sometimes it cannot.

- (12) Sono-ko-wa sensei-ni {tyuui-o/\*booru-o} uke-ta.  
 that-child-TOP teacher-DAT warning-ACC/ball-ACC receive-PAST  
 ‘That child got a {warning/a ball} from the teacher.’

The difference in acceptability in (12) on the choice of direct internal argument emerges if a dative phrase is present, and is determined depending on what type of event is referred to. When the direct internal argument is *tyuui* ‘warning’, the designated transfer pertains to linguistic messages transmitted from *sensei* ‘the teacher’ to *sono-ko* ‘that child’, where possession is conceptualized. In this case, a dative argument designating a goal is allowed to occur. By contrast, when the object is *booru* ‘ball’, a spatial change from *sensei* to *sono-ko* is expressed. In this case, a dative-marked source cannot appear, since no change of possession is conceptualized.

A similar point can be made with regard to the contrast in acceptability observed in (13), in which the verb *kiku* ‘hear’ is used.

- (13) Ano-hito-wa rinzin-ni {sono-uwasa-o/\*uta-goe-o} kii-ta.  
 that-man-TOP neighbor-DAT that-rumor-ACC/singing-voice-ACC hear-PAST  
 ‘That man heard {the rumor/the singing voice} from his neighbor.’

The verb *kiku* allows its indirect internal argument to be marked with dative case if the transfer invoked in the form of a linguistic message (as *uwasa* ‘rumor’), which induces

the conceptualization of a change of possession. If the transmission merely pertains to physical sounds (as *uta-goe* ‘singing voice’), no change of possession is conceptualized, which makes a dative argument unavailable. The facts illustrate that it is necessary to look at the type of event described by the verb plus object in order to determine the class of three-place predicates.

In this connection, observe that a postposition generally reflects a fixed grammatical relation. Thus, in (14a), which involves an intransitive motion verb like *deru* ‘go out’, the *ni*-marked argument cannot be interpreted as a source.

- (14) a. John-wa                    {dookutu-kara/soto-ni}    de-te                    ki-ta.  
           John-TOP                cave-from/outside-to       go.out-TE                come-PST  
           ‘John went {out of the cave/to the outside}.’  
       b. \*Soto-ga                John-ni                    de-rare-ta.  
           outside-NOM        John-by                    go.out-PASS-PST  
           (Lit.) ‘The outside was gone out by John.’

The *ni*-marked argument of *deru* ‘go out’ cannot be promoted to a passive subject (14b), and *ni* can be replaced with another goal postposition *e* ‘to’, as in *soto-e de-ta* [outside-to go.out-PAST], which would not be possible for a dative case marker. Thus we can assume that this argument serves as a PP. The fact that *deru* allows a source argument to appear only if it is marked with *kara* (14a) shows that the locative postposition *ni* is not usable for indicating ‘source’.

#### 2.4. The Animacy Constraint

As often discussed (see Jackendoff 1983, 1990, Pinker 1989, Van Valin and LaPolla 1997 and others), ‘possession’ is a semantic notion closely related to ‘location’. These two semantic relations display a number of distinct properties, however, even though they often show parallelisms. One notable semantic difference that distinguishes change-of-possession from change-of-location verbs is found in the susceptibility to the animacy restriction: The indirect internal argument of a change-of-possession verb must qualify as a possessor, hence, is confined to an animate entity (see Pinker 1989, Kishimoto 2005). As shown in (15), it is not possible for *ataeru* ‘give’ to have an inanimate noun as its *ni*-marked argument, while *okuru* ‘send’ allows for an inanimate *ni*-marked argument.

- (15) a. Hahaoya-wa            {kodomo-ni/\*Tokyo-ni}    okane-o                    atae-ta.  
           mother-TOP            child-DAT/Tokyo-DAT    money-ACC                give-PAST  
           ‘Mother gave {the child/Tokyo} money.’  
       b. Hahaoya-wa            {kodomo-ni/Tokyo-ni}    nimotu-o                    okut-ta.  
           mother-TOP            child-to/Tokyo-to        package-ACC                send-PAST  
           ‘Mother sent the package to {the child/Tokyo}.’

Likewise, the difference in acceptability between the two examples in (20) accrues from the animacy constraint.

- (16) a. Kodomo-wa {sakana-ni/\*sakana-no ike-ni} esa-o age-ta.  
 child-TOP fish-DAT/fish-GEN pond-DAT bait-ACC give-PAST  
 ‘The child gave a bait to {the fish/the fish pond}.’
- b. Kodomo-wa {sensei-ni/sensei-no uti-ni} tegami-o okut-ta.  
 child-TOP teacher-to/teacher-GEN home-to letter-ACC send-PAST  
 ‘The child sent the letter to {the teacher/the teacher’s home}.’

Since only an animate noun qualifies as the goal argument of *ageru* ‘give’, the animate *sakana* ‘fish’ cannot be replaced with *sakana-no ike* ‘fish pond’, which is only interpreted as a location (16a). In (16b), by contrast, *sensei* ‘teacher’ is construed as a location—the goal for the letter to reach via spatial movement (with no transfer of possession denoted)—despite the fact that it refers to an animate entity. In this case, since *sensei* is identified as a locative-goal, it can be replaced with an inanimate locative expression like *sensei-no uti* ‘teacher’s home’.

