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**DATIVE VERBS**: The subset of ditransitive verbs that take agent, recipient (possessional goal), and theme arguments, such as *give*, *send*, and *throw*; contrast the other major subset, verbs of putting.

- RH&L (2008) argue that any account of the argument realization of English dative verbs must be “verb sensitive”: a satisfactory analysis requires recognizing semantic distinctions among the verbs.
- In English, the challenge is that dative verbs show two argument realization options—a DATIVE ALTERNATION—one with recipient–theme order and the other with theme–recipient order.

(1) a. Terry gave Sam an apple. (double object construction; recipient–theme order)  
   b. Terry gave an apple to Sam. (*to* construction; theme–recipient order)

- Concomitantly, RH&L reassess the English facts used to support a competing “uniform multiple meaning” approach, which takes all dative verbs to have two distinct meanings, each giving rise to its own argument realization, and show they are better understood from a verb sensitive perspective.

- **Goals of the talk**: Argue for a meaning sensitive approach to Japanese and Korean dative verbs, which express their non-agent arguments using dative and accusative case, with either order of these arguments usually possible.

(2) Japanese:

   a. **DAT-ACC**: John-wa Mary-ni hon-o atae-ta.  
      John-TOP Mary-DAT book-ACC give-PST  
      ‘John gave a book to Mary.’

   b. **ACC-DAT**: John-wa hon-o Mary-ni atae-ta.  
      John-TOP book-ACC Mary-DAT give-PST  
      ‘John gave a book to Mary.’

(3) Korean:

      Mina-TOP/-NOM Swuni-DAT package-ACC give-PST-DCL  
      ‘Mina gave a package to Swuni.’

      Mina-TOP/-NOM package-ACC Swuni-DAT give-PST-DCL  
      ‘Mina gave a package to Swuni.’

**NOTE**: In cited data glosses and transliterations have sometimes been modified for consistency; Japanese –*ni* and Korean –*ey* and –*eykey* are glossed ‘DATive’, as is usual in the literature on ditransitives, though they are locative markers as well.

The ACC-ACC order found with a handful of Korean verbs (cf. Kittilä 2006) is largely ignored.
Mina gave a package to Swuni.

Given that DAT-ACC and ACC-DAT orders instantiate recipient-theme and theme-recipient orders, respectively, some have suggested that they can be understood as analogous to the English dative alternation (rather than, say, as scrambling; see Hoji 1985, Takano 1998, Yatsushiro 2003).

• Despite this, I will argue that the Japanese and Korean data should not be analyzed in terms of the uniform multiple meaning approach, even though researchers have borrowed from English the argumentation and evidence used to support this approach, adjusting as necessary.

1 Starting point: The argument realization problem posed by dative verbs

Representations relevant to an account of dative verbs:

• a verb’s root—its core lexicalized meaning (e.g., Grimshaw 2005, Pesetsky 1995, RH&L 1998):

  (5)  hand:v: ‘use the hand for transfer’

• the event types—and semantic roles—that this meaning can be associated with, giving rise to a “full” verb meaning:

  (6)  a. caused possession: ‘x act cause y to have z’ → y is a recipient
       e.g., ‘x act with the hand cause y to have z’

       b. caused motion: ‘x act cause z to be at y’ → y is a spatial goal
          e.g., ‘x act with the hand cause z to be at y’

• the morphosyntactic frames—or syntactic configurations—that realize these event types:

  (7)  a. double object construction: NP V NP NP (e.g., Smith handed Jones the medal)
       b. to construction: NP V NP to NP (e.g., Smith handed the medal to Jones)

The two parts of the argument realization problem with dative verbs:
— associations of verbs and event types: (core) verb (meaning) ⇒ event type
— associations of event types and morphosyntactic frames: event type ⇒ morphosyntactic frame

2 The verb sensitive approach to English (RH&L 2008; also Jackendoff 1990:197f)

• verb ⇒ event type in English:
  — give-type verbs: caused possession event type only.
  — send-type verbs: caused motion and (for some argument choices) caused possession.
2.1 The lexicalized meanings of dative verbs

(8) a. give-type verbs: assign, give, lend, loan, offer, promise, rent, sell, …
b. send-type verbs: forward, hand, mail, send, ship, …; includes throw-type verbs: fling, flip, kick, lob, slap, shoot, throw, toss, …

(Will largely ignore verbs involving communication of a message/transfer of information.)

