The Syntax of Giving and Receiving

Hiroyuki TANAKA*

I. Donors and Recipients

The aim of this paper is to show that the animate Source argument (Donor) of verbs of giving/receiving in Japanese is generated below Spec, \( \nu \)P and the Goal argument (Recipient) is generated below Source. Given that Japanese allows either Source or Goal to be the external argument of the clause, it follows that Spec, \( \nu \)P is not the base position of the external argument. Rather, I claim that this position arises from a formal requirement of \( \nu \) that causes some argument within its c-command domain to raise to its specifier. In other words, an external argument is a result of the “externalization” of some internally generated argument.

Hereafter I refer to the \( \theta \)-role assigned to the giver of the giving/receiving relation as Donor, and to the \( \theta \)-role assigned to the receiver of the relation as Recipient. A generally accepted terminology would be Source and Goal, but I use Donor and Recipient to emphasize the fact that the relations the pair of \( \theta \)-roles express are restricted to human-to-human relations, and hence their bearers are necessarily animate.

I examine what I call the dative Donor construction and the \( \kara \)-subject construction as cases where the “lowness” of Donor and Recipient are relatively clear. An example of the dative Donor construction is given in (1). As this example shows, there are verbs (whose meaning approximates that of receive) where Recipient is the nominative subject and Donor can be marked with dative (-ni). Syntactic properties of this type of verbs will be investigated in sections II–VI.

(1) Mary-ga John-ni hon-o morat-ta. (dative Donor)
   M.-NOM J.-DAT book-ACC receive-PAST
   ‘Mary received a book from John.’

In section VII I demonstrate that Japanese has a \( \kara \)-subject construction, where the subject is marked with the postposition \( \kara \) ‘from’ and verbs of giving are typically involved, and that the existence of this construction is naturally predicted once we allow
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for the basic $vP$ structure that is defended here.

The structure to be defended is illustrated in (2). I claim that this structure underlies verbs of giving/receiving in Japanese that involve an animate giver and an animate recipient. Semantically speaking, the dative Donor construction and the $kara$-subject construction both involve a close relationship between Donor and Recipient, which I take to be syntactically represented by an applicative projection (call it $PathP$) that pairs up Donor and Recipient. Donor and Recipient are generated in the multiple Specs of $PathP$, which dominates VP and is dominated by $vP$. (Throughout the paper the structures are illustrated in a head-initial fashion just for the sake of readability.)

(2) \[ TP \rightarrow T [vP \rightarrow v [PathP \text{Donor} [\text{Recipient} Path^0 [VP \text{V Theme}]]]] \]

Note that Recipient is generated below Donor, which I assume to reflect the universal thematic hierarchy projected onto syntax conforming to Uniformity of Theta Assignment Hypothesis (Baker, 1988). In the dative Donor construction Recipient crosses over Donor, lands in Spec,$vP$, and proceed to Spec,TP, for reasons to be discussed below. This proposal has two novel aspects: (i) what seems to be the subject of a transitive verb is base-generated lower than Spec,$vP$, and (ii) there is no argument base-generated in Spec,$vP$ but the subject moves into this position. In what follows I provide empirical and theoretical arguments that support (i) and (ii), and show how the analysis leads to predictions about the syntactic properties of this and related constructions.

II. Dative Donor Construction

In Japanese, some verbs that take a Donor argument can mark that argument with dative (-ni). For example, (3a) is a typical “double object” construction where the verb *age* ‘give’ takes a dative-marked Recipient, whereas (3b) is a case involving a verb that takes a Recipient subject and Donor, which is either marked by the dative -ni or the postposition $kara$ ‘from’. In parallel, (4a) has the verb *osie* ‘teach’, which takes a dative Recipient, and (4b) has the verb *osowar* ‘be.taught’, which takes a dative or $kara$-marked Donor.

(3) a. John-ga Mary-ni hon-o age-ta. (dative Recipient)  
   J.-NOM M.-DAT book-ACC give-PAST  
   ‘John gave a book to Mary.’

b. Mary-ga John-ni/-kara hon-o morat-ta. (dative Donor)  
   M.-NOM J.-DAT/-from book-ACC receive-PAST  
   ‘John received a book from Mary.’

(4) a. John-ga Mary-ni karate-o osie-ta. (dative Recipient)  
   J.-NOM M.-DAT karate-ACC teach-PAST  
   ‘John taught karate to Mary.’
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b. Mary-ga John-ni/-kara karate-o osowat-ta. (dative Donor)
    M.-NOM J.-DAT/-from karate-ACC be.taught-PAST
    'Mary was taught karate by John.'