### 2.7. Summary

In this section, by looking at various empirical facts, including passivization and the animacy constraint, we have observed that three-place predicates (change-of-location and change-of-possession verbs) are divided into source-subject and goal-subject verbs. We have argued that both goal-subject and source-subject versions of change-of-possession verbs assign dative case to their indirect internal arguments, whereas other types of three-place verbs assign oblique marking to their indirect internal arguments.

## 3. MORPHOLOGICAL MARKING AND SEMANTICS

### 3.1. Alternate Marking

Having looked at the nature of *ni*-marking assigned to three place predicates, we now turn to the discussion of the alternating morphology of indirect internal arguments. Let us begin by observing that source-subject verbs denoting a change of location allows their indirect internal arguments to be marked with *e* ‘to, toward’ as an alternative marking to *ni*, as illustrated in (17).

- (17) John-ga {Mary-ni/Mary-e} tegami-o okut-ta.  
 John-NOM Mary-to/Mary-to letter-ACC send-PAST  
 ‘John sent a letter toward Mary.’

We can hypothesize here that *e* ‘to, toward’ can be used to designate a locative-goal. Note that *e* could indicate an endpoint (as in *kenkyuusitu-e kuru* [office-to come] ‘coming to the office’) or just a direction (as in *Tokyo-e mukau* [Tokyo-toward head] ‘head toward Tokyo’). The same change in the morphological marking cannot be effected on the indirect internal arguments of change-of-possession verbs, however, as observed by Kishimoto (2001).

- (18) a. John-ga {Eri-ni/??Eri-e} hon-o age-ta.  
           John-NOM Eri-DAT/Eri-to book-ACC give-PAST  
           ‘John gave Eri a book.’  
       b. Sono-sensei-ga {Eri-ni/??Eri-e} eigo-o osie-ta.  
           that-teacher-NOM Eri-DAT/Eri-to English-ACC teach-PAST  
           ‘That teacher taught Eri English.’

In (18b), the verb *osieru* ‘teach’ describes transfer of knowledge, which is a sub-type of event conceptualized as a change of possession. Thus, both of the three-place verbs in (18) can be said to fall into the class of change-of-possession verbs. The data suggest then that the locative marking *e* ‘to’ is not compatible with the recipient (possessor) argument of a change-of-possession verb.

Goal-subject verbs differ from source-subject verbs, in that the oblique *kara* marking can appear on the indirect internal arguments of both types of three-place verbs. The examples in (19) illustrate that change-of-location verbs allow their indirect internal arguments to be marked only with *kara* ‘from’.

- (19) Eri-wa {sensei-kara/\*sensei-ni} tegami-o uketot-ta.  
       Eri-TOP teacher-from/teacher-DAT letter-ACC receive-PAST  
       ‘Eri received a letter from the teacher.’

The impossibility of *ni* marking on the indirect internal argument in (19) comes from the fact that the locative *ni* cannot designate a starting point. By contrast, the source arguments of change-of-possession verbs can be marked with *kara*, alongside *ni*.

- (20) a. Eri-ga {John-ni/John-kara} hon-o morat-ta.  
           Eri-NOM John-DAT/John-from book-ACC get-PAST  
           ‘Eri got a book from John.’  
       b. Eri-ga {sono-sensei-ni/sono-sensei-kara} Eigo-o osowat-ta.  
           Eri-NOM that-teacher-DAT/that-teacher-from English-ACC be.taught-PAST  
           ‘Eri was taught English from that teacher.’

Both examples in (20) are fully acceptable with the source arguments accompanying the postposition *kara* ‘from’, showing that the ‘*ni-kara*’ alternation can be freely implemented on the goal-subject variants of change-of-possession verbs.

We can derive the following generalization from the data. With change-of-possession verbs, both goal and source arguments can be assigned dative case *ni*. (21) illustrates the morphological patterns of the arguments that change-of-possession verbs can take.

(21) Argument type	External Arg	Indirect Internal Arg	Direct Internal Arg
Source-subject verb	-ga	-ni/??-e	-o
Goal-subject verb	-ga	-ni/-kara	-o

For change-of-location verbs, by contrast, the indirect internal argument representing a locative-goal can be marked by *ni*. Here, *ni* counts as a postposition (which can alternate with *e* ‘to’) rather than a dative case marker. In addition, the indirect internal argument

of a goal-subject verb can never receive *ni* marking, the only possibility being the oblique *kara* marking. (22) shows the morphological patterns obtained for change-of-location verbs.

(22)	Argument type	External Arg	Indirect Internal Arg	Direct Internal Arg
	Source-subject verb	- <i>ga</i>	- <i>ni/-e</i>	- <i>o</i>
	Goal-subject verb	- <i>ga</i>	- <i>kara/*-ni</i>	- <i>o</i>

It should be mentioned at this point that with goal-subject verbs, the difference in the source marking gives rise to a difference in the susceptibility to the animacy constraint. When their source arguments receive *ni* marking, they cannot refer to inanimate entities.

- (23) a. Eri-wa {otoosan-*ni*/\*otoosan-no tyokinbako-*ni*} okene-o morat-ta.  
 Eri-TOP father-DAT/father-GEN piggybank-DAT money-ACC get-PAST  
 ‘Eri got money from {her father/her father’s piggybank}.’  
 b. **Kare**-wa {kare-*ni*/\*kare-no kuti-*ni* zika-*ni*} sono-koto-o kii-ta.  
 he-TOP he-DAT/he-GEN mouth-DAT directly that-fact-ACC hear-PAST  
 ‘He heard that fact from {him/his mouth}.’