• Core dative verbs or, henceforth, give-type verbs:
  lexicalize causing a change of possession, i.e. lexically select a recipient: e.g., (6a).

Their meanings could be schematized as in (9), assuming a primitive HAVE, inherently signifying possession, whether stative (e.g., English have, own) or not (e.g., English give, sell); the verb’s root has the ontological type ‘poss-type’ and elaborates on the form of possession specific to that verb.

(9) \[ \[ x \text{ ACT} ] \text{ CAUSE} [ \text{ BECOME} [ y \text{ HAVE}_{<\text{POSS-TYPE}>} z ] ] \]

— Give: This verb’s root does not contribute anything beyond what is already encoded in the caused possession event type in (9) (Goldberg 1995, 2006).

— Other verbs of giving: Their roots refine on the nature of the caused possession:
  e.g., rent and lend specify that the possession is temporary in some sense.
  e.g., promise, a verb of future having, contributes a modal operator (Koenig & Davis 2001:85).

• Noncore dative verbs or, henceforth, send-type verbs:
  do not lexicalize caused possession; many are said to lexically select a spatial goal, e.g., (6b).

— (core) send-type verbs: They inherently describe causing a theme to move to a spatial goal.

(10) \[ \[ x \text{ ACT}_{<\text{SEND}>} ] \text{ CAUSE} [ y \text{ GO} [ \text{ PATH} z ] ] \]

— throw-type verbs: They basically describe two-participant events in which one entity instantaneously imparts a force on a second entity, the force recipient. They differ in the manner in which the force is imparted or in the instrument used to impart the force.

(11) \[ x \text{ ACT}_{<\text{THROW}>} \]

NOTE: As send- and throw-type verbs largely pattern together, they are taken to represent one type.
2.2 Dative verb ⇒ event type in English (and beyond)

• *give*-type roots are inherently associated with the caused possession event type; they are not associated with the caused motion event type, contra other accounts.

• *send*-type roots are inherently associated with the caused motion event type, as in (10).

• *throw*-type roots are associatable with the caused motion event type because events of imparting a force may cause the force recipient to move along a path to a goal.

(12) $\left[\left[ x \ \text{ACT}_{<\text{THROW}>} \right] \ \text{CAUSE} \left[ y \ \text{GO} \ \left[ \text{PATH} \ z \right] \right] \right]$ 

• The roots of *send*- and *throw*-type verbs may also be associated with the caused possession event type in English (Jackendoff 1990, RH&L 2008) and beyond (Croft et al. 2001, Levin 2008) as they describe activities that provide the means to effect caused possession.

(13) $\left[\left[ x \ \text{ACT}_{<\text{SEND}/\text{THROW}>} \right] \ \text{CAUSE} \left[ y \ \text{HAVE} \ z \right] \right]$ 

2.3 Event type ⇒ morphosyntactic frame in English

• Caused motion event type ⇒ *to* construction only; that is, spatial goals are marked by *to*.

• Caused possession event type ⇒ double object construction or *to* construction; that is, recipients meet the semantic characterizations for two syntactic realizations:


  — OBJECT OF *to*: It indicates various argument types, broadly falling under semantic categories covered by dative and allative cases of other languages: spatial goals, recipients, and some arguments with less clear characterizations (e.g., yield/submit/surrender/subject to). Available to recipients as they qualify as a kind of goal by the Localist Hypothesis (Gruber 1965, Jackendoff 1983).

2.4 Noteworthy properties of the verb sensitive approach to English dative verbs

• The association of verbs with event types is not uniform across all verbs.

• The pairing of event types with morphosyntactic frames is not one-to-one.


• VERB ⇒ EVENT TYPE IN ENGLISH:
  — all dative verbs: caused motion and caused possession event types; thus, all dative verbs can take spatial goals and recipients.

• EVENT TYPE ⇒ MORPHOSYNTACTIC FRAME IN ENGLISH:
  — CAUSED POSSESSION: double object construction only.
  — CAUSED MOTION: *to* construction only.
3 Verb Sensitivity: From English to Japanese and Korean

STARTING POINT: Languages should show same association of semantic verb types and event types.

