Lexical Meanings of Ditransitive Verbs in Japanese

Hiroko Kimura
Chiba Institute of Technology
2-1-1, Shibazono, Narashino-shi,
Chiba 275-0023, Japan
kimura.hiroko@p.chiabkoudai.jp

Chigusa Morita
Toita Women's College
2-21-17, Shiba, Minato-ku
Tokyo, 105-0014, Japan
morita@toita.ac.jp

Abstract

This paper aims to demonstrate that the lexical meanings of major ditransitive verbs (*okur-* 'send,' *atae-* 'give,' and *ur-* 'sell') in Japanese are the same as those of their English counterparts. Specifically, we will argue that *send*-type verbs encode both caused motion and caused possession whereas *give*-type and *sell*-type verbs encode only caused possession, contra Kishimoto's (2001) classification of Japanese ditransitive verbs, in which *send*-type verbs carry only a caused motion meaning whereas *sell*-type verbs carry both caused motion and caused possession meanings. Based on examples of sluicing, we will also show that *send*-type verbs have the two argument structures <agent, goal, theme> and <agent, possessor, theme>. Moreover, we will argue that these two argument structures of *send*-type verbs are in complementary distribution: they cannot be realized syntactically at one time.

1 Introduction

This paper examines the ditransitive construction in Japanese, exemplified in (1).

(1) Taro-ga Hanako-ni nimotu-o okutta.
Taro-NOM Hanako-DAT package-ACC sent
'Taro sent Hanako a package. / Taro sent a package to Hanako.'

Kishimoto (2001) classifies major ditransitive verbs in Japanese into three types, summarized as (2).

(2) Kishimoto's (2001) classification

Verb type	Examples	Meaning(s)
Send-type verbs (verbs of transfer)	*okur-* 'send' *hakob-* 'carry'	change of location
Give-type verbs (verbs of change of possession)	*atae-* 'give' *teikyosu-* 'offer'	change of possession
Sell-type verbs (verbs of transaction)	*ur-* 'sell' *kas-* 'rent'	change of location or change of possession

In this paper, we will argue against Kishimoto's classification, and show that the lexical meanings of *okur-* 'send,' *atae-* 'give,' and *ur-* 'sell' are the same as those of their English counterparts. Rappaport Hovav and Levin (RH&L) (2008) examine the English construction(s) corresponding to (1), which can appear in the double object construction and/or in the *to*-dative construction, as in (3). They claim that *send* encodes both caused motion and caused possession, whereas *give* and *sell*, which are classified in the same type, encode only caused possession, as in (4).

(3) a. Taro sent Hanako a package.
    b. Taro sent a package to Hanako.

(4) RH & L's (2008) classification

Verb type	Examples	Meaning(s)
Send-type verbs	send mail forward	caused motion or caused possession
Give-type verbs	give sell rent	caused possession

We will demonstrate that there is no difference between these verbs in Japanese and their English counterparts with respect to their lexical meanings. We classify Japanese ditransitive verbs as in (5), where *send*-type verbs carry both caused motion and caused possession meanings, whereas *give*-type verbs and *sell*-type verbs carry only a caused possession meaning.

(5) Our classification of Japanese ditransitive verbs

Verb type	Examples	Meaning(s)
Send-type verbs	*okur-* 'send' *hakob-* 'carry'	caused motion or caused possession
Give-type verbs	*atae-* 'give' *teikyosu-* 'offer' *ur-* 'sell' *kas-* 'rent'	caused possession

With the semantic classification of ditransitive verbs in (5), we will also claim that a caused motion meaning is linked with the argument structure <agent, goal, theme>, whereas a caused possession meaning is linked with the argument structure <agent, possessor, theme>. Based on examples of sluicing, we will demonstrate that *send*-type verbs in Japanese have two argument structures <argent, goal, theme> and <agent, possessor, theme>. As for the English verb *send*, RH & L (2008) argue that these two argument structures are not in complementary distribution, partly because *send* allows two goals, a possessor goal and a locative goal, to appear in a single sentence, as shown in (6). We dub this type of sentence the 'two-goal construction.'