While *ni*-marked arguments are constrained by the animacy constraint, this constraint is voided if *kara* substitutes for *ni*, as seen in (24).

- (24) a. Eri-wa {otoosan-*kara*/otoosan-no tyokinbako-*kara*} okene-o morat-ta.  
 Eri-TOP father-from/father-GEN piggybank-from money-ACC get-PAST  
 ‘Eri got money from {her father/her father’s piggybank}.’  
 b. John-wa {kare-*kara*/kare-no kuti-*kara* zikani} sono-koto-o kii-ta.  
 John-TOP he-from/he-GEN mouth-from directly that-fact-ACC hear-PAST  
 ‘John heard that story from {him/his mouth directly}.’

The animacy effect is voided for the *kara*-marked indirect internal arguments of goal-subject verbs, because they do not count as possessors.

### 3.2. Passivization of Goal-Subject Verbs

Goal-subject verbs expressing transfer of possession—including *kariru* ‘borrow’, *toru* ‘take’, and *eru* ‘get’, which are categorized as change-of-possession verbs—show peculiar behavior, in that when they take dative phrases, accusative arguments are prevented from getting turned into passive subjects.

- (25) a. Eri-ga sensei-*ni* sono-enpitu-o kari-ta.  
 Eri-NOM teacher-DAT that-pencil-ACC borrow-PAST  
 ‘Eri borrowed that pencil from the teacher.’  
 b. \*Sono-enpitu-ga (sensei-niyotte) Eri-*ni* kari-rare-ta.  
 that-pencil-NOM sensei-by Eri-DAT borrow-PASS-PAST  
 ‘That pencil was borrowed from Eri (by John).’

As seen in (25b), passivization cannot apply to (25a) (and since the subject is inanimate, an adversity passive interpretation is not available, as well).<sup>11</sup> If, however, the source is

marked with *kara* ‘from’, the accusative phrase can be turned into a direct passive subject.

- (26) a. Eri-ga                      sensei-kara              sono-enpitu-o      kari-ta.  
           Eri-NOM                  teacher-from        that-pencil-ACC    borrow-PAST  
           ‘Eri borrowed that pencil from the teacher.’  
       b. Sono-enpitu-ga                  Eri-kara                  kari-rare-ta.  
           that-pencil-NOM                  Eri-from                  borrow-PASS-PAST  
           ‘That pencil was borrowed from Eri.’

This shows that the *ni*-marked source argument realized as an NP impedes the passivization of a direct internal argument (the theme). Likewise, the source argument of a goal-subject verb cannot be promoted to subject under direct passivization.

- (27) #Eri-ga      sono-enpitu-o      kari-rare-ta.  
           Eri-NOM      that-pencil-ACC    borrow-PASS-PAST  
           ‘Eri was adversely affected by getting that pencil borrowed.’

(27) is understood to be an adversity passive, but not a direct one, showing that no promotion of the indirect internal argument (source) to a passive subject can take place. This effect is not observed for locative expressions even if they are marked with *ni* morphologically.

- (28) a. Hannin-ga              kabe-ni                  simon-o                  nokosi-te                  i-ta.  
           criminal-NOM      wall-on                  fingerprint-ACC      leave-PTCP              be-PAST  
           ‘The criminal left a fingerprint on the wall.’  
       b. Simon-ga              kabe-ni      nokos-are-te      i-ta.  
           fingerprint-NOM    wall-on    leave-PASS-PTCP    be-PAST  
           ‘A fingerprint was left on the wall.’

The data show that direct passivization fails when three-place verbs take non-canonical dative arguments—i.e. indirect internal arguments that do not count as goals, as in (25b).

Kageyama (2002) suggests that the possibility of direct passivization is closely tied to the semantic parameter of agentivity, and that direct passivization is possible only with agentive verbs. However, ‘agentivity’ does not play a role in determining the difference in acceptability between (25b) and (26b), which is differentiated by the type of source marking. To make this point, observe that source-subject verbs are in most cases agentive, so they can readily form imperative forms.

- (29) a. John-wa                  seito-ni                  eigo-o                  osie-ta.  
           John-TOP                  student-DAT              English-ACC              teach-PAST  
           ‘John taught the students English.’  
       b. Seito-ni                  sikkarito                  eigo-o                  osie-nasai.  
           student-DAT              hard                  English-ACC              teach-IMP  
           ‘Teach the students English hard.’

With *osieru* ‘teach’, we can find the two variants of direct passive clauses, since either

the recipient or the theme argument may appear as the subject of the direct passive.

- (30) a. Eigo-ga seito-ni osie-rare-ta.  
 English-NOM student-DAT teach-PASS-PAST  
 ‘English was taught to the students.’  
 b. Gakusei-ga eigo-o osie-rare-ta.  
 student-NOM English-ACC teach-PASS-PAST  
 ‘The students were taught English.’

Next, many goal-subject verbs including *osowaru* ‘learn’ and *kotozukaru* ‘be ordered’ can in no way undergo passivization, as exemplified in (31).