PREDICTION: The distinct association of give- and send-type verbs with event types posited for English should extend to other languages.

THE ASSOCIATION OF DATIVE VERBS WITH EVENT TYPES:
— give-type verbs: caused possession only.
— send-type verbs: caused motion and caused possession.

This prediction gains support from studies of Hebrew and Russian, which reveal that these languages parallel English in ‘verb type ⇒ event type’ (Francez 2006, Levin 2008).

Goal of the remainder of the talk: Show this is also so in Japanese and Korean.

NOTE: The association between an event type and morphosyntactic frames is a possible locus of crosslinguistic variation as the available frames depend on the resources of particular languages but this will only be discussed as it impinges on verb sensitivity.

4 Key evidence for the verb sensitive approach

A CENTRAL ASSUMPTION OF THE VERB SENSITIVE APPROACH: send- but not give-type verbs are associated with the caused motion event type; concomitantly, send- but not give-type verbs may take spatial goals.

Evidence that this is so is key to supporting the verb sensitive approach.

4.1 English evidence

send-type verbs in the to construction show certain properties that give-type verbs lack; these follow if send- but not give-type verbs select a spatial goal (Jackendoff 1990, Levinson 2005, RH&L 2008).

(14) (In)ability to question the to-phrase with where (Levinson 2005):
   a. To whom/where did you throw/send the ball?
   b. To whom/*where did you give the ball?

(15) (In)ability to select spatial prepositions beside to:
   a. Fred threw/kicked/sent the ball under the porch/behind the tree/over the fence.
   b. *Fred gave the ball at/behind/over Mary.

(16) (In)ability to take a source phrase (even in conjunction with a to phrase):
   a. Jill threw/kicked/sent the ball from home plate to third base.
   b. *Josie gave/offered the tickets from Marla to Bill.

Thus, the expression of the recipient in a to phrase is not on its own evidence that give-type verbs select a spatial goal, as posited by the uniform multiple meaning approach.
4.2 Japanese evidence

- THE QUESTION: Since like English to, Japanese –ni can mark a spatial goal or recipient (Sadakane & Koizumi 1995), do Japanese give-type verbs also select recipients only, and not spatial goals?

THE ANSWER: Recent work (e.g., Kishimoto 2001, Miyagawa & Tsujioka 2004) suggests this is so, but I will revisit this issue from a somewhat different perspective.

- –ni may be found with motion verbs, which may select for spatial goals, but never for recipients.

(17) Taro-wa eki-ni it-ta.
  Taro-TOP station-DAT go-PST
  ‘Taro went to the station.’

- Motion verbs can also be found with the goal postposition –e replacing –ni; this postposition “designates an ‘intended destination’” (Kishimoto 2001:42); the event delimiting postposition –made ‘up to/until’ (Beavers 2008) may also convey a similar notion.

(18) Taro-wa eki-e/-made it-ta.
  Taro-TOP station-ALL/-until go-PST
  ‘Taro went to/up to the station.’

- Interestingly, –e may replace –ni with the verbs okuru ‘send’ and yuu soo-suru ‘mail’; these verbs may also be found with a ‘from-to’ phrase, as well as a –made ‘until’ phrase; both properties are characteristic of verbs selecting spatial goals.

    John-TOP Mary-DAT letter-ACC send-PST/mail-PST
    ‘John sent a letter to Mary.’
    John-TOP Mary-ALL letter-ACC send-PST/mail-PST
    ‘John sent a letter to Mary.’ (Kishimoto 2001:42, (9))

(20) John-wa Mary-no uti-made nimotu-o okut-ta.
  John-TOP Mary-GEN home-until luggage-ACC send-PST
  ‘John sent luggage to Mary’s home.’ (Kishimoto 2001:43, (11))

(21) John-wa zitaku-kara Mary-ni tegami-o okut-ta.
  John-TOP home-from Mary-DAT letter-ACC send-PST
  ‘John sent a letter to Mary from his home.’ (Kishimoto 2001:44, (14))

- With atae ru ‘give’, –e cannot replace –ni, nor is –made or a ‘from-to’ combination possible.

