

# Table of Contents

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>Abstract</b>  | i         |
| <b>Acknowledgements</b>                                      | iv        |
| <b>Table of Contents</b>                                     | vii       |
| <b>Abbreviations</b>   | xi        |
| <br>   |           |
| <b>Chapter 1 Introduction: Framework and Overview</b>        | <b>1</b>  |
| 1 Argument Structure in the GB framework                     | 1         |
| 2 Argument Structure as Phrase Structure                     | 4         |
| 2.1 Hale and Keyser (1993)                                   | 4         |
| 3 Argument Structure as Restriction on Derivation            | 8         |
| 3.1 Functional vs. lexical                                   | 8         |
| 3.2 Pylkkänen (2002)   | 9         |
| 4 Proposal: The Generalized Little-Verb Hypothesis           | 11        |
| 4.1 Theoretical aim  | 11        |
| 4.2 Theoretical implication                                  | 12        |
| 4.3 Empirical discussion                                     | 14        |
| <br>   |           |
| <b>Chapter 2 Layered Little Verbs: Possessor of Interest</b> | <b>20</b> |
| 1 Introduction   | 20        |
| 2 The Possessive Relationship Construction (PRC)             | 26        |
| 2.1 Main properties  | 26        |
| 2.2 The verbs involved: Washio (1997)                        | 32        |
| 3 Hasegawa's (2001) Little- <i>v</i> Analysis                | 37        |
| 4 Where and How is Possessor Introduced into the Derivation? | 42        |
| 4.1 Derivation of the PRC and the regular transitive         | 42        |

|         |   |     |
|---------|---|-----|
| 4.2     | The first Merge as selection                          | 44  |
| 5       | Movement of Possessor                                 | 48  |
| 5.1     | Comparison with Possessor which stays in a DP         | 48  |
| 5.2     | The difference between the two “Experiencers”         | 49  |
| 5.3     | <i>Pro</i> or trace?                                  | 61  |
| 5.4     | The “PBC”   | 63  |
| 5.5     | Apparent extraction from relative clauses             | 64  |
| 6       | Comparison with the Adversity Passive                 | 68  |
| 7       | Decomposition of Little <i>v</i>                      | 72  |
| 7.1     | The PRC and other non-Agentive constructions          | 72  |
| 7.1.1   | Syntactic properties                                  | 73  |
| 7.1.1.1 | Verb selection  | 73  |
| 7.1.1.2 | The Cause subject is not always possible              | 74  |
| 7.1.2   | Semantic properties: Benefactive/Malefactive readings | 77  |
| 7.1.2.1 | Predicate types                                       | 77  |
| 7.1.2.2 | Possessor has to go up                                | 78  |
| 7.2     | The Applicative hypothesis                            | 82  |
| 7.3     | A proposal  | 83  |
| 7.3.1   | Morphology of the layered little verbs                | 88  |
| 7.4     | Controllability of the event                          | 97  |
| 8       | Remaining Problems and Cross-Linguistic Perspective   | 101 |
| 8.1     | Verb selection  | 101 |
| 8.2     | External or internal Merge to Appl                    | 104 |
| 8.3     | Why is Possessor permitted to move?                   | 105 |
| 9       | Conclusion  | 108 |

### **Chapter 3 Ditransitives and Applicative**

|   |   |     |
|---|---|-----|
| 1 | Introduction                                      |     |
|   | —Derivationally-Related View vs. Split- Head View | 111 |
| 2 | Two Types of Approaches for Double Objects        | 113 |

|         |  |     |
|---------|--|-----|
| 2.1     | A derivationally-related view: Larson (1988)                   | 113 |
| 2.2     | A split-head view: Pylkkänen (2002)                            | 119 |
| 3       | Japanese Ditransitives   | 122 |
| 3.1     | Derivationally-related by scrambling: Hoji (1985)              | 122 |
| 3.2     | The two-Goal hypothesis: Miyagawa and Tsujioka (2004)          | 125 |
| 4       | Proposal: Morphologically Realized Applicative Head            | 134 |
| 4.1     | Applicative for Possessor                                      | 134 |
| 4.2     | Applicative for the Benefactive/Malefactive                    | 134 |
| 4.3     | The existence restriction                                      | 136 |
| 5       | The Give Benefactive/Malefactive Construction (GBC)            | 143 |
| 5.1     | Basic properties   | 143 |
| 5.1.1   | The original donative verbs <i>age-ru/yar-u</i>                | 143 |
| 5.1.2   | The adverbial phrase <i>no-tame-ni</i>                         | 145 |
| 5.2     | <i>Ni</i> -phrases   | 146 |
| 5.2.1   | Categorical status of a <i>ni</i> -phrase: Pattern 1           | 151 |
| 5.2.2   | Categorical status of a <i>ni</i> -phrase: Pattern 2           | 155 |
| 5.2.3   | Verb types: Levin (1993)                                       | 158 |
| 5.2.4   | Performance verbs  | 164 |
| 5.3     | Benefactive raising  | 165 |
| 5.3.1   | Absence of the <i>ni</i> -marked Benefactive phrase: Pattern 4 | 165 |
| 5.3.2   | Indeterminate binding  | 167 |
| 5.3.2.1 | Comparison with Kishimoto's proposal                           | 177 |
| 5.3.3   | Pronoun binding  | 177 |
| 5.3.4   | Scope interaction  | 185 |
| 5.3.5   | What undergoes raising?  | 189 |
| 5.4     | Introducing a <i>ni</i> -marked Benefactive phrase: Pattern 3  | 190 |
| 5.5     | The mechanism of Benefactive raising                           | 194 |
| 5.6     | Comparison with construction grammar                           | 195 |
| 5.7     | Properties of the 'give' verb                                  | 198 |
| 5.8     | Benefactive constructions in Alamblak: Iwamoto (1999)          | 206 |

|  |  |     |
|--|--|-----|
| 5.9  | Comparison with the PRC                                    | 209 |
| 6  | Conclusion and Remaining Issues                            | 209 |
| <br>   |  |     |
| <b>Chapter 4 What Counts as a SINGLE Event?</b>            |  |     |
| <b>—Approaching from Japanese V-V Predicates</b>           |  |     |
| 1  | Introduction   | 213 |
| 1.1  | Overview   | 213 |
| 1.2  | Issue 1: Lexical or syntactic                              | 215 |
| 1.3  | Issue 2: How is a SINGLE event/argument structure derived? | 216 |
| 2  | What is a “SINGLE” Verb?                                   | 217 |
| 2.1  | Four types of VVPs   | 217 |
| 2.2  | Is T included?   | 224 |
| 2.3  | Inner structures of VVPs                                   | 229 |
| 2.3.1  | Focus particles and isolated tense                         | 229 |
| 2.3.2  | The inner structure of an event                            | 232 |
| 2.3.3  | Transitivity alternation: Sakai et al. (2004)              | 233 |
| 2.3.4  | Decomposing VVPs   | 241 |
| 2.4  | Little verb in VVPs  | 246 |
| 2.5  | Interim summary  | 252 |
| 2.6  | Type D: V1- <i>te</i> -V2                                  | 256 |
| 2.6.1  | Constituency   | 258 |
| 2.6.2  | Properties related to single/complex event(s)              | 263 |
| 3  | Conclusion and Implication                                 | 265 |
| Appendix to Chapter 4 T in Non-Finite Forms: Mihara (1997) |  | 271 |
| <br>   |  |     |
| <b>Chapter 5 Conclusion</b>                                |  | 277 |
| <br>   |  |     |
| <b>Bibliography</b>  |  | 282 |