- (31) a. Eri-ga {sensei-ni/sensei-kara} eigo-o osowat-ta.  
 Eri-NOM teacher-DAT/teacher-from English-ACC be.taught-PAST  
 ‘Eri learned English from the teacher.’  
 b. \*Sensei-ga eigo-o osowar-are-ta.  
 teacher-NOM English-ACC learn-PASS-PAST  
 ‘The teacher was learned English.’  
 c. \*Eigo-ga {sensei-ni/sensei-kara} osowar-are-ta.  
 English-NOM teacher-DAT/teacher-from learn-PASS-PAST  
 ‘English was learned from the teacher.’

Sentences (31b) and (31c) are excluded on the grounds that the verb has the morpheme *-ar-*, as in *osowar-u*, which imposes a morphological restriction precluding the passive morpheme *(r)are* from attaching to the verb.<sup>12</sup>

Note, however, that the source-subject verbs *kariru* ‘borrow’, which does not include the morpheme *-ar-*, can undergo direct passivization if the source is marked with *kara* ‘from’, as shown in (26b), but cannot undergo direct passivization if accompanied by a dative-marked source argument, as in (25b).<sup>13</sup> In Kageyama (2002), direct passivization is analyzed as invoking suppression of an agent argument. One might argue then that (25b) should be excluded on the grounds that *kariru* ‘borrow’ counts as non-agentive when it takes a *kara*-marked argument. On the contrary, in the light of (32), we can reasonably state that the verb counts as agentive irrespective of whether the source is marked with dative case or *kara* ‘from’.

- (32) {Sensei-ni/Sensei-kara} hon-o kari-nasai.  
 teacher-DAT/teacher-from book-ACC borrow-IMP  
 ‘Borrow the book from the teacher.’

Imperative forms can be constructed from agentive verbs. Thus *kariru* should always be agentive since it can form an imperative regardless of the type of source marking. In fact, many other source-subject verbs like *eru* ‘obtain’, *toru* ‘take’, and *tori-tukeru* ‘take-attach(=take)’, if not all, are agentive, as seen in the well-formedness of imperative forms in (33a).<sup>14</sup>

- (33) a. {Ano-sensei-kara/Ano-sensei-ni} kyoka-o e-nasai.  
 that-teacher-from/that-teacher-DAT permission-ACC obtain-IMP  
 ‘Obtain a permission from that teacher.’  
 b. Kyoka-ga {ano-sensei-kara/\*ano-sensei-ni} e-rare-ta.  
 permission-NOM teacher-from/teacher-DAT obtain-PASS-PAST  
 ‘A permission was obtained from that teacher.’

Here again, passivization is possible if the verbs take *kara*-marked arguments, but not *ni*-marked arguments, as seen in (33b). The data show clearly that agentivity cannot be responsible for the difference in the passivizability of (25b) and (26b). If so, we can say that passivization is prevented from applying to source-subject verbs taking dative arguments, and that agentivity is not held responsible for determining the passivizability of the goal-subject verbs at issue.

### 3.3. Verbs Showing Peculiar Behavior

Three-place verbs of commercial transaction include source-subject verbs *uru* ‘sell’, *harau* ‘pay’, *tyuumon-suru* ‘order’, as well as goal-subject verbs *kau* ‘buy’, *te-ni ireru* ‘buy’, *soozoku-suru* ‘inherit’. Some representative examples are given in (34).

- (34) a. John-wa Mary-ni toti-o ut-ta.  
 John-TOP Mary-to land-ACC sell-PAST  
 ‘John sold the land to Mary.’  
 b. John-wa Mary-kara toti-o kat-ta.  
 John-TOP Mary-from land-ACC buy-PAST  
 ‘John bought the land from Mary.’

The peculiarity of this class of verbs consists in the fact that they code both change of possession and change of location simultaneously, as discussed by Kishimoto (2001). We can confirm the special status of verbs of commercial transaction. In the first place, the examples in (35) indicate that the indirect internal arguments count as possessors constrained by the animacy constraint.

- (35) a. John-wa {Mary-ni/?\*Mary-no konpyuutaa-ni} toti-o ut-ta.  
 John-TOP Mary-to/Mary-GEN computer-to land-ACC sell-PAST  
 ‘John sold the land to {Mary/Mary’s computer}.’  
 b. John-wa {Mary-kara/?\*Mary-no konpyuutaa-kara} toti-o kat-ta.  
 John-TOP Mary-from/Mary-GEN computer-from land-ACC buy-PAST  
 ‘John bought the land from {Mary/Mary’s computer}.’

This shows that the conceptualization of a change of possession is involved in verbs of commercial transaction. Note that the examples are rendered acceptable when *Mary-no konpyuutaa* ‘Mary’s computer’ is replaced with *kaisya* ‘company’ or *zimusyo* ‘office’. This is because the NPs representing organizational bodies may fall into the class of expressions ruled in by the animacy constraint. This state of affairs is expected because the notion of ‘animacy’ is sometimes extended to include corporate bodies and organizations, perhaps via metonymy, as often observed by the animacy constraint imposed on the English double object construction, e.g. *John sent {Mary/the*

*government/\*the border} the letter* (see, e.g. Green 1974, Oehrle 1976, Levin 1993).

Notably, with the verb *kau* ‘buy’, the animacy constraint is observed even if the goal is marked with *kara* ‘from’. In fact, the goal-subject verb *kau* ‘buy’ cannot have a source argument marked with dative case, as seen in (36).

- (36) John-wa {ano-hito-kara/\*ano-hito-ni} hon-o kat-ta.  
 John-TOP that-man-from/that-man-DAT book-ACC buy-PAST  
 ‘John bought books from that man.’