(22) ?? John-wa Mary-e zyoohoo-o atae-ta/teikyoo-si-ta.
    John-TOP Mary-ALL information-ACC give-PST/offer-do-PST
    ‘John gave/offered information to Mary.’ (Kishimoto 2001:42, (10))

(23) ∗ John-wa Mary-no uti-made nimotu-o teikyoo-si-ta/wariate-ta.
    John-TOP Mary-GEN home-until luggage-ACC assign-PST
    ‘John offered/assigned luggage to Mary’s home.’ (Kishimoto 2001:43, (12))
(24) *John-wa zitaku-kara Mary-ni hon-o age-ta.
   John-TOP home-from Mary-DAT book-ACC give-PST
   ‘John gave a book from his home to Mary.’ (Kishimoto 2001:44, (13))

• okuru ‘send’ can take a ‘place’ argument, atae ‘give’ cannot, as expected if give-type verbs only take recipients (Kishimoto 2001:48, Miyagawa & Tsujioka 2004:9).

    Taroo-NOM Tokyo-DAT package-ACC send-PST
    ‘Taro sent a package to Tokyo.’ (Miyagawa & Tsujioka 2004:9, (20b))

(26) * Taroo-ga Tokyo-ni nimotu-o atae-ta.
    Taroo-NOM Tokyo-DAT package-ACC give-PST
    ‘Taro gave a package to Tokyo.’ (intended)

• These observations suggest that Japanese distinguishes give-type verbs from send-type verbs, as proposed by Ito (2007), Kishimoto (2001), and Matsuoka (2003).


• These observations also support the more general proposal that give-type verbs take recipients, but not spatial goals, and, thus, are only associated with the caused possession event type.

Summary: The verb sensitive approach to Japanese

• VERB ⇒ EVENT TYPE IN JAPANESE:
  — give-type verbs: caused possession event type only.
  — send-type verbs: caused motion and caused possession.

• EVENT TYPE ⇒ MORPHOSYNTACTIC FRAME IN JAPANESE:
  — CAUSED POSSESSION: recipient expressed with –ni only.
  — CAUSED MOTION: spatial goal expressed with –ni or –e.

4.3 Korean evidence

THE QUESTION: Are Korean give-type verbs associated with the caused motion event type? No.

• –eykey is the form of the dative marker found with animates, contrasting with –ey, which is found with non-animates (e.g., Maling 2002). (See Park & Whitman 2003 and Urushibara 1991 for arguments that –eykey is more correctly a postposition.)

• –eykey, like –ey, is also found with verbs that clearly only take spatial goals, i.e. verbs of motion; thus, it may introduce spatial goals, as well as recipients.
In clear spatial uses, –eykey may be suffixed by –lo (simply glossed ‘LO’), which “denotes the direction ‘to, toward, (heading) for’” (Sohn 1994:257; see also Son 2006:195, n. 21), while –ey, the dative found with inanimates, alternates with –lo (there is no form *–ey-lo).

Interestingly, –eykey can be suffixed with –lo with ponay ‘send’, but not cwu ‘give’.

This distributional property supports extending to Korean the proposal that only send- and not give-type verbs are associated with the caused motion event type: only they then select for spatial goals, as well as recipients, and, thus, only they allow the addition of –lo.

Just as the –ni–e alternation supports making a distinction between spatial goals and recipients in Japanese, so too does the distribution of –lo support a comparable distinction in Korean.

Thus, Korean distinguishes give-type verbs from send-type verbs, with only the latter being associated with the caused motion event type.

### give-type verbs:
- cwu ‘give’
- kennay ‘hand’
- kicungha ‘donate’
- mathki ‘entrust’
- phal ‘sell’
- pillye cwu ‘lend’
- semnwulha ‘present (gift)’
- sensaha ‘present (gift)’
- say noh/cwu ‘rent (apartment)’
- taychwlha ‘lend (bank context)’
- tayyeha ‘rent (video/car)’

### send-type verbs:
- centalha ‘forward (e-mail)’
- pannapha ‘return (books)’
- panpwumha ‘return (merchandise)’
- pansongha ‘return (package)’
- paysongha ‘ship’
- paytalha ‘deliver’
- ponay ‘send’
- pwuchi ‘mail’
- cha ‘kick’
- chi ‘hit’
- phaysuha ‘pass’
- tenci ‘throw’
- thosuha ‘toss’
NOTE: Jung & Miyagawa (2004) make a somewhat overlapping cut by differentiating the verbs allowing ACC-ACC, which are a subset of the give-type verbs, from other dative verbs.