The class of verbs that can take a dative Donor is rather restricted. There are verbs (some of which are listed in (5a)) that can mark (what seems to be) Donor with kara ‘from’ but cannot mark it with dative, as shown in (5b).

    b. Mary-ga John*-ni/-kara hon-o ubat-ta.
       M.-NOM J.-DAT/-from book-ACC rob-PAST
       'Mary robbed John of a book.'

I assume that these verbs are not compatible with the structure (2); they do not take Donor but simply Source, whose volition is not relevant to the event described by the verb. Source in this sense is generated in a position not closely related to the subject, perhaps internal to VP.

As we will see below, two types of verbs that do take a dative Donor must be recognized. The distinction is based on the morphology of the verbs. What I call the osowar-type verbs, listed in (6b), have the morpheme -ar in their stem, which alternates with -e to derive their dative Recipient counterparts as in (7a). (I call the dative Recipient verbs age-type verbs hereafter.) Moraw-type verbs, listed in (6c), do not have an age-type counterpart whose morphology is transparently related to them as in the case of osowar-type verbs.

    b. Osowar-type (dative Donor): osowar ‘be.taught’, azukar ‘be.entrusted’, sazukar ‘be.endowed’, iitukar ‘be.ordered’
(7) a. osow-ar ‘be.taught’/osi-e ‘teach’, azuk-ar ‘be.entrusted’/azuk-e ‘entrust’, sazuk-ar ‘be.endowed’/sazuk-e ‘endow’, iituk-ar ‘be.ordered’/iituk-e ‘order’
    b. moraw ‘receive’/age ‘give’, kari ‘borrow’/kas ‘lend’, naraw ‘learn’/__

III. Base Positions for Donor and Recipient

Intuitively, the pairs of sentences in (3) and (4) describe the same event, in which a movement of Theme is conducted between two participants, Donor and Recipient, just like passivized sentences describe the same event as its active counterpart does. In fact, there have been some suggestions (Shibatani, 1978; Zushi, 1992) that the dative marking on Donor is comparable to the dative marking in the passive. (See also Kageyama (2002).)
I claim that the pairs in (3) and (4) are indeed derived from the same base structure. Let us assume that they differ only in the choice of the argument to be picked up as the subject and moved to Spec,TP: Whereas Donor moves to Spec,TP when the verb is of the age-type, Recipient is chosen as the subject when the verb is of the moraw/osowar-type.

This analysis predicts certain asymmetries between the subjects of age-type verbs and the subject of moraw/osowar-type verbs, since the former is the highest argument in the clause throughout the derivation but the latter starts lower than Donor and crosses over Donor on its way to Spec,TP. As expected, it can float a numeral quantifier after the dative Donor (8, 9), and it can take scope below the dative Donor (10).

(8) a. *Gakusei-ga Mary-ni futari karate-o osie-ta.
    student-NOM M.-DAT two.CL karate-ACC teach-PAST
    ‘Two students taught karate to Mary.’

   b. Gakusei-ga Mary-ni futari karate-o osowat-ta.
    student-NOM M.-DAT two.CL karate-ACC be.taught-PAST
    ‘Two students were taught karate by Mary.’

(9) a. *Gakusei-ga Mary-ni san-nin hon-o age-ta.
    student-NOM M.-DAT three-CL book-ACC give-PAST
    ‘Three students gave a book to Mary.’

   b. Gakusei-ga Mary-ni san-nin hon-o morat-ta.
    student-NOM M.-DAT three-CL book-ACC receive-PAST
    ‘Three students received a book from Mary.’

(10) a. Dareka-ga daremo-ni purezento-o age-ta. (حساسیت, ُ, ُ, ُ)
    someone-NOM everyone-DAT present-ACC give-PAST
    ‘Someone gave a present to everyone.’

   b. Dareka-ga subete-no heya-ni hait-ta. (حساسیت, ُ, ُ)
    someone-NOM all-GEN room-to enter-PAST
    ‘Someone entered every room.’

Thus, the subject of dative Donor verbs are like the subjects of passives/unaccusatives in that it behaves as if it is base-generated in a lower position than typical external arguments are.

