On the Verb Condition for Affectee *

Tomokazu Takehisa
McGill University/University of Tokyo

ttakeh@po-box.mcgill.ca

Abstract
This paper argues for a syntactic approach to the distribution of Affectee. Although its distribution seems to receive a natural explanation in terms of the notion of change of state in the face of the data from Japanese and English, it is argued that change of state is not a significant notion and that a Case-theoretic approach best captures the distribution. Evidence in favor of such an approach comes from a variety of languages where Affectee appears as a so-called possessor dative.

Keywords: Causatives, Transitivity Alternation, Change of State, Possessor Datives, Case Theory

1. Introduction

Inoue (1974, 1976) discusses sentences involving Affectee (her Experiencer), as in (1), and states the descriptive generalization in (2).[1,2]

---

* This work is a sequel to Takehisa (1999). Part of this work was presented at the annual meeting of the University of Tokyo English Linguistics Association (July, 2000) and at McGill Syntax Projects' Meeting (November, 2000). I would like to thank the following people for their native intuitions: Marie Claude Boivin, Michel Paradis (French), Theres Grüter, Susi Wurmbrand (German), Elena Valenzuela, Pablo Ruiz (Spanish), Armit Shaked (Modern Hebrew). I am greatly indebted to Jonathan Bobaljik, Lisa Travis and Susi Wurmbrand for discussions and invaluable comments on an earlier version of this paper; to Akira Watanabe for occasional, but helpful discussions; to Yukiko Koizumi and Terue Nakato for help. I am solely responsible for any inadequacies or misanalyses of the data contained herein. This work is supported in part by grants from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (Canada) #410-99-0902 and the Fonds pour la Formation de Chercheurs et l'Aide à la Recherche (Québec) #00-NC-2043 (Principal Investigator, Jonathan Bobaljik), which are hereby greatly acknowledged.

[1] Affectee is assumed to be a theta-role for non-agentive, possessor arguments, which appear as subjects in Japanese and English, and it should be sharply distinguished from Experiencer. See Takehisa (1999). Moreover, another necessary condition on the Affectee interpretation is that a relation, typically a relation of possession, must hold between the subject and the object, be it direct or indirect. We will not discuss this in this paper. One thing to be noted here is that some context is necessary when alienably possessed nouns are involved as objects.

[2] The notation of √ 'root' is borrowed from Pesetsky (1995).

Linguistic Research 17(2000) 31-45

(1) a. Taroo-ga ude-o ot-ta (<or-ø-ta)
Taroo-Nom arm-Acc √break-Cause-Past
'Taroo broke his arm' ('Lit. Taroo broke arm')
b. Hanako-ga sode-o yabu-i-ta (<yabuk-ø-ta) (Context: e.g., where H. wore it)
Hanako-Nom sleeve-Acc √rip-Cause-Past
'Hanako ripped her sleeve' (Lit. Hanako ripped sleeve')
c. Yosiko-ga epuron-o kog-asi-ta (<kog-as-ta) (Context: e.g., where Y. wore it)
Yosiko-Nom apron-Acc √burn-Cause-Past
'Yosiko burnt her apron' (Lit. Yosiko burnt apron')

(2) The Affectee interpretation is available in cases where the transitive alternant of a verb entering into the transitivity alternation is involved.[3]

Thus, Affectee cannot appear with verbs that do not alternate in transitivity, as in (3).

(3) Taroo-ga ude-o nagut-ta (<nagur-ta) (*Affectee)
Taroo-Nom arm-Acc punch-Past
'Taroo punched his arm'

As can be seen in the glosses in (1) and (3), (2) is true of English as well.[4]

Based on (2), Amano (1995) proposes the following condition on verbs that allow the appearance of Affectee.

(4) If a transitive verb denotes an activity and change of state, then it can give rise to the Affectee interpretation.

However, reference to the transitivity alternation seems to be still necessary in order to account for examples such as (5).