• Further evidence that Korean send-type verbs are associated with the caused motion event type, but give-type verbs are not:

— send-type verbs can take a ‘place’ argument, give-type verbs cannot.

(37) a. na-nun Tokyo-ey/-lo sopho-lul ponay-ss-ta.
    I-TOP Tokyo-DAT/-LO package-ACC send-PST-DCL
    ‘I sent the package to Tokyo.’

    I-TOP Tokyo-DAT package-ACC give-PST-DCL
    ‘I gave the package to Tokyo.’ (intended)

— send-type verbs can take a ‘from-to’ combination, but give-type verbs cannot.

(38) a. na-nun Tokyo-eye/-lopwuthe Seoul-lo sopho-lul ponay-ss-ta.
    I-TOP Tokyo-ABL/-ABL Seoul-LO package-ACC send-PST-DCL
    ‘I sent the package from Tokyo to Seoul.’

    I-TOP Tokyo-ABL/-ABL Seoul-LO package-ACC give-PST-DCL
    ‘I gave the package from Tokyo to Seoul.’ (intended)

Summary: The verb sensitive approach to Korean

• VERB ⇒ EVENT TYPE IN KOREAN:
  — give-type verbs: caused possession event type only.
  — send-type verbs: caused motion and caused possession.

• EVENT TYPE ⇒ MORPHOSYNTACTIC FRAME IN KOREAN:
  — CAUSED POSSESSION: recipient expressed with –eykey only.
  — CAUSED MOTION: spatial goal with –ey or –lo, if inanimate, and –eykey or eykey-lo, if animate.

5 Evidence from verb–abstract theme combinations

The caused possession event type is amenable to abstract as well as concrete entities as themes.

Prediction of the verb sensitive approach: Instances of caused possession should show the same argument realization options independent of the type of theme.

5.1 Evidence from English (RH&L 2008)

The prediction for English: The recipient should still show two argument realization options even with abstract themes.

• Evidence: give-type verbs are only associated with the caused possession event type, and when they take abstract themes, they can be found in both the double object and to construction.
(39)  a. We gave a fresh coat of paint to the house.  
We gave the house a fresh coat of paint.
   b. The music lent a festive air to the party.  
The music lent the party a festive air.
   c. The judge gave/awarded custody to the child’s uncle.  
The judge gave/awarded the child’s uncle custody.
   d. The new spray cleaner gave a streaked appearance to the mirror in the bedroom.  
The new spray cleaner gave the mirror in the bedroom a streaked appearance.

• Unlike examples with concrete themes, these have a ‘cause to come into existence’ reading and, concomitantly, lack a source of transfer.

• In contrast, proponents of the uniform multiple meaning approach assume that the to construction always encodes caused motion and, thus, must involve a path of motion.

   — Thus, they take uses of give-type verbs with abstract themes not to be open to a caused motion interpretation: without a source of transfer, there can be no path constituent.

   — Such uses, then, should be incompatible with the to construction.

   — Indeed, proponents of this approach (Goldberg 1992, Harley 2003, Krifka 2004) claim that the to construction is unavailable with abstract themes.

(40)  a. The kids gave me a headache.
   b. ?? The kids gave a headache to me.

   b. *Interviewing Nixon gave a book to Norman Mailer.

   — However, the reduced acceptability of (40b) and (41b) most likely is attributable to givenness and heaviness considerations (Bresnan et al. 2007, RH&L 2008, Snyder 2003); these are known to sometimes preclude one of the two realizations of the caused possession event type.

   — Once these are controlled for, the verb–argument combinations in (40b) and (41b) improve.

(42)  a. This can give a headache even to a Tylenol. (http://www.dilbert.com/)
   b. Nixon’s behavior gave an idea for a book to every journalist living in New York City in the 1970s. (Snyder 2003: 35, (48))

• Why is it appealing to associate give-type verbs with the caused motion event type?

Most likely, the appeal stems from taking the real world context of the prototypical caused possession event to be part of the meaning of the verb (root) and/or construction (event type).