(6) Anne is curious as to why her father sent **her** a telegram **to America** to return home at once …
(RH&L, 2008)

We will examine the Japanese two-goal construction, and show that the two argument structures of *send*-type verbs are necessarily in complementary distribution (cf. Goldberg, 1995; Harley, 2002). Specifically, we will argue that both of the goals in the two-goal construction are not selected by the verb at one time.

2 Kishimoto's (2001) Classification

Kishimoto (2001) classifies ditransitive verbs in Japanese into three types, as in (2), repeated as (7).

(7) Kishimoto's (2001) classification

Verb type	Examples	Meaning(s)
Send-type verbs (verbs of transfer)	*okur-* 'send' *hakob-* 'carry'	change of location
Give-type verbs (verbs of change of possession)	*atae-* 'give' *teikyosu-* 'offer'	change of possession
Sell-type verbs (verbs of transaction)	*ur-* 'sell' *kas-* 'rent'	change of location or change of possession

Kishimoto claims that *send*-type verbs encode change of location, whereas *give*-type verbs do not. This claim is supported by the fact that the former is compatible with a spatial postposition such as *made* 'to,' while the latter is not, as in (8).

(8) a. John-wa Mary-no uti-**made** nimotu-o
   John-TOP Mary-GEN home-to package-ACC
   okutta.
   sent
   'John sent a package to Mary's home.'
   b. *John-wa Mary-no uti-**made** nimotu-o
   John-TOP Mary-GEN home-to package-ACC
   teikyoosita.
   offered
   'John offered a package to Mary's home.'
   (Kishimoto, 2001)

Moreover, he argues that *send*-type verbs do not encode change of possession, whereas *give*-type verbs encode change of possession, mainly for the following two reasons. First, *give-type* verbs, but

not *send*-type verbs, have an implication of successful transfer. *Send*-type verbs are generally neutral with respect to whether or not the theme reaches the goal, unlike *give*-type verbs. For instance, (9a) does not sound contradictory, because the dative goal *Mary-ni* 'to Mary' of *okur-* 'send' is interpreted as a locative goal, but not as a recipient. In contrast, (9b) sounds contradictory, because *give*-type verbs require a recipient of the theme.

(9) a.　John-wa　Mary-ni　tegami-o　okutta-ga,
　　　John-TOP　Mary-DAT　letter-ACC　sent-but
　　　Mary-wa　mada uketot-te i-nai.
　　　Mary-TOP　yet　　receive　be-NEG
　　　'John sent a letter 'to Mary, but Mary has not received it yet.
　　b.　#John-wa　Mary-ni　hon-o　　　ataeta-ga,
　　　John-TOP　Mary-DAT　book-ACC　gave-but
　　　Mary-wa　mada　morat-te　i-nai.
　　　Mary-TOP　yet　　get　　be-NEG
　　　'John gave Mary a book, but Mary has not gotten it yet.'　　　(Kishimoto, 2001)

Second, *give-type verbs*, but not *send*-type verbs, are subject to the animacy restriction. *Send*-type verbs allow an inanimate goal, which cannot be interpreted as a recipient, as shown in (10a). In contrast, *give*-type verbs require an animate goal as a recipient, as shown in (10b).

(10) a.　John-wa　Mary-ni/zitaku-ni　　tegami-o
　　　John-TOP　Mary-DAT/home-DAT　letter-ACC
　　　okutta.
　　　sent
　　　'John sent a letter to Mary/his home.'
　　b.　John-wa　　　Mary-ni/*zitaku-ni
　　　John-TOP　　Mary-DAT/home-DAT
　　　zyoohoo-o　　　ataeta.
　　　information-ACC　gave
　　　'John gave Mary/his home information.'
　　　　　　　　　　　　(Kishimoto, 2001)

Based on these examples, Kishimoto concludes that *send*-type verbs encode only change of location whereas *give*-type verbs encode only change of possession.

As for *sell*-type verbs, Kishimoto claims that they encode both change of location and change of possession. He demonstrates that *sell*-type verbs are subject to the animacy restriction, as shown in (11).

He claims that this is because *sell*-type verbs encode change of possession.

