Two-Goal Datives
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Miyagawa and Tsujioka (M&T) (2004) claim Japanese examples like (1) exhibit both a "possessive goal" (Hanako-ni) and a "locative goal" (Tokyo-ni):

(1) Taroo-ga Hanako-ni Tokyo-ni nimotu-o okut-ta
Taro-Nom Hanako-Dat Tokyo-Dat package-Acc send-Past
'Taro sent Hanako a package to Tokyo'

Two goal datives cast doubt on derivationalist views of the dative alternation (Baker 1988, den Dikken 1995, Larson 1988) where IOs arise from PP goals by movement: (2)a,b. In a two-goal dative, the source position for the IO appears filled (2)c, and a movement account unavailable.

(2) a. Taroo sent a package to Hanako.
b. Taroo sent [Hanako] a package to Tokyo.
c. Taroo sent [Hanako] a package to Tokyo.

We argue that Miyagawa and Tsujioka (2004) misanalyze examples like (1): The latter are not two-goal datives but rather a combination benefactive/dative. (1) thus constitutes either (3) or (4).

(3) Taroo-ga Hanako-ni Tokyo-ni mukete nimotu-o okut-ta
Taro-Nom Hanako-Dat Tokyo-Dat toward package-Acc send-Past
Lit. 'Taro sent a package to Hanako toward Tokyo.'

(4) Taroo-ga Hanako-no tame-ni Tokyo-ni nimotu-o okut-ta
Taro-Nom Hanako-Gen sake-Dat Tokyo-Dat package-Acc send-Past
'Taro sent a package to Tokyo for Hanako's sake'

1. Ditransitive Sentences in Japanese

1.1. The "Standard" Analysis: GOAL > THEME

Taro-Nom Hanako-Dat package-Acc send-Past
'Taro sent Hanako a package.'
b. Taroo-ga nimotu-o Hanako-ni okut-ta.
Taro-Nom package-Acc Hanako-Dat send-Past

1.2. The "Standard" Analysis Questioned

(7) The standard analysis predicts...
"[U]nlike English, we should not find any argument-structure differences in the ditransitive constructions because there is only one structure associated with ditransitive verbs." (Miyagawa and Tsujioka 2004:6)

(8) The prediction not borne out:
Taroo-ga dokoka-ni dono nimotu-mo okut-ta.
Taro-Nom whichpackage-all package-all send-Past
'Taro sent every package to some place'

1.3. M&T (2004): Ditransitives as Hidden Applicatives

1.3.1. The Structure

(9) Marantz 1993:
A non-derivationalist approach to DOCs; postulates an applicative head (mediating possession relation between the DO and IO) for the DOC. The to-dative is assumed to lack the applicative head.

(10) [Diagram]

(Miyagawa and Tsujioka 2004:14)
1.3.2. M&T’s (2004) Evidence for the Two (High and Low) Goals

• Evidence 1: Quantifier scope facts

(11) Taroo-ga [_{VP1} dareka-ni] [_{VP2} subete-no-basyo-ni] nimotu-o
Taro-Nom someone-Dat all-Gen-place-to package-Acc
okut]-ta.
send-Past 'Taro sent someone a package to every place.'

some > every, *every > some

(12) Taroo-ga [_{VP1} dareka-ni][_{VP2} Tokyo-ni] subete-no-nimotu-o
Taro-Nom someone-Dat Tokyo-to all-Gen-package-Acc
okut]-ta.
send-Past 'Taro sent someone every package to Tokyo.'

some > every, *every > some

(13) The locative goal allows inverse scope with the theme.

Taroo-ga [_{VP1} Hanako-ni] [_{VP2} dokoka-no-basyo-ni] subete-no-
Taro-Nom Hanako-Dat some-Gen-place-to all-Gen-
imotu-o okut]-ta.
package-Acc send-Past
'Taro sent Hanako every package to some place.'

some > every, every > some

((11)-(13) from Miyagawa and Tsujioka 2004:15)

(14) Quantifier Scope in VPs (Based on Marantz 1993, Bruening 2001)
   a. Two quantifiers can take either the wide scope or the narrow
      scope with respect to the other, as long as they are in the same
      VP.
   b. If two quantifiers reside in different VPs, scope freezing effects are
      observed.

(15) M&T’s Account for (11)-(13):
   a. The high goal is in the specifier of the applicative head; hence it is
      outside the lower VP containing the lower goal and the theme. | →
      The high goal unambiguously takes a wider scope over the low
      goal in (11) and (12).
   b. The low goal and the theme are within the same VP, leading to
      the ambiguity of (13).