---

[3] In fact, (2) does not fully capture the distribution of the Affectee interpretation, and non-alternating verbs such as *nakus-* 'lose' and *ut-* 'hit' do allow the subject to have the Affectee interpretation. No account has been provided for such verbs so far, to the best of my knowledge, and it may turn out that they give rise to a serious problem against the approaches discussed in the text. However, the point that I will make in the following is not undermined by these exceptions. One way to treat them might be to stipulate that they do not necessarily select Agent. If this is the case, we can account for them in terms of the syntactic approach in the text, along with verbs showing the transitivity alternation.

[4] But Japanese and English differ as to the object NPs that can appear in the Affectee interpretation. See Takehisa (1999).

(5) a. Taroo-ga titioya-o korosita (<koros-ta) (*Affectee)
Taroo-Nom father-Acc kill-Past
'Taroo killed his father'

The verb *koros-* 'kill' does not alternate in transitivity. (5) shows that, though it denotes an activity and change of state, it does not allow the Affectee interpretation of the subject.

Given the observation that verbs entering into the transitivity alternation typically have the change-of-state semantics (cf. Levin and Rappaport Hovav 1995), (4) can be viewed as a (partial) restatement of (2) in semantic terms. Note that this restatement also rules out transitive verbs that denote only an activity, as in (3).

In relation to his analysis of the transitivity alternation, Kageyama (1996) also suggests an analysis in the same spirit, as in (6).

(6) a. Taroo-ga ude-o ot-ta (<or-ø-ta) (= (1a))
b. [x EXPERIENCE [[x's y] BECOME *BROKEN*]]
c. [[x's y] BECOME *BROKEN*]]
(Kageyama 1996: 287, with minor changes)

In a nutshell, Kageyama claims that a verb that has the inchoative template in (6c) can have the template in (6b). Thus, (5) can be ruled out in his analysis, since *koros-* 'kill' does not have an intransitive alternant. Note that having (6b) as part of the lexical rule amounts to referring to the transitivity alternation.

It is not clear that they can be taken to be refinements of the generalization in (2), but it is clear that these analyses are committed to the thesis that the data in (1) and (3) are explained in semantic terms. The aim of this paper is to argue against the line of inquiry pursued by Amano and Kageyama. Instead, I will argue for a syntactic approach to (2). Specifically, despite the fact that (4) or (6) apparently holds in Japanese and English, I will show that reference to such a semantic notion is not only unnecessary but also untenable in that it leads to incorrect predictions as we investigate a variety of languages. I will argue that a Case-theoretic approach best captures the distribution of Affectee and also derives the generalization in (2).

This paper is organized as follows: in the next section, we will identify differences between the lexical semantic approach and the syntactic approach in general and the predictions they make. In section 3, we will show that the former is empirically untenable by presenting data from Romance and other languages, where Affectee can appear as a so-called non-lexical dative. Section 4 is a summary.

2. Syntax vs. Semantics: Case Competition or Change of State?

It is fairly common in the field of lexical semantics to invoke notions such as change of state to give an account of a certain set of data. As briefly presented in the last section, the existing previous analyses of the Affectee interpretation put this method into practice, crucially making recourse to the change-of-state semantics inherent in the verbs that allow Affectee to appear. Moreover, another seemingly benign point is that, in conjunction with the other necessary condition on the relation of possession between the subject and the object, the change-of-state semantics can seem to explain the Affectee interpretation. Specifically, suppose that we have a definition of affectedness and a set of verbs that satisfy the definition. For the sake of discussion, let us assume that change of state somehow contributes to the notion of affectedness. Given this, it is conceptually natural to say that, if part of X is "affected," then X is "affected."[5] Thus, if the subject argument is in possession of the object argument in sentences involving such a verb, it is possible for the subject to receive the Affectee interpretation. However, the claim would be vacuous unless we have the definition of affectedness, and it is not at all clear what kind of theta-role the Affectee argument receives. Thus, though we might reach a conceptually natural explanation for the Affectee interpretation, it is unclear in Amano's (1995) analysis how the subject receives such an interpretation. Given our knowledge of syntax, the argument with the Affectee interpretation seems to receive a theta-role different from Agent.[6] Kageyama (1996) is explicit on this point. He assumes that there is a function responsible for assigning such an interpretation in the lexical representation of a verb, thereby ensuring the Affectee interpretation. Yet, there are at least two remaining questions. One is why such a function is restricted to appear only in the context described above, namely the transitive alternant of an alternating verb. Obviously, stating such a lexical rule that refers to both the templates as in (6b) and (6c) is not close to an explanation by any means.[7] The other