(11)　*John-wa　zitaku-ni　　kuruma-o　utta.
　　　John-TOP　home-DAT　car-ACC　　sold
　　　'John sold a car to his home.'
　　　　　　　　　　　　(Kishimoto, 2001)

Moreover, he shows that *sell*-type verbs also encode change of location, because they pattern with *send*-type verbs, which encode change of location, in two respects. First, these two types of verbs can combine with a directional movement verb such as *kom-* 'get into' and *das-* 'get out.' For instance, *hakob-* 'carry,' a *send*-type verb, and *ur-* 'sell' can combine with *kom-* 'get into,' forming *hakobi-kom* 'carry into' and *uri-kom* 'promote,' respectively. In contrast, *atae-* 'give' cannot combine with a directional movement verb like *kom-* 'get into,' and hence Japanese has no compounds like *atae-kom-* 'give-get.into.'

(12) a.　hakob + kom → hakobi-kom 'carry into'
　　b.　ur + kom → uri-kom 'promote'
　　c.　atae + kom →*atae-kom 'give-get.into'

Second, he observes that the meaning(s) of *sell*-type verbs can be retained even when they are replaced by a directional movement verb such as *de-* 'go out' and *ire-* 'get into,' just like *send*-type verbs, as in (13a) and (13b). In contrast, the meaning(s) of *give*-type verbs cannot be retained when they are replaced by a directional movement verb, as in (13c).

(13) a.　Korerano-sinamono-wa subete ure-te/de-te
　　　these-goods-TOP　　　all　　sell/go.out
　　　simatta.
　　　finished
　　　'These goods were all sold out.'
　　b.　John-wa　kozutumi-o　sokutatu-de
　　　John-TOP　parcel-ACC　express.mail-by
　　　okutta/dasita.
　　　sent/got.out
　　　'John sent a parcel by express mail.'
　　c.　John-wa Mary-ni　purezento-o ateta/*ireta.
　　　John-TOP Mary-DAT gift-ACC　　gave/got.in
　　　'John gave Mary a gift.'
　　　　　　　　　　　　(Kishimoto, 2001)

From these observations, Kishimoto concludes that (i) *send*-type verbs encode only change of location (caused motion), (ii) *give*-type verbs encode only change of possession (caused possession), and (iii) *sell*-type verbs encode both change of location (caused motion) and change of possession (caused possession).

In contrast with his classification, we will argue in the next section that *send*-type verbs encode both change of location (caused motion) and change of possession (caused possession), whereas *sell*-type verbs encode only change of possession (caused possession).

3 Arguing against Kishimoto (2001)

We will argue that ditransitive verbs in Japanese are lexically classified just as their English counterparts. RH&L (2008) examine lexical meanings of English ditransitive verbs and claim that *send*-type verbs carry the meanings of caused motion and caused possession, whereas *give*-type verbs and *sell*-type verbs carry only the meaning of caused possession, as in (14). According to RH&L, *sell*-type verbs are classified as a sub-class of *give*-type verbs. In what follows, we adopt their terminology 'caused motion' and 'caused possession' rather than Kishimoto's terms 'change of location' and 'change of possession.'

(14) RH & L's (2008) classification

Verb type	Examples	Meaning(s)
Send-type verbs	send mail forward	caused motion or caused possession
Give-type verbs	give sell rent	caused possession

We first demonstrate that *sell*-type verbs in Japanese do not encode caused motion, just like their English counterparts. Kishimoto (2001) claims that *sell*-type verbs encode caused motion. However, his argument cannot be maintained for the following four reasons. First, *sell*-type verbs do not form compounds with a directional movement verb in the same way as *send*-type verbs. For instance, the directional movement meaning of the verb *kom-* 'into' can be maintained when it is attached to a *send*-type verb (e.g. *hakobi-kom* 'carry into'). But when it

forms a compound with a *sell*-type verb, its directional movement meaning is lost (e.g. *uri-kom* 'promote').

Second, Kishimoto's claim that *sell*-type verbs can be replaced by a directional movement verb is not always true. For instance, the meanings of *kas-* 'lend' in (15a) and *ur-* 'sell' in (15b) cannot be retained when they are replaced by a directional movement verb such as *das-* 'get out' and *de-* 'go out.' Kishimoto claims that the meaning of *ur-* 'sell' in (13a), repeated as (16), is retained when the verb is replaced by *de-* 'go out.' However, (15b) shows that the replacement of *ur-* 'sell' by *de-* 'go out' is impossible when an overt locative goal appears.