(36) shows that the animacy constraint obtains even if verbs of commercial transaction take *kara*-arguments. In any event, the data illustrate that ‘possession’ should constitute part of the lexical meaning for verbs of commercial transaction.

We can postulate that a change of location is conceptualized as part of the lexical meaning of the verbs of commercial transaction as well. This is evidenced by the fact that this type of verb can often be replaced by a simple change-of-location verb. This is exemplified in (37).

- (37) a. Kono-hon-wa moo zenbu de-te simai-masi-ta  
 this-book-TOP already all go.out-TE finish-POLITE-PAST  
 ‘The books were already sold out.’  
 b. Koko-de-wa itumo sono-omise-kara sinamono-o ire-ru.  
 here-at-TOP always that-shop-from commodity-ACC let.in-PAST  
 ‘Here, commodities are always purchased from that shop.’

Embedded in an appropriate context in which both speaker and hearer share the assumption that some transaction is going on, the verbs in (35) can be taken to describe the act of buying or selling; *deru* ‘go out’ can mean ‘to be sold’, while *ireru* ‘let in’ can mean ‘to purchase’. Note that this type of replacement is not possible with change-of-possession verbs.

- (38) #John-ga kodomo-ni okasi-o {ire-ta/dasi-ta}.  
 John-NOM child-DAT sweet-ACC let.in-PAST/let.out-PAST  
 ‘John sent the sweets to the child.’

(38) is not understood to mean that John gave the sweets to the child, due to the fact that a verb like *agaeru* ‘give’ does not denote a spatial change. On the other hand, if a verb encodes a change of location as part of its meaning, as *yuusoo-suru* ‘mail’, it can readily be replaced with a simple motion verb like *dasu* ‘send out’.

- (39) John-ga kodomo-ni tegami-o {yuusoo-si-ta/dasi-ta}.  
 John-NOM child-DAT letter-ACC mail-PAST/send.out-PAST  
 ‘John {mailed/sent out} the letter to the child.’

As a general rule, a simple change-of-location verb can replace a verb expressing a change of location along with certain additional meanings (e.g. a manner of motion). Thus, the presence of conventional commercial expressions making use of simple change-of-location verbs in (37) is naturally expected if verbs of commercial transaction

encode a change of location as a grammatically relevant part of lexical meaning.

Some commercial transactions, such as those selling and buying rights, contracts, a large building etc., are not likely to be associated with a physical change of location. Nevertheless, we can readily find expressions where motion verbs like *dasu* ‘take out’ and *modosu* ‘return’ are used to describe the events, e.g. *{biru-o/meimei-no kenri-o} uri-ni dasu* (building-ACC/naming-GEN rights-ACC sale-for take.out) ‘take out the building/naming rights for sale’ and *{biru-o/kenri-o} kai-modosu* (building-ACC/rights-ACC purchase-return) ‘return the building/rights by purchasing (=repurchase the building/rights)’. This should be possible if a locational change is conceptualized with commercial transaction verbs.

Observe at this point that the source-subject verb *uru* ‘sell’ does not allow its associated *ni*-marked argument to be turned into a passive subject. This is illustrated in the examples below.

- (40) a. Gengogaku-no hon-ga kinoo John-ni ur-are-ta.  
 linguistics-GEN book-NOM yesterday John-to sell-PASS-PAST  
 ‘Linguistics books were sold to John yesterday.’  
 b. #John-wa kinoo gengogaku-no hon-o ur-are-ta.  
 John-TOP yesterday linguistics-GEN book-ACC sell-PASS-PAST  
 ‘John was adversely affected by being sold linguistics books yesterday.’

(40b) is only interpreted as an ‘adversity’ passive, indicating that the verbs of commercial transaction, which conceptualize both movement and possession, behave like change-of-location verbs with regard to passivization.

Interestingly, direct passivization is possible with a goal-subject verb like *kau* ‘buy’ when a locative expression is present, whereas passivization cannot apply when the verb takes a *kara*-marked argument.

- (41) Kono-hon-wa {?\*ano-hito-kara/kono-mise-de} kaw-are-ta.  
 this-book-TOP that-person-from/this-shop-at buy-PASS-PAST  
 ‘This book was bought {from that person/at this shop}.’

When a *kara*-marked argument is not present, the verb *kau* ‘buy’ denotes ‘caused possession’ (in the sense of Rappaport Hovav and Levin 2008), rather than the transfer of possession (through the act of purchasing). Note that the *kara*-marked argument of *kau* is construed as a possessor, which is constrained by the animacy constraint. Here, it is instructive to see how goal-subject verbs differ in their passivizability, in relation to the type of marking appearing on an indirect internal argument.

(42)	Marking	Animacy	Promotion of Argument
Change-of-possession verb	-ni/-kara	√/NA	*/√
Verbs of commercial transaction	-kara	√	*

From (42), it should be apparent that the passivizability of goal-subject verbs does not tightly correlate with the type of morphological marking on the indirect internal argument. Rather, the fact should be accounted for in semantic terms, since direct passivization is not possible with an indirect internal argument that counts as a

possessor.

Compound verbs like *kiki-tukeru* ‘overhear’ and *kiki-oyobu* ‘hear about’ provide further evidence that the dative case is made unavailable if a motional meaning is added to a change-of-possession verb. These verbs—derived via compounding *kiku* ‘hear’ with motion verbs—stand in stark contrast to the base verb, in that they do not allow dative case to be assigned to the source.