In the real world, when one person causes another to have possession of a physical object, the first person usually physically transfers it to the second person. Such a transfer, however, cannot be effected unless the first person has physical control over the object and, thus, is perceived as the source of a path from the giver to the recipient.

In contrast, abstract entities such as custody, ideas, or headaches need not be possessed by the giver or even exist prior to the event.
Thus, caused possession may be effected even in the absence of a source of transfer; events of caused possession should be separated from their possible instantiation via physical transfer.

5.2 Evidence from Japanese and Korean

Although instances of caused possession with abstract themes are less prevalent in Japanese and Korean than in English, their existence nonetheless further supports the claim that give-type verbs are not associated with the caused motion event type in these languages, despite claims to the contrary.

- **Support from Japanese**: Although they are proponents of the uniform multiple meaning approach, Miyagawa & Tsujioka note that grammaticality contrasts attributed to caused possession with abstract themes such as English (40) are not found in Japanese (2004:33, n. 15).

— Miyagawa & Tsujioka’s own examples are not cited here, as those I consulted find them slightly unnatural, but other examples are possible.

(43) Saibanchoo-ga Mary-ni kodomo-no yooikuken-o atae-ta.
judge-NOM Mary-DAT child-GEN custody-ACC give-PST
‘The judge gave Mary custody of the child.’

(44) John-wa Mary-ni yoi inshoo-o atae-ta.
John-TOP Mary-DAT good impression-ACC give-PST
‘John made a good impression on Mary.’ [lit. John gave Mary a good impression]

(45) John-no kotoba-ga/ Sono shiken-no kekka-ga Mary-ni kiboo-o atae-ta.
John-GEN word-NOM/ that exam-GEN result-NOM Mary-DAT hope-ACC give-PST
‘John’s words/That exam’s results gave Mary hope.’

— Although (43)-(45) have DAT-ACC order, ACC-DAT counterparts are possible; however, slight modifications may be necessary: e.g., a slightly simplified form of (43) is fine with either order.

judge-NOM Mary-DAT custody-ACC give-PST
‘The judge gave Mary custody.’

b. ACC-DAT: Saibanchoo-ga yooikuken-o Mary-ni atae-ta.
judge-NOM custody-ACC Mary-DAT give-PST
‘The judge gave Mary custody.’

- **Support from Korean**: Instances of caused possession with abstract themes are attested; they are illustrated with DAT-ACC order, but ACC-DAT order is possible, but not given here.

(47) phansa-ka Mary-eykey ku ai-uy yangyukkwen-ul cwu-ess-ta.
judge-NOM Mary-DAT that child-GEN custody-ACC give-PST-DCL
‘The judge gave Mary custody of the child.’

John-NOM Mary-DAT good impression-ACC give-PST-DCL
‘John made a good impression on Mary.’ [lit. John gave Mary a good impression]

(49) John-i Mary-eykey huymang/casinkam-ul cwu-ess-ta.
John-NOM Mary-DAT hope/self.confidence-ACC give-PST-DCL
‘John gave Mary hope/self-confidence.’
6 Evidence from idioms (and conventional collocations)

- RH&L (2008) show that distributional facts concerning the realization of the “fixed” arguments of English idioms conform to the verb sensitive approach and, thus, support it; they also show that the facts are not as assumed by proponents of the uniform multiple meaning approach.

- Comparable data cited in the Japanese/Korean literature will be revisited.

- The verb sensitive approach predicts a previously unobserved asymmetry in dative verb distribution in idioms; RH&L show it holds in English, and it turns out to hold in Japanese and Korean.

6.1 Evidence from English (RH&L 2008)

- Dative verb idioms are classified according to whether the theme or the goal is fixed, where the term ‘goal’ is used to refer to the non-agent, non-theme argument.

(50) a. **FIXED GOAL IDIOMS**: send x to the showers, send x to the devil, take x to the cleaners, push x to the edge, carry x to extremes, throw x to the wolves, . . .
   b. **FIXED THEME IDIOMS**: read x the riot act, lend x an ear, show x the ropes, promise x the moon, give x the cold shoulder, give x the creeps, give x the boot, . . .

- The verb sensitive approach requires determining whether ‘goal’ means ‘spatial goal’ or ‘recipient’; this will be clarified.