(15) a. Taro-wa Hanako-ni   hon-o
        Taro-TOP Hanako-DAT book-ACC
        kasita/*dasita.
        lent/got.out
        'Taro lent Hanako a book.'
    b. Sinamono-wa subete zyoorenkyaku-ni
        goods-TOP   all   regular.customer-DAT
        ure-te/*de-te simatta.
        sell/go.out   finished
        'Goods were all sold out to the regular customers.'

(16)   Korerano-sinamono-wa   subete
         these-goods-TOP   all
         ure-te/de-te   simatta.
         sell/go.out   finished
         'These goods were all sold out.'
                              (Kishimoto, 2001)

Third, *sell*-type verbs do not pattern with the compounds consisting of them and a directional movement verb in that the former cannot take a locative (inanimate) goal, as shown in (17a), whereas the latter can, as shown in (17b).

(17) a. Taro-ga   {Hanako-ni/*(?)sizyoo-ni}
        Taro-NOM {Hanako-DAT/market-DAT}
        zibun-no sakuhin-o   utta.
        self-GEN art-work-ACC sold
        'Taro sold his work to {Hanako/the market}.'
    b. Taro-ga   {Hanako-ni/sizyoo-ni}
        Taro-NOM Hanako-DAT/market-DAT
        zibun-no sakuhin-o   uri-dasita.
        self-GEN art-work-ACC sell-put.on
        'Taro put his work on sale to {Hanako/the market}.'

Some speakers may allow *sizyoo-ni* 'to the market' in (17a). For them, *sizyoo-ni* might be interpreted as a possessor goal "the person in the market" rather than a locative goal. Thus, the examples in (17) indicate that *sell*-type verbs do not encode caused motion, unlike the compounds derived from them.

Fourth, there is a further piece of evidence from sluicing that *sell*-type verbs do not encode a caused motion meaning. Many linguists argue that sluicing involves a clausal structure (Ross, 1969; Chung et al., 1995; Merchant, 2001). Under this view, the example of sluicing (18) is analyzed as (19), where the unpronounced parts are indicated in the angle brackets. In (19) the *wh*-remnant *what* is interpreted as the object of the elided (unpronounced) verb *ate*.

(18) John ate something, but I don't know what.
(19) … but I don't know what$_i$ <he ate t_i >.

A well-known identity restriction on sluicing is that the argument structure of the elided part must be identical to that of the corresponding verb in the antecedent clause (Chung et al., 1995; Chung, 2013). To see this restriction, notice first that some verbs allow their argument(s) to be omitted. For instance, *serve* has two different argument structures given in (20), and the second internal argument can be omitted as shown in (21).

(20) Argument Structures of the Verb *SERVE*
    a. server <meal, (diner)>
    b. server <diner, (meal)>
                           (Chung et al., 1995)

(21) a. I served leek soup (to my guests).
    b. I served my guests (leek soup).
                           (Chung et al., 1995)

With this in mind, Chung et al. (1995) explain the (un)grammaticality of (22) in terms of the identity requirement.

(22) a. She served the soup, but I don't know to whom$_i$ <she served the soup t_i>.
    b. She served the students, but I don't know what$_i$ <she served the students t_i>.
    c. *She served the soup, but I don't know who <she served t_i the soup>.
                           (Chung et al., 1995)

In (22a), both the antecedent clause and the sluiced clause involve the argument structure (20a), and hence the identity requirement is satisfied. (22b) also satisfies the identity requirement; the argument structure (20b) licenses both the antecedent clause and the sluiced clause. In contrast, (22c) is ungrammatical due to the mismatch of the argument structure(s); the antecedent clause is licensed by the argument structure (20a) whereas the sluiced clause is licensed by (20b).

Given that the identity requirement reviewed above also holds for Japanese, (23) indicates that the verb *ur-* 'sell' encodes only caused possession, but not caused motion.

(23) A: Taro-ga *e* okiniiri-no kaban-o utta.
      Taro-NOM   favorite   bag-ACC sold
      'Taro sold his favorite bag.'
   B: Dare-ni?   B': */?*Doko-ni?
      whom-to?   where-to
      '(To) whom?'   '(To) where?'
   B'': *Dono   basyo-ni?
        which   place-to
        '(To) which place?'