• Evidence 2: The categorial status of the two goal phrases

(16) In ditransitive sentences, a locative phrase cannot be passivized.
   a. Taroo-ga nimotu-o okur-are-ta.
      Taro-Nom package-Acc send-Pass-Past
      'Taro was sent a package.'
   b. *Tokyo-ga nimotu-o okur-are-ta.
      Tokyo-Nom package-Acc send-Pass-Past
      Lit. 'Tokyo was sent a package.'

(17) M&T’s prediction: The passivization of the low goal is out.
   a. The difference in the categorial status of high and low goals;
      The low goal is PP, which is orthogonal to Case-related
      operations like passivization.
   b. Locality considerations; moving the low goal over the high goal
      may violate the locality principles (cf. (10)).

(Miyagawa and Tsujioka 2004:16)

(18) a. Taroo-ga Tokyo-ni nimotu-o okur-are-ta.
    Taro-Nom Tokyo-to package-Acc send-Pass-Past
    'Taro was sent a package to Tokyo.'
    Tokyo-Nom Taroo-Dat package-Acc send-Pass-Past
    (Lit.)'Tokyo was sent a package to Taro.'

((17)-(18) from Miyagawa and Tsujioka 2004:16)

(19) M&T’s explanation on (16)b/(18)b:
   a. If Tokyo-ni is a PP, it cannot undergo Case-motivated operations.
   b. Tokyo-ni is a 'low' goal; hence movement to Spec, TP past the
      position of the 'high' goal is blocked by locality principles.

2. Japanese Ditransitives are NOT Hidden Possessives

2.1 Quantifier Scope in Two-Goal Datives Revisited

(20) A problem with M&T’s quantifier test:
   A use of quantifiers like dareka 'someone' and subete-no 'all ...' which
   admit specific group readings (Ueyama 1998), often confused with
   wide scope.
• If quantifiers are substituted for those that resist specific group readings, ambiguity occurs.

(21) Yamada-sensei-ga san-nin-izyoo-no gakusei-ni
Yamada-professor-Nom three-CL-more-Gen student-Dat
ni-kasyo-izyoo-no atesaki-ni ronbun-o okut-ta.
two-CL-more-Gen address-to paper-Acc send-Past
‘Professor Yamada sent three or more students papers to two or more addresses.’  Q-Dat > Q-Acc, Q-Acc > Q-Dat

[Interpretation 1]  Q-Dat > Q-Acc - most salient
Four students: Tomoko, Yukiko, Yunju, and Lanko. Prof. Yamada sent his latest drafts to more than two addresses for each of the students; e.g., one for his/her apartment, another for his/her office, and the other for his/her parents' home.

[Interpretation 2]  Q-Acc > Q-Dat  INVERSE SCOPE POSSIBLE
There are more than two addresses, where Professor Yamada sent papers to more than three students.

U Tokyo: 5 students  Kyusyu U: 7 students
Tohoku U: 8 students  Nanzan U: 2 students
Kyoto U: 2 students

(22) Yamada-sensei-ga san-nin-izyoo-no gakusei-ni
Yamada-professor-Nom three-CL-more-Gen student-Dat
ofisu-ni ni-hon-izyoo-no ronbun-o okut-ta.
address-to two-CL-more-Gen paper-Acc send-Past
‘Professor Yamada sent three or more students two or more papers to the office.’

[Interpretation 1]  Q-Dat > Q-Acc - most salient
Four students, not necessarily in the same office: Tomoko, Yukiko, Yunju, and Lanko. Prof. Yamada sent three of his latest drafts to their office(s). That is, each of them gets the same set of papers by Prof. Yamada.

* [Interpretation 2]  Q-Acc > Q-Dat  INVERSE SCOPE IMPOSSIBLE
Four students: Tomoko, Yukiko, Yunju, and Lanko. Prof. Yamada sent some of his latest drafts to their offices. Depending on the students' interest, he picks up different drafts for each student.

Tomoko: Paper A, Paper B, Paper C
Yukiko: Paper A, Paper C, Paper D

Paper A: Tomoko, Yukiko, Yunju, Lanko
Paper B: Tomoko, Yunju
Paper C: Tomoko, Yukiko, Lanko
Paper D: Yunju, Yukiko, Lanko

(23) Yamada-sensei-ga Hanako-ni ni-kasyo-izyoo-no
Yamada-professor-Nom Hanako-to two-CL-more-Gen
atesaki-ni yon-hon-izyoo-no ronbun-o okut-ta.
address-Dat four-CL-more-Gen paper-Acc send-Past
‘Professor Yamada sent Hanako four or more papers to two or more addresses.’

[Interpretation 1]  Q-Dat > Q-Acc - most salient
There are two or more addresses to which Prof. Yamada sent four or more papers for Hanako.