- The English idiom facts are as expected on the verb sensitive analysis
  — **FIXED GOAL IDIOMS** as in (50a) involve caused motion and, hence, a spatial goal, rather than a recipient; as expected, they are found only in the to construction, though their verbs can alternate.

(51) a. The employee sent his boss to the devil.
   b. *The employee sent the devil his boss.

  — **FIXED THEME IDIOMS** as in (50b) involve a caused possession meaning and, hence, a recipient, rather than a purely spatial goal; as expected, they are found in both constructions.

(52) a. Oscar will give that employee the boot.
   b. Oscar will give the boot **to** any employee that shows up late.
      (Harley 2003:43, (19c); based on Larson 1988:341, (11))

(53) a. The president gave the senator the cold shoulder.
   b. Even the Argentine president, known for his weakness for women, was giving the cold shoulder **to** the flamboyant American singer . . . (COBUILD)

(54) a. The candidate gave his opponent a wide berth.
   b. “. . . You want to give a wide berth **to** political discussion.” (The Columbus Dispatch, October 23, 2001, p. 02B; Nexis)
• **A NOTE ON DISTRIBUTION:** Previous work (e.g., Harley 2003) takes fixed theme idioms to be restricted to the double object construction, contrary to fact.

This apparent asymmetry, like the verb–abstract theme asymmetry, is attributable to factors such as givenness and heaviness.

However, it seems to support the uniform multiple meaning approach because on the surface it appears as if each idiom type is associated with a distinct construction:

(55) a. Fixed theme idioms with the double object construction.
   
   b. Fixed goal idioms with the *to* construction.

• **A NEW OBSERVATION:** There are apparently no fixed recipient idioms.

A **REASON:** Recipients by their very nature are animate NPs, but there is a constraint against fixed animate NPs in idioms, as they are not good inputs to metaphors (Nunberg et al. 1994).

**INDEPENDENT EVIDENCE:** The rarity of agents as fixed parts of idioms (Marantz 1997).

### 6.2 Evidence from Japanese and Korean

Idioms involving dative verbs have been used to reach varied conclusions about Japanese and Korean dative verbs, all within the confines of the uniform multiple meaning approach (Kim 2008, Miyagawa & Tsujioka 2004, Oh & Zubizarreta 2009).

**THE REPORTED OBSERVATION:** In Japanese and Korean idioms headed by dative verbs (cf. (55)):

— Fixed theme idioms: theme immediately to the left of the verb; i.e. have ACC-V order.
— Fixed goal idioms: goal immediately to the left of the verb; i.e. have DAT-V order.

(56) a. Taroo-wa sainoo-o *hana-ni* kaketeiru.  
   Taro-TOP talent-ACC nose-DAT hanging  
   ‘Taro always boasts of his talent.’  
   *... *hana-ni* sainoo-o kaketeiru

   b. Taroo-wa sono giron-ni *hakusya-o* kaketa.  
   Taro-TOP that controversy-DAT spur-ACC hang  
   ‘Taro added fresh fuel to the controversy.’  
   *... *hakusya-o* sono giron-ni kaketa

(Miyagawa & Tsujioka 2004:21, (53))

### 6.2.1 Fixed goal idioms

• On the verb sensitive approach, English fixed goal idioms necessarily involve a spatial goal and, thus, the caused motion event type; hence, they are only found in the *to* construction.

• Japanese and Korean fixed goal idioms too should only instantiate the caused motion event type and involve a spatial goal and not a recipient.

• **SUPPORT FROM JAPANESE:** In many idioms, the fixed NP, which is marked with −*ni*, may also be marked with −*e*, like other spatial goals (Tsujioka 2009:10-11; contra Kishimoto 2008).
(57) a. sono jijitu-o mune-ni/-e simau
that fact-ACC chest-DAT/-ALL put away
‘keep the fact as a secret’ (Tsujioka 2009:10, (20b))

b. uwasa-o mimi-ni/-e ireru
rumor-ACC ear-DAT/-ALL put in
‘hear the rumor’ (Tsujioka 2009:10, (20c))

NOTE: According to Tsujioka, only some fixed –ni phrase idioms allow such an alternation, though which varies across speakers as well as over time (2009:11, 36, n. 5). She proposes that the idioms that resist the alternation are more “frozen” (18-20); if so, lack of alternation is not in itself a reason to take these idioms to involve recipients.