Some Japanese speakers might allow *doko-ni?* '(to) where?' in (23B'). However, even for them, (23B') cannot be replied by phrases like *Tokyo-ni* 'to Tokyo,' which are interpreted just as a location. It must be answered by phrases like *kobutu-syoo-ni* 'to a second-hand store,' which has a possessor interpretation. Then, the impossibility of the locative phrase(s) as the *wh*-remnant in the sluiced clause in (23B') and (23B'') indicates that the implicit (unpronounced) dative phrase in the antecedent cannot be a locative goal. This is not consistent with Kishimoto's claim that *sell*-type verbs encode caused motion (change of location). Moreover, the possibility of *dare-ni?* 'to whom?' (23B) indicates that *sell*-types verbs encode caused possession.

For the reasons above, we argue that *sell*-type verbs encode only caused possession, but not caused motion.

Moreover, the sluicing diagnostic test shows that *send*-type verbs encode both caused motion and caused possession, contra Kishimoto's claim. It also demonstrates that *give*-type verbs encode only caused possession. The relevant examples are given in (24) and (25).

(24) A: Taro-ga   nimotu-o   okutta.
     Taro-NOM   package-ACC   sent
     'Taro sent a package.'
   B: Dare-ni?   B': Doko-ni?
     whom-to?   where-to
     '(To) whom?'   '(To) where?'
   B'': Dono basyo-ni?
     which   place-to
     '(To) which place?'
(25) A: Taro-ga sono hon-o   ataeta.
     Taro-NOM that book-ACC gave
     'Taro gave that book.'
   B: Dare-ni?   B': */?*Doko-ni?
     whom-to?   where-to
     '(To) whom?'   '(To) where?'
   B'': *Dono basyo-ni?
     which place-to
     '(To) which place?'

In (24), the antecedent clause with the verb *okur-*
'send' can be responded either by *dare-ni?* '(to)
whom?,' which is interpreted as a possessor, or by
doko-ni? '(to) where?'/*dono basyo-ni?* '(to) which
place?,' which are interpreted as a locative goal.
Based on this, we argue that *send*-type verbs allow
two argument structures, <agent, possessor, theme>
and <agent, goal, theme>. In the case of *dare-ni* 'to
whom?' (24B), the verb *send* has the argument
structure <agent, possessor, theme>. In the cases of
doko-ni '(to) where?' (24B') and *dono basyo-ni* '(to)
which place?' (24B''), it has the argument structure
<agent, goal, theme>. As in (25), in contrast, the an-
tecedent clause with the verb *atae-* 'give' can be fol-
lowed by *dare-ni?* '(to) whom?,' which is
interpreted as a possessor, but not by *doko-ni?* '(to)
where?'/*dono basyo-ni?* '(to) which place?,' which
are interpreted as a locative goal. Again, *doko-ni?*
'(to) where?' (25B') and *dono basyo-ni?* '(to) which
place?' (25B'') are possible only when they have a
caused possession reading. Under this reading, they
can be replied by phrases like *tosyokan-ni* '(to) the
library,' which can be interpreted as a possessor,
but not by locative phrases like *Tokyo-ni* '(to) To-
kyo'. For this reason, we claim that *give*-type verbs
have only the argument structure <agent, possessor,
theme>.

To conclude, contra Kishimoto's (2001) classi-
fication, we argue that the lexical meanings of the
ditransitive verbs *okur-* 'send', *atae-* 'give' and *ur-*
'sell' in Japanese is exactly the same as those of
their English counterparts: according to RH&L

(2008), the verb *send* may encode caused motion
and caused possession whereas the verbs *sell* and
give carry only the meaning of caused possession.

(26) Lexical meanings of ditransitive verbs

	Japanese Kishimoto (2001)	Japanese our proposal	English RH&L (2008)
Send- type verbs	caused motion	caused motion or caused possession	caused motion or caused possession
Give- type verbs	caused possession	caused possession	caused possession
Sell- type verbs	caused motion or caused possession	caused possession	caused possession

Before leaving this section, we will revisit Ki-
shimoto's examples supporting his claim that *send*-
type verbs in Japanese encode only caused motion.
We will demonstrate that his examples do not ex-
clude the possibility that *send*-type verbs encode
caused possession.