---


    someone-NOM everyone-DAT introduce-PASS-PAST
    ‘Someone was introduced to everyone.’

   b. Dareka-ga subete-no heya-ni hait-ta. (حساسیت, ُ, ُ) (Hoji et al., 1989)
    someone-NOM all-GEN room-to enter-PAST
    ‘Someone entered every room.’
IV. Raising to Spec, vP

Though the Recipient subjects of dative Donor verbs seem to start low in the verb phrase, there are some reasons to believe that it is in Spec, vP at some point in the derivation. I turn to two of them below. First, it is clear that the Recipient argument of moraw-type verbs is interpreted as having the intention of receiving, and in this sense it is an “Agent”. As shown in (11), the moraw-type verbs like kari ‘borrow’ are compatible with the adverb wazato ‘intentionally’, in constrast to the osowar-type verbs like azukar ‘be. entrusted’.

    J.-NOM M.-DAT intentionally much.money-ACC borrow-PAST
    ‘John intentionally borrowed a fortune from Mary.’

    b. ?John-ga Mary-ni wazato taikin-o azukat-ta.
    J.-NOM M.-DAT intentionally much.money-ACC be.entrusted-PAST
    ‘John was intentionally entrusted with a fortune by Mary.’

Does this mean that a single argument can count as Recipient and Agent at the same time, receiving two θ-roles? I assume that what is generally called Agent is not a primitive θ-role. Rather, the agentive interpretation is what is “superimposed” to an argument with an independent θ-role (such as Donor/Recipient) in a certain syntactic configuration. Following the standard assumption that v is the source of agentivity, I assume that Agent is superimposed to the element in the innermost Spec of a [+agentive] v (i.e., the argument that is first merged with v). Under this conception of Agent, the subjects of both age-type and moraw-type verbs only have the Donor and Recipient roles respectively. There is no need to loosen the θ-criterion so as to allow one argument to have multiple θ-roles.2)

Note that the subject of osowar-type verbs does not seem to receive an agentive interpretation, as shown in (11b). Nevertheless, I assume that the structure for these verbs still has a v, which is [−agentive], for reasons to which I turn directly.

(12) a. v for moraw-type verbs: [+agentive]

    b. v for osowar-type verbs: [−agentive]

The second argument for positing a v for dative Donor verbs is syntactic: Dative Donor verbs (both moraw-type and osowar-type) can license an accusative object (Theme), as

2) If Donor/Recipient and Agent were independent from each other, one would predict that (ia) is grammatical, whatever the interpretation would be.

   (i) a. *John-ga Mary-kara Bili-ni hon-o age-ta.
       J.-NOM M.-from B.-DAT book-ACC give-PAST
       ‘John sent a package from Tokyo to Osaka.’

      J.-NOM Tokyo-from Osaka-to package-ACC send-PAST
      ‘John sent a package from Tokyo to Osaka.’
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can be seen in every dative Donor construction given so far. If a \( v \) is responsible for accusative Case assignment, the structures for dative Donor verbs should have a \( v \) that assigns accusative Case to Theme.

Recall that the Recipient subject of dative Donor verbs is generated inside the complement of \( v \) and raises to Spec,TP. Assuming the Phase Impenetrability Condition (PIC; Chomsky, 2000), which states that elements inside the c-command domain of a phase head are not accessible for probes outside the phase, T cannot probe directly into the domain of \( v \), which is a \( \phi \)-complete phase head. It follows that the subject must somehow first raise to Spec,\( v \)P, where it can then be attracted by T.

\[
(13) \quad [\text{TP Recipient}_i T [vP t'_i v [\text{PathP Donor} t_i ... ]]]
\]

Having established that dative Donor verbs undergo the derivation delineated in (13), we will next discuss how this derivation is possible and why it is necessary.

V. Derivations

I have proposed the following derivations for the dative Recipient construction (with age-type verbs) and the dative Donor construction (with osowar/moraw-type verbs). In this section I will present the theoretical details concerning these derivations.

\[
(14) \quad \begin{align*}
\text{a. Dative Recipient: } & [\text{TP Donor}, T [vP t'_i v [\text{PathP} t_i \text{ Recipient Path}^0 [\text{VP V Theme }]]]] \\
\text{b. Dative Donor: } & [\text{TP Recipient}_i T [vP t'_i v [\text{PathP Donor} t_i \text{ Path}^0 [\text{VP V Theme }]]]]
\end{align*}
\]

Both constructions involve the movement of the subject from the PathP-internal base positions into Spec,\( v \)P. I assume that this movement is driven by a kind of EPP feature of \( v \) that attracts the closest argument (whether DP or PP) to its Spec. Closeness in this case is based on c-command.