- SUPPORT FROM KOREAN: Few true fixed goal idioms are cited, but one such idiom allows its fixed NP, which is marked with –ey, also to be marked with –lo, as expected of a spatial goal.

(58) In the context: Bring me $10,000 by tomorrow . . .

an kulemyen (nay-ka) (ne-lul) cesung-ey/-ulo ponay-keyss-ta.
if not do (I-NOM) (you-ACC) other.world-DAT/-LO send-FUT-DCL
‘if not, I’ll send you to the other world (i.e. kill you).’

6.2.2 Fixed theme idioms

- As fixed theme idioms in English are found in both dative alternation constructions, comparable Japanese and Korean idioms might not be expected to show rigid ACC-V order.


Sue-TOP mother-DAT duck.foot-ACC thrust.out-PST-DCL
‘Sue feigned innocence to her mother.’ (Kim 2008:123, (30a))

(60) ACC-DAT?? Sue-nun olipal-ul emma-eykey naymil-ess-ta.
Sue-TOP duck.foot-ACC mother-DAT thrust.out-PST-DCL
‘Sue feigned innocence to her mother.’ (Kim 2008:123, (30b))

(61) kutul-un mwuchaykim-uy ip-ul olaycen-ey ssis-ko,
they-TOP irresponsibility-GEN mouth-ACC long.ago-LOC wipe-and
olipal-ul swuncinhan kwukmintul-eykey naymil-kyense,
duck.foot-ACC naive people-DAT thrust.out-while
cangoythwucayng-uy kkwulmas-ey cec-ko mal-ass-ta.
off.stage.fight-GEN honey.taste-LOC soak-end.up-PST-DCL
‘They [the opposition party] ignored their responsibility a long time ago, feigned innocence to naive citizens, and ended up indulging themselves in the sweet taste of the off-stage fight (i.e. outside the Assembly).’
Nevertheless, there is a very strong preference for a fixed theme to be verb-adjacent in Japanese and Korean idioms, so word order in idioms is less flexible than in English.

This difference in idiom rigidity might be attributed to independent factors that affect word order, interacting with the lack of determiners in Japanese and Korean.

Factors determining word order in Korean ditransitives (Choi 2007, 2008):
— A given-before-new preference
— A long-before-short preference (also in Japanese; Yamashita & Chang 2001, Yamashita 2002);
  this preference holds particularly strongly in ACC-DAT-V order (Choi 2008);
  contrast with the reverse short-before-long preference in English!

A potential explanation of word order rigidity:
Due to the given-before-new preference, earlier material is typically taken to be referential despite the lack of a determiner and, hence, given.
Thus, in ACC-DAT-V order the theme of a fixed theme idiom would be typically understood as referential, making the idiomatic interpretation impossible.
In fact, the theme of a fixed theme idiom in ACC-DAT-V order is usually understood literally (Kim 2008 for Korean; Kishimoto 2008 for Japanese), though there are rare exceptions, as in (61).

6.3 A newly attested idiom asymmetry predicted by the verb sensitive approach

Prediction: Due to the lack of recipient idioms, fixed goal idioms must involve send-type verbs or verbs of putting, which like them take spatial goals, but not give-type verbs, which do not.

Support from English: No verb in (50a) is a give-type verb (RH&L 2008).


Support from Korean: Less information is readily available. Although Kim (2008) cites a study of ditransitive verb idioms by Hong (1998), this study only gives aggregate figures, which suggests a paucity of fixed goal idioms. Furthermore, the examples cited suggest Hong’s notion of idiom is overly broad, encompassing sayings and adages.

However, the Korean fixed goal idiom cited in (58) does satisfy the prediction regarding verb type: cesung-ey ponay ‘send to the other world’ [i.e. kill]

7 Taking stock and looking forward

The meaning of each dative verb contributes to the morphosyntactic realization of its arguments.
The contribution is mediated by the distinct associations of semantic verb classes with event types.
With the verb type–event type associations clarified, it should become easier to resolve the lack of consensus about how the morphosyntactic frames characteristic of Japanese and Korean dative verbs should be aligned with those of the English dative alternation.
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