Kishimoto observes that (9a), repeated as (27a),
does not sound contradictory, whereas (9b), re-
peated as in (27b), does. He explains this contrast in
terms of the presence/absence of the implication of
successful transfer: *give*-type verbs entail that the
theme object is transferred to the goal object, while
send-type verbs do not have such an entailment. Ki-
shimoto concludes that *send*-type verbs do not en-
code caused possession, unlike *give*-type verbs.

(27) a. John-wa Mary-ni tegami-o okutta-ga,
     John-TOP Mary-DAT letter-ACC sent-but
     Mary-wa mada uketot-te i-nai.
     Mary-TOP yet   receive be-NEG
     'John sent a letter to Mary, but Mary has
     not received it yet.'
   b.#John-wa Mary-ni hon-o   ataeta-ga,
     John-TOP Mary-DAT book-ACC gave-but
     Mary-wa mada morat-te   i-nai.
     Mary-TOP yet   get   be-NEG
     'John gave Mary a book, but Mary has not
     gotten it yet.'   (Kishimoto, 2001)

However, the example in (27a) does not necessarily indicate that *send*-type verbs do not have a caused possession meaning. Under our classification, *send*-type verbs may have two argument structures <agent, goal, theme> and <agent, possessor, theme>, which correspond to a caused motion meaning and a caused possession meaning, respectively. We claim that in (27a), the verb *okur-* 'send' has the argument structure <agent, goal, theme>, and that since *Mary-ni* 'to Mary' is interpreted as a locative goal rather than a possessor goal, the contradiction does not occur. In contrast, the verb *atae-* 'give' has only the argument structure <agent, possessor, theme>, and hence, *Mary-ni* 'to Mary' in (27b) must be interpreted as a recipient. For this reason, (27b) sounds contradictory.

Moreover, Kishimoto's example in (10a), repeated as (28), does not necessarily indicate that *send*-type verbs do not encode caused possession, either.

(28) John-wa Mary-ni/zitaku-ni   tegami-o
      John-TOP Mary-DAT/home-DAT   letter-ACC
      okutta.
      sent
      'John sent a letter to Mary/his home.'
                              (Kishimoto, 2001)

As shown in (28), the dative object of *send*-type verbs is free from the animacy restriction, and Kishimoto argues that these verbs do not encode caused possession. However, the lack of the effect of the animacy restriction in (28) does not necessarily mean that *send*-type verbs do not encode caused possession. *Send*-type verbs can have either of the two argument structures <agent, goal, theme> and <agent, possessor, theme>. We claim that *Mary-ni* in (28) is a realization of the possessor of the argument structure <agent, possessor, theme>, while *zitaku-ni* 'to his home' in (28) corresponds to a (locative) goal of the argument structure <agent, goal, theme>.

To sum up, Kishimoto's examples in (27a) and (28) do not pose a problem for our claim that *send*-type verbs encode caused possession, as well as caused motion.

4   Structure of Ditransitive Verbs

In this section, we will consider how the argument structures of ditransitive verbs are mapped to syntactic structures. In Section 3, we have demonstrated that the lexical meanings of Japanese ditransitive verbs (*send*-type verbs, *give*-type verbs and *sell*-type verbs) are the same as those of their English counterparts as shown in (29): according to RH&L (2008), *send*-type verbs encode both caused motion and caused possession, whereas *give*-type verbs (including *sell*-type verbs) encode only caused possession.

(29) Lexical meanings of ditransitive verbs

	Japanese Kishimoto (2001)	Japanese our proposal	English RH&L (2008)
Send-type verbs	caused motion	caused motion or caused possession	caused motion or caused possession
Give-type verbs	caused possession	caused possession	caused possession
Sell-type verbs	caused motion or caused possession	caused possession	caused possession

Assuming that the caused motion meaning is linked with the argument structure <agent, goal, theme>, whereas the caused possession meaning is linked with the argument structure <agent, possessor, theme>, we argue that each type of ditransitive verbs has the following argument structure(s).