Apartment: Papers 1, 2, 4, 8  Office: Papers 2, 4, 6, 8, 9
Parents': Papers 3, 6, 9  Relatives': Papers 1, 2, 3, 4, 5
Friends': Papers 7, 9

* [Interpretation 2]  Q-Acc > Q-Dat  INVERSE SCOPE IMPOSSIBLE
Prof. Yamada wants to send some papers to Hanako, but she is hard to catch. According to her schedule, Prof. Yamada decides to send some of the papers to the places where Hanako is likely to show up. In doing so, he sends some of the papers to most of the addresses, while some that are not of so importance are sent to only a couple of places. There are five papers out of seven which got sent to two or more addresses - those are the ones that Prof. Yamada has considered as important.

Paper 1: Apt, Office, Friends'  Paper 2: Apt
Paper 5: Apt, Office, Relatives'  Paper 6: Office, Parents'
Paper 7: Apt, Office, Relatives', Friends'  Paper 8: Relatives'
(24) Summary of (21)-(23):
   a. There is no intrinsic asymmetry as to the position of High Goal and that of Low Goal. (cf. (21))
   b. High Goal is situated in a position higher than the Theme. (cf. (22))
   c. Low Goal is situated in a position higher than Theme. (cf. (23))
⇒ The hierarchical relation between the two goals undetermined.

2.2. The Passive Test Revisited

(25) a. Tarooga nimotu-o okur-are-ta.
   Taro-Nom package-Acc send-Pass-Past
   'Taro was sent a package.'
   b. *Tokyo-ga nimotu-o okur-are-ta.
   Tokyo-Nom package-Acc send-Pass-Past
   Lit. 'Tokyo was sent a package.'

(26) a. Taro-ga Tokyo-ni nimotu-o okur-are-ta.
   Taro-No-m Tokyo-to package-Acc send-Pass-Past
   'Taro was sent a package to Tokyo.'
   Tokyo-No-m Taro-Dat package-Acc send-Pass-Past
   (Lit.) 'Tokyo was sent a package to Taro.'

   Inanimate NPs do not stand in the subject position of passives.

   I-Top neighbor-Gen-dog-by bark-Pass-Past
   'I was barked by the neighbor's dog.'
   b. Taro-wa densya-ni hik-are-ta.
   Taro-Top train-by hit-Pass-Past
   'Taro was run over by a train.'
   c. *Hanako-wa booru-ni butukar-are-ta.
   Hanako-No-m ball-by hit-Pass-Past
   'Hanako was hit by a ball.'
   d. *Taro-wa niwaki-ni siger-are-te komat-te
   Taro-Top garden.green-by grow-Pass-Ger be.annoyed-Ger be-Pres
   'Taro is annoyed at (the fact that) the garden trees have grown (too thick).' (Inoue 1976:76)

(29) Restrictions on Passives in Japanese 2:
   If the complement of the passive morpheme is a ditransitive clause,
   (i) The DO becomes the subject of the passive sentence if the IO is inanimate. (cf. (30))
   (ii) Either of the two objects can be the subject in the passive sentence if both DO and IO are animate. (cf. (31))

(30) a. Kare-ga watasi-ni hidori-o soodans-are-ta.
   he-Nom I-Dat date-Acc consult-Pass-Past
   'He consulted me the date (of some event).'
   b. Watasi-ga kare-ni/(kara) hidori-o soodans-are-ta.
   I-Nom he-Dat/by date-Acc consult-Pass-Past
   'I was consulted by him about the date (of some event.).'
   c. *Hidori-ga kare-ni/(kara) watasi-ni soodans-are-ta.
   Date-Nom he-Dat/I-Dat consult-Pass-Past
   Lit. 'The date (of some event) was consulted to me by him.'

   Hanako-Nom baby-Acc I-Dat leave-Past
   'Hanako left (her) baby to me.'
   b. Watasi-ga Hanako-ni/(kara) akanboo-o azuke-rare-ta.
   I-Nom Hanako-Ni/from baby-Acc leave-Pass-Past
   'I was left (Hanako's) baby by Hanako.'
   Baby-Nom Hanako-from I-Dat leave-Pass-Past
   'The baby was left to me by Hanako.'
   ((30)-(31) from Inoue 1976:81)

(32) Summary:
   Whatever principles underlying (27) and (29), they independently account for the ill-formed status of (25)b and (26)b.
   The issue of Case/locality is thus orthogonal to the point.

2.3. Harley's Generalization

(33) Correlation between HAVE and possessives
   (Benveniste 1966, Freeze 1992 among others)
   a. HAVE languages: P incorporates into BE, yielding HAVE
   b. BE languages: Possession as BE + P_loc/spatial; Possessives look like existentials.
(Freeze 1992; simplified)

(35) Harley’s Generalization
DOC is found only in a language with have-type possessives.