Given this assumption and the base structure in (14), there appears to be no way for the Recipient subject in (14b) to be raised to Spec,\( v \)P over Donor, which is closer to \( v \). But this apparent problem is accommodated given the following general assumptions about the syntactic realization of the arguments projected by Path\(^0\). Donor and Recipient can be realized as any of the following:

\[
(15) \quad \begin{align*}
\text{a. Non-oblique: } & \text{DP with } u\text{Case, } \phi\text{-complete: structural Case via Agree (-ga/-o)} \\
\text{b. Oblique:} & \text{ (i) DP with } u\text{Case, } \phi\text{-incomplete: inherent dative Case licensed via Agree (-ni)} \\
& \text{ (Chomsky, 2000); immobile} \\
& \text{ (ii) PP: -kara (Donor), -e/-ni (Recipient); no structural licensing necessary}
\end{align*}
\]
Note that inherently dative-marked DP’s can participate in Agree. They surface as dative, but need to be Agreed by a $\phi$-probe in order to check its $u$Case off. I assume that inherent datives are immobile but normally are visible to the EPP-feature. However, when they are “suppressed”, as happens in the dative Donor construction, they become invisible to the EPP. PP Donors, too, are usually subject to EPP-triggered attraction but become EPP-invisible when they are suppressed. It is exactly in these circumstances, where Donor is suppressed, that Recipient can be attracted by the EPP-feature of $v$.

I also assume that Japanese $v$ cannot assign accusative to multiple non-oblique DP’s (i.e., cannot value multiple $\phi$-complete DP’s), but can license a $\phi$-incomplete inherent dative while probing for a $\phi$-complete DP. That is to say, it can value the $u$Case feature of $\phi$-incomplete DP’s until it encounters a non-oblique DP; once it Agrees with a non-oblique DP, it values the $u$Case of that DP and gets its own $\phi$-probe valued.

\[
\begin{align*}
(16) \quad a. \quad & v > DP[\phi_{\text{comp}}, \text{uCase}] > DP[\phi_{\text{comp}}, u\text{Case}] \\
& v > DP[\phi_{\text{incomp}}, \text{uCase}] > DP[\phi_{\text{comp}}, \text{uCase}] \\

\end{align*}
\]

Now we are ready to state the following proposal about the lexical property that makes dative Donor verbs distinct: Dative Donor verbs have a kind of “passivization” at the PathP level. As depicted in (17), the Path$^0$ for dative Recipient (age-type) verbs do not have any requirement as to how its arguments are to be realized. On the other hand, the Path$^0$ for dative Donor verbs has an abstract passive morpheme attached to it, which “suppresses” the higher of its two arguments (Donor) and makes the lower argument (Recipient) active for the process of Agree.\(^3\) As assumed above, suppressed arguments are invisible to EPP, but visible to Agree.

\[
\begin{align*}
(17) \quad a. \quad & \text{Dative Recipient verbs: (no requirement)} \\
& \text{b. Dative Donor verbs:} \\
& \quad \text{PathP} \\
& \quad \quad \text{Donor (suppressed)} \\
& \quad \quad \text{Recipient (non-oblique)} \\
& \quad \quad \text{VP} \\
& \quad \quad \text{Path$^0$PASS} \\
\end{align*}
\]

This idiosyncrasy of having an additional passive morpheme on its Path$^0$ accounts for why the class of dative Donor verbs is so restricted. It is natural to conjecture that the number of verbs with richer specification for its morphological composition is smaller than

\(^3\) This is comparable to Larson (1988), who proposes that the double object construction in English is derived from the dative constructions via passivization at the lower VP level.
the number of verbs with less specification. It is also important to note that a subclass of
dative Donor verbs, i.e. osowar-type verbs, realize this abstract passive morpheme as -ar.
Moraw-type verbs, by definition, have no transparent morphology.