(30) Argument structures of ditransitive verbs in Japanese
   a. *send*-type verbs
      <agent, possessor, theme> or
      <agent, goal, theme>
   b. *give*-type & *sell*-type verbs
      <agent, possessor, theme>

With these argument structures, now we will demonstrate that the two argument structures of *send*-type verbs in (30a) are in complementary distribution: it will never happen that the two argument

structures are realized simultaneously. Our claim differs from RH&L's (2008) view regarding English ditransitive verbs that the caused motion and caused possession event schemata (<agent, goal, theme> and <agent, possessor, theme> in our theory) are not in complementary distribution. RH&L claim that the verb *sent* in the two-goal construction (31) takes both the possessor goal *her* and the locative goal *to America* at the same time, and that (31) is a syntactic realization caused by combining the two schemata.

(31) Anne is curious as to why her father sent **her** a telegram **to America** to return home at once …
(RH&L, 2008)

The verb *okur-* 'send' in Japanese also allows the two-goal construction, as pointed out by Miyagawa and Tsujioka (2004).

(32) Taro-ga **Hanako-ni** nimotu-o
Taro-NOM Hanako-DAT package-ACC
Tokyo-ni   okutta.
Tokyo-DAT   sent
'Taro sent Hanako a package to Tokyo.'
(Miyagawa and Tsujioka, 2004)

We argue that the two-goal construction like (32) is not derived by combining the two argument structures <agent, possessor, theme> and <agent, goal, theme>. Rather, we argue that the two argument structures are in complementary distribution (see Goldberg (1995) and Harley (2002) regarding similar suggestions for English ditransitive verbs).

Before examining the *send*-type verbs in Japanese, let us first consider the example in (33), which has two dative phrases, *katiku-ni* 'livestock' and *buta-ni* 'pigs.'

(33) Taro-ga katiku-ni   buta-ni esa-o
Taro-NOM livestock-DAT pig-DAT food-ACC
ataeta.
gave
'Taro fed the livestock, pigs.'

(33) can never be a realization of the combination of two argument structures. The verb *atae-* 'give' has only the argument structure <agent, possessor, theme>. Notice that (33) is unacceptable without a pause between the two dative phrases. The necessity of pause indicates that the second dative phrase

buta-ni 'pigs' is a kind of after-thought information to specify the content of the first dative phrase *katiku-ni* 'livestock.' For this reason, we argue that the first dative phrase *katiku-ni* 'livestock' is an argument selected by the verb, whereas the second one is an unselected adjunct. Thus, the presence of two dative phrases in a single sentence does not always indicate that a single verb selects them as arguments, simultaneously.

Now, let us return to the two-goal construction in (32), where a possessor goal and a locative goal appear in a single sentence. Under our analysis, the verb *okur-* 'send' allows the two argument structures <agent, possessor, theme> and <agent, goal, theme>. The sluicing diagnostic test shows that the two-goal construction with this verb is not derived by combining the two argument structures.

(34) A: Taro-ga   nimotu-o   okutta.
Taro-NOM   package-ACC   sent
'Taro sent a package.'
B: Dare-ni?   B': Doko-ni?
who-to   where-to
'(To) whom?'   '(To) where?'
B'':*Dare-ni   doko-ni?
who-to   where-to
'(To) whom (to) where?'
B''':*Doko-ni?   dare-ni?
where-to   who-to
'(To) where (to) whom?'

In (34), the *wh*-remnant corresponds to the implicit (unpronounced) dative argument of the verb *okutta* 'sent' in the antecedent clause. (34B) and (34B') show that *okur-* 'send' takes either a possessor goal or a locative goal. The examples of multiple sluicing with both a possessor goal and a locative goal (34B'') and (34B''') are unacceptable without the context where Taro sent someone a package to somewhere.' Without such a special context, (34A) cannot be replied by (34B'') nor by (34B'''). This would be surprising if the verb *okutta* 'sent' could select both a possessor goal and a locative goal at one time. We claim that the verb *okutta* 'sent' takes only one implicit (unpronounced) goal in the antecedent (34A), and that (34B'') and (34B''') are impossible due to the identity requirement, which requires the unpronounced verb *okutta* 'sent' in the elided clause to take only one goal.

Some Japanese speakers might judge (34B'')
and (34B''') are acceptable with a specific intona-
tion or pause. We argue that such native speakers
might analyze (34B'') and (34B''') as in (35).