(36) Japanese lacks HAVE-possessives
Taroo-\text{ni} okane-\text{ga} ar-\text{u}.
Taro-at money-Nom be-Pres.
’Taro has (some) money.’

(37) If M&T’s claim about the two-goal datives were correct, it would constitute an exception to the otherwise solid generalization by Harley.

3. Two-Goal Datives as Benefactives/Directionals

(38) Suggestion
What corresponds to “two-goal datives in M&T ((1); repeated below in (39)) is a benefactive/dative combination.

(39) (= (1))
Taroo-\text{ga} Hanako-\text{ni} Tokyo-\text{ni} nimotu-\text{o} okut-\text{ta}
Taro-Nom Hanako-\text{Dat} Tokyo-\text{Dat} package-Acc send-Past
‘Taro sent a package to Hanako toward Tokyo.’

(40) Studies of the dative alternation note the existence of to- and for-
DOC constructions, but do not address the possibility of their co-
occurrence. We suggest this is what is going on in (1), precisely
because Japanese -\text{ni} conflates for and to. (cf. Inoue 1976; Sadakane
and Koizumi 1995, among others)

• The majority of the native speakers prefer (41)/(42) to (39).

(41) Taroo-\text{ga} Hanako-\text{ni} Tokyo-\text{ni} mukete nimotu-\text{o} okut-\text{ta}
Taro-Nom Hanako-\text{Dat} Tokyo-\text{Dat} toward package-Acc send-Past
Lit. ‘Taro sent a package to Hanako toward Tokyo.’

(42) Taroo-\text{ga} Hanako-\text{no} tame-\text{ni} Tokyo-\text{ni} nimotu-\text{o} okut-\text{ta}
Taro-Nom Hanako-\text{Gen} sake-\text{Dat} Tokyo-\text{Dat} package-Acc send-Past
‘Taro sent a package to Tokyo for Hanako’s sake’

(43) a. Taroo sent a package for Hanako to Tokyo.
b. Taroo sent [Hanako] a package for to Tokyo.

(44) This accounts for the otherwise unexplained fact that two-goal datives are normally licit only when the goal contains a phrase anaphorically bound to the benefactive: (45)a.b.

(45) a. ?John sent Mary flowers to her office.
b. *John sent Mary flowers to Bill.

4. Summary
• We argued against M&T by critically reviewing the quantifier scope test and the passive test.
• We suggested an alternative in which the attested “two-goal” datives are viewed as disguised benefactives/directionals.
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APPENDIX. Case-Marker Drop (Harada 2005)

(46) Kansai dialect shows Case-marker drop more frequently than in other dialects; omission of "dative" ni is possible under certain conditions.

(47) Target data: A dialogue between the participants A and B.
   The task: After watching a cartoon segment (Dora-emon) for 10 minutes, A explains the gist of the piece to B. (Bono 2005)

(48) From Case 1
   A: De, (breath) ieØ kaet-te, (Ø = The site of Case-marker drop)
      Then, home return-ing, 'Then, (he) went home and ...'
   B: Un. 'OK,'
      Int (Int = Interjective)
   A: Maa, Dora-emon-ni, eh, ikoto-na, minna-no
      Dora-emon-Dat, Int good.thing-SFP everyone-Gen
      hanasi-te speak-ing (SFP = Sentence final particle)
      Lit: 'And then, (he) told Dora-emon all the good things happened to the others, and ...'

(49) Summary of the occurrence of ni-drop in three dialogue sessions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Case 1</th>
<th>Case 2</th>
<th>Case 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of ditransitives</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø # of [-animate] NP</td>
<td>1/1 (100%)</td>
<td>8/8 (100%)</td>
<td>2/2 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø # of of ni Ø</td>
<td>1/1 (100%)</td>
<td>8/8 (100%)</td>
<td>2/2 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[+a]/total # of Ø</td>
<td>4/10 (40%)</td>
<td>3/18 (16.7%)</td>
<td>6/14 (42.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[+a]/total # of [-a] NPs</td>
<td>6/8 (100%)</td>
<td>12/12 (100%)</td>
<td>8/8 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(50) Observations:
   Ni with a [+animate] NP never undergo deletion:
   Ni-drop is limited only when the preceding NP is [-animate].

(51) Ni-drop is not ad-hoc; it is constrained by a principle sensitive to a semantic feature [+/-animate] of the preceding nominal expression.

These data suggest that the position of DP-ni is not directly tied to the high/low status of the DP under question; what is more crucial is the semantic feature associated with the DP attached by ni.
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