Let us now examine the derivation of the dative Donor construction step by step. First,
\( vP \) is built with Theme, Recipient and Donor in place. Recall that dative Donor verbs
require that Donor be suppressed and Recipient be non-oblique. Next, the EPP feature of \( v \)
attracts the closest argument in its domain, which happens to be Recipient. Donor is
suppressed and is invisible to EPP, as assumed above. Then \( v \) multiply Agrees with Donor
and Theme, valuing their \( u \)Case. Donor, though suppressed, is still visible to Agree. It has
an incomple \( \phi \)-set and a \( u \)Case, so \( v \)'s probe can check the Case feature and continue
probing until it encounters the \( \phi \)-complete Theme, to which \( v \) assigns accusative. The
inherently dative-marked Donor retains its dative marking, though its Case feature is valued
by \( v \). Finally, when \( T \) is merged with \( vP \), \( T \) Agrees with Recipient in Spec,\( vP \) and attracts it
to its Spec. Recipient is assigned nominative, and the derivation converges. The resulting
case array is \( \langle \text{nominative Recipient–dative Donor–accusative Theme} \rangle \).

\[
(18) \quad \left[ \text{TP Recipient T} \left[ vP \ t_i \ v \left[ \text{PathP Donor} \ t_i \ \text{Path}^0 \left[ V \text{Theme} \right] \right] \right] \right] \\
3: \text{Agree & Move} \quad 1: \text{EPP} \quad 2: \text{Agree} \quad 2: \text{Agree}
\]

The derivation goes in the same way when Donor is a PP (with kara ‘from’), except
that this PP does not participate in Agree in any way. It is suppressed and invisible to EPP.
Therefore, it does not block the raising of Recipient to Spec,\( vP \). \( v \) Agrees only with Theme,
and the raised Recipient Agrees with \( T \) as before. The derivation yields \( \langle \text{nominative Recipient–kara-PP Donor–accusative Theme} \rangle \), the pattern seen in the
kara-marked version of (3b)(4b).

There are various possibilities for the derivations of age-type verbs that emerge from
the PathP-based structure, as these verbs have no restriction as to how their Donor and
Recipient arguments should be realized. Here I sketch a derivation that leads to
\( \langle \text{nominative Donor–dative Recipient–accusative Theme} \rangle \) (3a)/(4a). (I will turn to other
possibilities in section VII.)

Since neither Donor nor Recipient is suppressed, Donor always counts as the closest to
\( v \)'s EPP and gets raised to Spec,\( vP \). Suppose Donor is realized as non-oblique DP and
Recipient an inherently dative-marked DP. Then Donor raises to Spec,\( vP \) to satisfy EPP, and
\( v \) probes for a goal inside PathP. It first encounters the \( \phi \)-incomplete Recipient, valuing its
\( u \)Case, and keeps searching down until it detects Theme, to which it assigns accusative. \( T \)
is then introduced and Agrees with Donor in Spec,\( vP \). The derivation converges with
the array \( \langle \text{nominative Donor–dative Recipient–accusative Theme} \rangle \). The case where Recipient is
a PP (with -e/-ni) goes along the same line as the derivation for dative Donor verbs where
Donor is a PP instead of inherent dative.

Consider another derivation in which Recipient is non-oblique. Theme is always non-
oblique, so there are two non-oblique DP’s in \( v \)’s domain. This derivation is doomed, because Japanese \( v \) does not have the ability to Agree with multiple non-oblique DP’s, as argued above. As a result, there is no derivation that yields <accusative Recipient–accusative Theme>.

To sum up, the dative marking of Donor/Recipient argument in dative Donor/Recipient constructions is due to inherent Case marking, but the dative elements require formal licensing in that it needs to be (partially) Agreed by \( v \). Recipient can cross over Donor in the dative Donor construction because exactly those verbs require Donor to be suppressed.

VI. Passivization

This section tests the analysis of the verbs of giving/receiving against passivization data to see if the predictions are borne out.

Recall that we distinguished the two types of dative Donor verbs, the \textit{osowar}-type and the \textit{moraw}-type. The two types differ in passivizability. First, \textit{osowar}-type verbs cannot be passivized.

(19) *Karate-ga Mary-niyotte John-ni/kara osowar-are-ta.
   karate-NOM M.-by J.-DAT/-from be.taught-PASS-PAST

(20) *Koinu-ga Mary-niyotte John-ni/kara azukar-are-ta.
   puppy-NOM M.-by J.-DAT/-from be.entrusted-PASS-PAST

According to the analysis in the previous section, the morpheme -\textit{ar} counts as a passive marker, and I conjecture that the above examples are ungrammatical for morphological reasons: Verbs that already have a passive morpheme cannot host another passive morpheme.

That the problem of the passivization of \textit{osowar}-type verbs is morphological is confirmed by the fact that \textit{moraw}-type verbs are passivizable.