(35) a. [$_{CP}$ [[$_{vP1}$ ~~Taro-ga$_i$~~ dare-ni ~~nimotu-o$_j$ t$_k$~~] &
  [$_{vP2}$ pro$_i$ doko-ni pro$_j$ t$_k$] okutta$_k$]]
  b. [$_{CP}$ [[$_{vP1}$ ~~Taro-ga$_i$~~ doko-ni ~~nimotu-o$_j$ t$_k$~~] &
  [$_{vP2}$ pro$_i$ dare-ni pro$_j$ t$_k$] okutta$_k$]]

In (35), there are two occurrences of *okur-* 'send,'
and each occurrence selects *dare-ni* 'to whom' and
doko-ni 'to where,' separately.

This analysis leads a possibility that the English
two-goal construction in (31) is analyzed in the
same manner as (35): *her* and *to America* in (31) are
selected by each occurrence of *send*, separately. If
so, the two argument structures <agent, possessor,
theme> and <agent, goal, theme> are in comple-
mentary distribution both in Japanese and in English.

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we showed that the lexical meanings
of major ditransitive verbs in Japanese are the same
as those of their English counterparts. Specifically,
we argued that Kishimoto's (2001) classification of
send-type verbs and *sell*-type verbs is not correct.
Under his classification, *send*-type verbs encode
only caused motion (change of location in his term).
However, we demonstrated that Kishimoto's exam-
ples regarding the implication of successful transfer
and the animacy restriction do not eliminate the pos-
sibility that *send*-type verbs encode caused posses-
sion (as well as caused motion). We also showed
that the identity requirement on sluicing presents a
supportive argument for the view that *send*-type
verbs encode both caused motion and caused pos-
session. Furthermore, contra Kishimoto's claim that
sell-type verbs encode both caused motion and
caused possession, we argued that this type of verb
encodes only caused possession. We demonstrated
that Kishimoto's observation that *sell*-type verbs
pattern with *send*-type verbs, which encode only
caused motion, is not always correct: e.g. *sell*-type
verbs as ditransitive verbs cannot retain their mean-
ings when they are replaced by a directional move-
ment verb, unlike *send*-type verbs. We also showed
based on a sluicing test that *sell*-type verbs do not
take a locative goal.

Finally, we argued that *send*-type verbs have two
argument structures <agent, goal, theme> and
<agent, possessor, theme>, and that these two argu-
ment structures are in complementary distribution,
contra RH&L's (2008) view. They argue that the
two-goal construction is syntactically realized by
combining the two argument structures. In contrast,
we claimed that the two-goal construction involves
two occurrences of a ditransitive verb, each of
which has a different argument structure <agent,
goal, theme> or <agent, possessor, theme>. If so, it
is not the case that a single verb in the two-goal con-
struction selects two dative phrases simultaneously.
We conclude that the two argument structures of
send-type verbs are in complementary distribution.

References
Chung, Sandra. 2013. Syntactic Identity in Sluicing: How
  Much and Why. Linguistic Inquiry, 44: 1-44.

Chung, Sandra, William A. Ladusaw and James McClos-
  key. 1995. Sluicing and Logical Form. Natural Lan-
  guage Semantics, 3:239-282.

Goldberg, E. Adele. 1995. Constructions: A Construction
  Grammar Approach to Argument Structure, Univer-
  sity of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL.

Harley, Heidi. 2002. Possession and the Double Object
  Construction. Linguistic Variation Yearbook 2: 29-68.

Kishimoto, Hideki. 2001. The Role of Lexical Meaning
  in Argument Encoding: Double Object Verbs in Japa-
  nese. Gengo Kenkyu, 120:35-65.

Merchant, Jason. 2001. Syntax of Silence: Sluicing, Is-
  lands, and the Theory of Ellipsis. Oxford University
  Press, Oxford.

Miyagawa, Shigeru and Takae Tsujioka. 2004. Argument
  Structure and Ditransitive Verbs in Japanese. Journal
  of East Asian Linguistics, 13:1-35.

Rappaport Hovav, Malka and Beth Levin. 2008. The
  English Dative Alternation: The Case for Verb Sensi-
  tivity. Journal of Linguistics, 44: 129-167

Ross, John. 1969. Guess Who? Proceedings of the fifth
  Chicago Linguistic Society, 252-286.