- (43) John-wa tomodati-ni uwasa-o {kii-ta/?\*kiki-tuke-ta/\*kiki-oyon-da}.  
 John-TOP friend-DAT rumor-ACC hear-PAST/hear-attach-PAST/hear-reach-PAST  
 ‘John {heard/overheard/heard about} the rumor from his friend.’

The compound verbs carry the sense that the information comes from an individual in a remote place, due to the presence of the second verbs, which express motional meanings in one way or another. Since the compound verbs cannot assign dative case to their indirect internal arguments, they must be marked with the postposition *kara* ‘from’, as shown in (44).

- (44) John-wa tomodati-kara uwasa-o {kii-ta/kiki-tuke-ta/kiki-oyon-da}.  
 John-TOP friend-from rumor-ACC hear-PAST/hear-attach-PAST/hear-reach-PAST  
 ‘John {heard/overheard/heard about} the rumor from his friend.’

The distribution of dative marking in the compound verb constructions with *kiki-tukeru* and *kiki-oyobu* suggests that *kiku* ‘hear’—which originally falls into the class of change-of-possession verb—loses the ability to take a dative-marked source when it is compounded with motion verbs.

### 3.4. Summary

In this section, we have seen that the replacement of *kara* with *ni* is possible with goal-subject versions of change-of-possession verbs, despite the fact that their source-subject counterparts do not allow alternative marking to be instantiated. It has also been seen that goal-subject versions of change-of-possession verbs as well as verbs of commercial transaction show peculiar behavior, in that direct passivization is precluded when their indirect internal arguments are constrained by the animacy constraint.

## 4. CONCLUDING REMARKS

In this article, it has been shown that the distribution of *ni* marking assigned to the indirect internal argument of a three-place verb can be optimally characterized on the basis of the verb’s inherent lexical meaning. The central claim of this paper is that in Japanese, dative case, which is a particle attached to a nominal, is assigned to an internal argument that is construed as a possessor. It has been observed that dative case assignment is implemented regardless of whether the indirect internal argument is construed as a source or a goal. We have shown that the source argument of a change-of-location verb cannot be marked with *ni*. Furthermore, the facts of verbs of commercial transaction as well as compound verbs reveal that dative case is closely linked to the semantic notion of possession.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> The terms are often used differently in different frameworks. For some typological frameworks, particles are seen as constituting ‘case marker’ and ‘postposition’ at the same time, where the classification is primary based on surface forms. In contrast, in the present paper, we follow the terminology standardly used in syntactic analyses which posit the distinction between noun phrases and postpositional phrases. Accordingly, this paper maintains that a case marker constitutes a grammatical marker that is attached to a noun projecting a noun phrase. On the other hand, a postposition is regarded as an oblique marker projecting a postpositional phrase. For thematic relations, the labels ‘source’ and ‘goal’ are used to designate a starting point and an endpoint specified by both change-of-possession and change-of-location verbs.

<sup>2</sup> Japanese has an expression like *me-de aizu-o okuru* [eye-with signal-ACC send] ‘send a signal with an eye’. Here, what happens in the real world would be the sendee’s recognizing the sender’s signal of a wink, and nothing is really moved between the two individuals. Nevertheless, the verb *okuru* ‘send’ is used to express a change of location, since the event is conceptually construed as receiving a signal from the sender in a separate location.

<sup>3</sup> Some three-place verbs of the source-subject type are ambiguous. For instance, *watasu* ‘hand’ can be used as a change-of-possession verb, when it denotes transfer of possession and the indirect internal argument must be animate.

- (i) John-wa {Mary-ni/\*Mary-no heya-ni} hon-o watasi-ta.  
 John-TOP Mary-DAT/Mary-GEN room-DAT book-ACC hand-PAST  
 ‘John handed {Mary/Mary’s room} a book.’

When the verb is used in this sense, the dative as well as the accusative argument can undergo direct passivization, as indicated by the well-formedness of (ii).

- (ii) a. Sono-toki Mary-ga hon-o watas-are-ta.  
 that-time Mary-NOM book-ACC hand-PASS-PAST  
 ‘At that time, Mary was handed a book.’  
 b. Sono-toki hon-ga Mary-ni watas-are-ta.  
 that-time book-NOM Mary-DAT hand-PASS-PAST  
 ‘At that time, a book was handed to Mary.’

The same verb could be used as a change-of-location verb. In this usage, the verb describes physical movement, and the indirect internal argument can be inanimate.

- (iii) John-wa taigan-ni kuruma-o watasi-ta.  
 John-TOP other.shore-to car-ACC get.across-PAST  
 ‘John moved the car to the other side of the shore.’

In this case, direct passivization can only apply to the accusative argument.

- (iv) a. \*Taigan-ga kuruma-o watas-are-ta.  
 other.shore-NOM car-ACC get.across-PASS-PAST  
 ‘The other shore was the place where the car was moved.’  
 b. Kuruma-ga taigan-ni watas-are-ta.  
 car-NOM other.shore-to get.across-PASS-PAST  
 ‘The car was moved to the other side of the shore.’

The patterns of distribution confirm the two-way classification of three-place predicates.

<sup>4</sup> Even though the interpretive effect triggered by this passivization is not necessarily limited to an adverse one, the term ‘adversity passive’ commonly used in the Japanese literature is adopted.