(21) Koinu-ga Mary-niyotte John-kara moraw-are-ta.
   puppy-NOM M.-by J.-from entrust-PASS-PAST
   ‘A puppy was received from John by Mary.’

(22) Zisyo-ga Mary-niyotte John-kara kari-rare-ta.
   dictionary-NOM M.-by J.-from borrow-PASS-PAST
   ‘A dictionary was borrowed from John by Mary.’

But there is an interesting restriction on the passivization of \textit{moraw}-type verbs; they can be passivized only if Donor is marked with \textit{kara ‘from’}. Passivization fails when Donor is dative.
(23) *Koinu-ga Mary-niyotte John-ni moraw-are-ta.
puppy-NOM M.-by J.-DAT entrust-PASS-PAST
‘A puppy was received from John by Mary.’
dictionary-NOM M.-by J.-DAT borrow-PASS-PAST
‘A dictionary was borrowed from John by Mary.’

This is what we predict from the current analysis. Notice that an inherently dative-marked DP has a $u$Case feature that needs to be checked off by a $\phi$-probe. In this situation $v$ and $T$ are potential candidates for such a probe. Being passivized, $v$ cannot execute Agree. $T$ cannot Agree with the dative either, assuming that $vP$, even when passivized, retains its character as a phase and the PIC prevents $T$ from accessing the dative inside PathP. Therefore the $u$Case feature of the dative Donor in (23) and (24) is left unchecked and the derivation crashes. In contrast, (21) and (22) are predicted to be grammatical because they have a PP Donor instead of a dative DP. PP’s do not have a $u$Case feature to check, and there is no problem that would be created by the datives.\footnote{One might wonder why Theme can Agree with $T$ if the passive $vP$ is a phase. Under this set of assumptions it has to be the case that the Theme DP, which has an unvalued, complete $\phi$-set, can be raised to the edge of the current phase $(vP)$. DP’s with an incomplete $\phi$-set, including inherently dative-marked DP’s, cannot be raised, due to the fact that they are immobile, as has been assumed throughout.}

\section{Kara-Subject Construction}

In section V we examined possible derivations of dative Recipient (age-type) verbs where Donor is non-oblique. Here we consider cases where Donor is oblique, which is allowed in principle. Oblique arguments come in two varieties: inherently dative-marked DP’s and PP’s. We will examine them in turn. Recall that dative Recipient verbs do not suppress any of its arguments, and that the postposition that marks Donor is $kara$ ‘from’.

The derivation in which Donor is an inherently dative-marked DP never converges, whatever the realization of Recipient might be. As assumed in section V, inherent datives are immobile. Since the closest argument to $v$’s EPP feature is the dative Donor, it has to move to satisfy the EPP. However, since it is immobile, there is no way to satisfy the EPP. This is in contrast with the case with the dative Donor construction, where the dative Donor is not only immobile but suppressed, i.e., invisible to EPP. Recipient can be attracted by $v$ because it is the closest to $v$, Donor being invisible to EPP.

Let us now turn to the other case of an oblique Donor, i.e. the case where Donor is a $kara$-PP. Unlike inherent datives, PP’s are not immobile. Note also that the Donor PP of the dative Recipient construction is not suppressed, either. There is no reason that prevents the PP from being attracted by $v$’s EPP. If this situation arises, we have the configuration in (25). The $vP$ phase should have no problem, if Recipient is either a dative or a PP; the Agree operation by $v$’s $\phi$-probe proceeds exactly the same as it does for the dative Donor

\footnote{One might wonder why Theme can Agree with $T$ if the passive $vP$ is a phase. Under this set of assumptions it has to be the case that the Theme DP, which has an unvalued, complete $\phi$-set, can be raised to the edge of the current phase $(vP)$. DP’s with an incomplete $\phi$-set, including inherently dative-marked DP’s, cannot be raised, due to the fact that they are immobile, as has been assumed throughout.}
construction. If, furthermore, T can take care of its unvalued features, the derivation would converge and the case array \(\langle \text{kara-PP Donor--dative or PP Recipient--accusative Theme} \rangle\) would result.

\[(25) \quad [\text{TP} \quad \text{T} \quad [\text{VP} \text{kara-PP} \quad \text{v} \quad [\text{PathP} \quad \text{Recipient Path} \quad [\text{VP} \text{Theme}] \quad ]]]\]