<sup>5</sup> There are other phenomena pointing to the conclusion that the subjects of adversity passives do not involve promotion to subjects. First, as discussed by Kageyama (2006), adversity passives allow a long distance relation, which would not be possible with direct passives.

- (i) B-si-ga Newsweek-ni [(zibun<sub>i</sub>-ga) supai-da toyuu] kizi-o happyoo-s-are-ta.  
 B-Mr-TOP Newsweek-DAT self-NOM spy-is that article-ACC publish-do-PASS-PAST  
 ‘Mr. B was annoyed by Newsweek’s publication of an article which claimed he was a spy.’

In (i), the passive subject can be coreferential with a resumptive pronoun, which can optionally appear in the noun complement clause. Second, Takezawa and Whitman (1998) argue for the base-generation of the subject of an adversity passive by way of quantifier floating.

- (ii) \*Kodomo-ga ame-ni san-nin hur-are-ta.  
 child-NOM rain-DAT three-CL fall-PASS-PAST  
 ‘Three children got rained on.’

As argued by Miyagawa (1989), if the affectee argument originates as an object, the floating quantifier can be associated with it. The unacceptability of (ii) indicates that the adversity passive does not involve promotion from a direct object.

<sup>6</sup> For other criteria for making this distinction, see Kishimoto (2001) and the following discussion. For a psycholinguistic study based on this proposal, see Tamura (2007). In recent Japanese literature, a number of works such as Miyagawa and Tsujioka (2004) propose similar two-way distinctions of three-place predicates.

<sup>7</sup> Verbs like *ageru* ‘give’ and *morau* ‘obtain’ can be used as auxiliary verbs, as seen in (i).

- (i) a. John-wa Mary-ni ki-te morat-ta.  
 John-TOP Mary-DAT come-PTCP get-PAST  
 ‘John had Mary come.’  
 b. John-wa Mary-ni tegami-o kai-te age-ta.  
 John-TOP Mary-DAT letter-ACC write-PTCP give-PAST  
 ‘John wrote a letter for Mary.’

Even when used as auxiliary verbs, *ageru* and *morau* can have arguments marked in the dative case. Conceivably, the auxiliary verbs implement the same mechanisms of morphological marking as main verbs.

<sup>8</sup> The verb *kiku* ‘hear’ should not be confused with the homonymous verb *kiku* meaning ‘ask’. The latter verb is not relevant for the present discussion.

<sup>9</sup> Some goal-subject verbs do not have true source-subject counterparts, but verbs indicating approximate counter-transfer are included in the list.

<sup>10</sup> Some authors (e.g. Matsumoto 2000) views that the goal-subject verbs also involve the reduction of arguments, but the present analysis differs, since it is viewed that this class of verbs does not involve valence reduction.

<sup>11</sup> The sentence can be accepted under an irrelevant interpretation in which the *ni*-marked argument is taken as a demoted subject when the *niyotte* phrase (i.e. *by*-phrase) is dropped.

<sup>12</sup> We can assume that this morphological constraint is derived from the fact that these two morphemes have the same origin (see Matsumoto 2000). The addition of the passive morpheme to the verb with the morpheme *-ar-* is excluded due to an illicit double passive sequence.

<sup>13</sup> In the case of *morau* ‘get’, the theme needs to be an animate noun representing a pet or a human for passive formation to be successful, but the relevant paradigms still emerge. In the first place, when the clause has a dative phrase representing source, no direct passivization is possible.

- (i) a. \*Kono-neko-wa ano-hito-ni moraw-are-ta.  
 this-cat-TOP that-man-DAT get-PASS-PAST  
 ‘This cat went to that man.’  
 b. \*Ano-hito-ga neko-o moraw-are-ta.  
 that-man-NOM cat-ACC get-PASS-PAST  
 ‘That man got the cat.’

(ia) is not acceptable on the interpretation where the dative phrase counts as a source (but it is acceptable if interpreted as an obliquely-marked agent/goal nominal). In the second, when a *kara*-phrase is present, direct passivization is possible.

- (ii) Kono-otokonoko-wa zyuunen-mae koziin-kara moraw-are-te  
 this-boy-TOP ten.years-ago orphan’s.home-from get-PASS-PTCP  
 yoosi-tosite sodate-rare-ta.  
 adopted.child-as raise-PASS-PAST  
 ‘This boy came from an orphan’s home ten years ago, and was raised as an adopted child.’

<sup>14</sup> Some verbs such as *moositukaru/kotozukaru/oosetukaru* ‘be given (a message)’ are inherently non-agentive.