I propose that this is what is known as the \text{kara}-subject construction. In Japanese the subjects are allowed to be marked with \text{kara} ‘from’ in some contexts, as in (26). Here the subject \text{Taro} is marked with \text{kara} and has the interpretation of Agent/Donor. (Nominative (-\text{ga}) marking on \text{Taro} is also allowed.) Unlike the nominative marking, the acceptability of \text{kara}-subjects is subject to idiolectal variation and is also sensitive to such factors as the person of the subject (1st and 2nd persons are more acceptable than 3rd person) and whether or not the clause is embedded (as a tensed clause or under aspectual expressions using the \text{-te} form of the verb; embedding facilitates \text{kara}-subjects). Due to space limitation, I cannot discuss the details about these factors and will abstract away from them, assuming that sentences like (26) are grammatical.\(^5\)

\[(26) \quad \text{Taro-kara Hanako-ni tegami-o okut-ta.} \]
\[\text{T.-from H.-DAT tegami-ACC send-PAST}\]
\[\text{‘Taro sent Hanako a letter.’}\]

It should be noted that the following “initiating” reading is irrelevant to the discussion, and should be distinguished from the “\text{kara}-subject reading”, where no such “first-of-all” meaning is implied. I suppose that the \text{kara}-phrase in this reading is an adjunct modifying some argument of the clause. As shown in (27b), it can even modify an object. This reading can be excluded by inserting pragmatically conflicting adverbs like \text{saigoni} ‘lastly’.

\[(27) \quad \text{a. (\#Saigoni) John-kara shawaa-o abi-ta.}\]
\[\text{lastly J.-from shower-ACC take-PAST}\]
\[\text{‘John was the first to take a shower (\#lastly).’}\]

\[\text{b. John-wa (\#saigoni) Chomsky-no ronbun-kara yon-da.}\]
\[\text{J.-TOP lastly C.-GEN paper-from read-PAST}\]
\[\text{‘John read Chomsky’s paper first (\#lastly).’}\]

One might wonder if the subject in (26) is really a subject—there might be a null subject that corefers to the \text{kara}“subject”. However, no overt nominative argument can

\(^5\) For an analysis of the factors mentioned, see Tanaka (2009). There I claimed that the marginality (if any) of (25)/(26) is due to the very fact that the defectiveness of PP sometimes blocks the proper checking of T’s features. For the description of the \text{kara}-subject construction, see Cho (1995). Inoue (1998, 2002), Ueda (2003) and Kishimoto (to appear) are the only theoretical works I am aware of. Ito (2001) is cited by Inoue (2002) as a descriptive work, but I have not been able to access it.
cooccur with a *kara*-subject in any position in the sentence. If there was a null pronominal that receives nominative Case from T, an overt nominative DP could surface, but this is not the case. Therefore the *kara*-PP is the only element in the structure that can function as the subject.

   -self/he/John/Bill-NOM J.-from M.-DAT caution-PAST
   -J.-from self/he/John/Bill-NOM M.-DAT caution-PAST

Also, *Kara*-subjects seem to have subjecthood. It can bind the subject-oriented reflexive *zibun* (29), and induce subject honorification (30).

(29) Taroo-y-kara Hanako- ni zibun-y-no ronbun-o okut-ta.
   -T.-from H.-DAT self-GEN paper-ACC send-PAST
   ‘Taroo sent his paper to Hanako.’
(30) Yamada-sensei-kara Hanako- ni ronbun-o o-okuri-ni nat-ta.
   -Y.-teacher-from H.- DAT paper-ACC HON-send-NI become-PAST
   ‘Prof. Yamada sent a paper to Hanako.’

The most relevant property of the *kara*-subject construction is that if there is a *kara*-subject, there must be a Recipient argument (Ito, 2001; Inoue, 2002). (31) is a partial list of the verbs compatible with this construction.

(31) okur ‘send’, yuzur ‘transfer’, hanas ‘talk’, tutae ‘tell’, tanom ‘ask (sb for sth)’, ayamar ‘apologize’, tyuui-su ‘give caution’, ...

As following examples show, *kara*-subjects are impossible if there is no Recipient; the existence of a locative -ni ‘to’ phrase, for example, is not sufficient. (Note that all the examples are acceptable in the irrelevant “initiating” reading. The label “Agent” is used here only as a cover term for arguments with agentivity.)

   -T.-from front.door-to package-ACC carry-PAST
   ‘Taroo carried the package to the front door.’ [Agent, Location, Theme]
b. *Taroo-kara Tokyo-ni/-e it-ta.
   -T.-from Tokyo-to/-to go-PAST
   ‘Taroo went to Tokyo.’ [Agent, Location]
If we are on the right track in that the *kara*-subject construction is derived from (25), this property of the construction is predicted, as the *kara*-phrase originates as an argument of the Path head, which necessarily projects Recipient as well. Moreover, since the *kara*-subject and the Recipient in this construction are arguments of the Path head, which are animate by definition, both arguments are predicted to be animate. As expected, inanimate *kara*-subjects (33a) and inanimate datives (33b) are unacceptable under the relevant reading.

(33) a. *[Sensei-no kotoba]-kara seito-tati-ni hinto-o atae-ta.
   teacher-GEN words-from student-PL-DAT hint-ACC give-PAST
   ‘The teacher’s words gave students hints.’

   J.-from office-DAT package-ACC send-PAST
   ‘John sent the package to his office.’

The existence and the basic θ-theoretic properties of the *kara*-subject construction are thus accounted for by positing the PathP-based vP structure I have been advocating.

VIII. Conclusion

I have proposed that the vP structure with PathP captures the syntactic properties of verbs of giving/receiving in Japanese. What is novel about my proposals is the assumption that θ-roles (Donor/Recipient) are assigned inside PathP, and one of the arguments raises to Spec,vP, where (in some cases) agentivity is added to the interpretation of that argument. In other words, Agent is not an independent θ-role (as standardly assumed) and Spec,vP is not a position where θ-roles are assigned.

The dative Donor construction involves passivization at the PathP level. Together with the assumptions on how inherently dative-marked elements are to be structurally licensed, and on how movement to Spec,vP works, this lexical idiosyncrasy of the dative Donor verbs derives the syntactic difference between these verbs and dative Recipient verbs. Also, the system naturally predicts the existence of the *kara*-subject construction.

I have concentrated on Japanese data here, but if this analysis is basically correct, it provides a new perspective on the parametric difference in the expression of Donor/Recipient across languages: It is possible, for example, that languages like English do not possess the PathP structure or do not have the abstract passive morpheme on Pathθ as depicted here, which may account for the fact that those languages lack dative Donors. In constrast, languages like Korean and Chinese apparently allow for (what seems to be) dative marking on a much broader range of arguments than Japanese. This might be
because they have a different mechanism for licensing datives than PathP, masking the
effect that PathP would otherwise create. I leave these topics to future research.
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The Syntax of Giving and Receiving

Hiroyuki TANAKA

I propose that the Donor (animate Source) argument of verbs of giving/receiving in Japanese is generated below Spec,VP and the Recipient (animate Goal) argument is generated below Donor, as in the following structure. Given that Japanese allows either Donor or Recipient to be the external argument of the clause, it follows that Spec,VP is not the base position of the external argument. Rather, I claim that this position arises from a formal requirement (EPP) of v that causes some argument within its c-command domain to raise to its specifier. In other words, an external argument is a result of the “externalization” of some internally generated argument.

(1) \[ TP \_ T \_ [vP \_ v [PathP Donor [Recipient Path^0 [VP V Theme]]]]\]

I examine in detail the syntactic properties of what I call the dative Donor construction, in which Recipient is the nominative subject and Donor is marked with dative. There are a limited number of verbs in Japanese that are compatible with this construction.

(2) Mary-ga John-ni hon-o morat-ta.
   M.-NOM J.-DAT book-ACC receive-PAST
   ‘Mary received a book from John.’

I argue that this construction involves “passivization” at the PathP level, with an abstract passive morpheme attached to Path^0, which is realized as -ar in some verb stems. This morpheme has the effect of suppressing Donor. Together with the assumptions on how inherently dative-marked elements are to be structurally licensed, this lexical idiosyncrasy of the dative Donor verbs derives the syntactic difference between these verbs and dative Recipient verbs, which have a Donor subject and a dative Recipient, a much commoner structure found across languages. Especially, it is explained (i) why the base position of the Recipient subject seems lower than that of ordinary external arguments, (ii) why the verb can license an accusative object despite the passive/unaccusative-like behavior of the subject, and (iii) why the dative Donor cannot be retained when the verb is passivized. It is also shown that the system naturally predicts the existence of the kara-subject construction, where the Donor subject is marked with a postposition kara ‘from’.