## REFERENCES

- Anderson, John M. 1977. *On case grammar*. London: Croom Helm.
- Blake, Barry J. 1994. *Case*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Blansitt, Edward L. 1988. Datives and allatives. In Michael Hammond; Edith Moravcsik & Jessica Wirth (eds.) *Studies in syntactic typology*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 173-191.
- Croft, William 1990. *Syntactic categories and grammatical relations*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Goldberg, Adele E. 1995. *Constructions: A construction grammar approach to argument structure*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Goldberg, Adele E. 2006. *Constructions at work: The nature of generalization in language*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Green, Georgia 1974. *Semantics and syntactic regularity*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Harley, Heidi 2003. Possession and the double object construction. *Linguistic Variation Yearbook* 2, 31-70.
- Haspelmath, Martin 2003. The geometry of grammatical meaning: Semantic maps and cross-linguistic comparison. In Michael Tomasello (ed.) *The new psychology of language vol. 2*. Mahwah, NJ: Laurence Erlbaum. 211-242.
- Jackendoff, Ray 1983. *Semantics and cognition*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Jackendoff, Ray 1990. *Semantic structures*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Janda, Laura 1993. The shape of the indirect object in central and eastern Europe. *The Slavic and East European Journal* 37, 533-563.
- Kageyama, Taro 1996. *Doosi imiron* (Verb Semantics). Tokyo: Kurosio.
- Kageyama, Taro 2002. Hitaikaku-koozoo-no tadoosi (Transitive verbs with unaccusative structures). In Takane Ito (ed.) *Bunpooriron: Lexicon-to Toogo* (Grammatical Theory: Lexicon and syntax). Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press. 119-145.
- Kageyama, Taro 2006. Property description as a voice phenomenon. In Tasaku Tsunoda and Taro Kageyama (eds.) *Voice and grammatical relations*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 85-114.
- Kishimoto, Hideki 2001. The role of lexical meanings in argument encoding: Double object verbs in Japanese. *Gengokenkyu* (Language Research) 120, 35-65.
- Kishimoto, Hideki 2005. *Toogokoozoo-to Bunpookankei* (Syntactic Structure and Grammatical Relations). Tokyo: Kurosio.
- Kuno, Susumu 1973. *The structure of the Japanese language*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Levin, Beth 1993. *English verb classes and alternations: A preliminary investigation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Levin, Beth & Malka Rappaport Hovav 2005. *Argument realization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Malchukov, Andrej, Martin Haspelmath & Bernard Comrie 2007. Ditransitive constructions: A typological overview. ms. Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology.
- Maling, Joan 2001. Dative: The heterogeneity of the mapping among morphological case, grammatical functions and thematic roles. *Lingua* 111, 419-464.
- Martin, Samuel 1975. *A reference grammar of Japanese*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Matsumoto, Yo 2000. Osowaru/osieru nado no tadoosi (Transitive verbs like osieru/osowaru). In Susumu Yamada, Yasuto Kikuti and Yosuke Momiyama (eds.) *Nihongo: Imi-to bunpoo-no huukei* (Japanese: A Landscape from Meaning and Grammar). Tokyo: Hituzi Syobo. 79-95.
- Miyagawa, Shigeru 1989. *Syntax and semantics 22: Structure and case marking in Japanese*. San Diego, Calif.: Academic Press.
- Miyagawa, Shigeru & Takae Tsujioka 2004. Argument structure and ditransitive verbs in Japanese. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 13, 1-38.

- Miyajima, Tatsuo 1972. *Doosi-no imi/yoohoo-no kizyututeki kenkyuu* (A Descriptive Study on the Meaning and Uses of Japanese Verbs). Tokyo: Syuueisyuppan.
- Noda, Hisashi 1991. Bunpootekina voisu-to goitekina voisu-no kankei (The relation between grammatical voice and lexical voice). In Yoshio Nitta (ed.) *Nihongo-no voisu-to tadoosei* (Voice and Transitivity in Japanese). Tokyo: Kurosio. 211-232.
- Oehrle, Richard 1976. *The grammatical status of the English dative alternation*. Ph.D. dissertation, MIT.
- Okutsu, Keiichiro 1967. Zidoosika/tadoosika oyobi ryookyokutenkei (Transitivization, intransitivization and bipolar conversion). *Kokugogaku* (Japanese Linguistics) 70, 46-66.
- Pinker, Steven 1989. *Learnability and cognition: The acquisition of argument structure*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Pustejovsky, James 1991. The syntax of event structure. *Cognition* 41, 47-81.
- Pustejovsky, James 1995. *The generative lexicon*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT.
- Rappaport Hovav, Malka. & Beth Levin 2008. The English dative alternation: The case for verb sensitivity. *Journal of Linguistics* 44, 129-167.
- Sadakane, Kumi & Masatoshi Koizumi 1995. On the nature of the “dative” particle *ni* in Japanese. *Linguistics* 33, 5-33.
- Shimizu, Yasuyuki 1977. Shoyuu-no idoo-o arawasu doosi-no kaku to wakugumi (The case and frame of verbs that express transfer of possession). *Matsumura Akira kanreki kinen: Kokugogaku to kokugosi* (Festschrift for Professor Akira Matsumura: Japanese linguistics and linguistic history), 39-35(1184-1170). Tokyo: Meizi-shoin.
- Sugimoto, Takeshi 1986. Kakuzyoshi—“ga”, “o”, “ni” to bunpookankei (Case particles: “ga”, “o”, “ni” and their grammatical relations). In Keiichiro Okutsu (ed.) *Iwayuru nihongo zyosi-no kenkyu* (A Study of so-called particles in Japanese). Toyo: Bonzinsya. 227-379.
- Takazawa, Koichi & John Whitman 1998. *Kaku-to gozyun-to toogokoozoo* (Case, word order and syntactic structure). Tokyo: Kenkyusya.
- Tamura, Shinichi 2007. Semantics in children’s production of ditransitives. Paper presented at Conference on Ditransitive Constructions (November, 2007), Leipzig, Germany.
- Van Belle, William & Willy Van Langendonck (1996). *The dative: Volume 1: Descriptive studies*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Van Valin, Robert, and Randy LaPolla (1997). *Syntax: Structure, meaning and syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Williams, Edwin 1981. Argument structure and morphology. *The Linguistic Review* 1, 81-118.