---

[5] To be precise, this is different from Amano's original proposal. She argues that the subject is interpreted as a possessor in the sense that it does not instigate, but rather has an experience of the event in which it is involved. Since she eventually has to refer to the relation of possession between the subject and the object, I discuss a more natural alternative instead. Note that an independent condition on possession does not explain the theta-role the subject receives, and also that, since she works within the traditional Japanese grammar, the following discussion on the theta-role in the text is my problem, not hers.

[6] Agent and Affectee are syntactically different: the former can be realized as a *by*-phrase in passives, while the latter cannot. Observe the following:

(i) John-no ude-ga kare-niyotte or-ø-are-ta (OKAgent; *Affectee)
John-Gen arm-Nom he-by √break-Cause-Pass-Past
'John's arm was broken by him'

[7] (6b) is empirically flawed as well: the object NP does not necessarily contain the possessor argument coreferential with the subject. Thus, *John* can be interpreted as Affectee in sentences like *John broke Bill's arm*, if John has Bill's arm transplanted into him (Alan Bale p.c.). The same holds in Japanese.

question is whether the function responsible for Affectee is encoded as part of the lexical representation of a verb or is a head distinct from a verb. I will argue that it is a head present in syntax below.

Conceivably, another mode of explanation is also possible. Specifically, given that the verbs that can give rise to the Affectee interpretation are those that enter into the transitivity alternation, it is possible to account for the distribution of Affectee in terms of Case theory. Assume, as in the standard view, that transitive verbs that alternate and those that do not are different with respect to their argument structure specifications: the former do not necessarily select Agent, as the intransitive alternants show, whereas the selection of Agent is obligatory in the latter.[8] Assume further that even a causative morpheme does not select Agent (Pylkkänen 1999), and Agent is assigned by an independent head (Chomsky 1995, Kratzer 1996). This assumption is supported by the following examples.

(7) a. *Taroo-ga Hanako-niyotte ude-o ot-ta (<or-ø-ta) — Adversity Causative
Taroo-Nom Hanako-by arm-Acc √break-Cause-Past
'Taroo broke his arm by Hanako'

b. Taroo-ga Hanako-niyotte ude-o or-ø-are-ta — Passive
Taroo-Nom Hanako-by arm-Acc √break-Cause-Pass-Past
'Taroo had his arm broken by Hanako'

(8) a. Context: Taroo's father died of natural causes — Adversity Causative
#Taroo-ga titioya-o sin-ase-ta
Taroo-Nom father-Acc die-Cause-Past
'Taroo was affected by his father's dying'

b. Context: Taroo's father died of natural causes — Adversity Passive
Taroo-ga titioya-ni sin-are-ta
Taroo-Nom father-Dat die-Pass-Past
'Taroo was affected by his father's dying' (Pylkkänen 1999)

(7) and (8) involve adversity causatives and passives. It is reasonable to assume that the subjects of adversity causatives bear Affectee in that the subject argument is in some relation to the object argument and that the verbs in this construction are restricted to unaccusative verbs with causative morphemes (Harley 1995). In (7), the Agent argument cannot be realized as a *by*-phrase in adversity causatives, as in passives. If Agent was

[8] I exclude stative predicates from the discussion. See also footnote 3. Moreover, it is obvious that this assumption pertains to the issue of what explains the transitivity alternation and more generally the argument structure specifications of verbs, and it is essential to syntactic theory to settle this issue. However, since what follows is independent of this issue, I simply assume the argument structure of the type proposed by Williams (1981) for the sake of discussion.

present as an implicit argument, we would expect (7a) to be grammatical on a par with (7b). Thus, the contrast in (7) shows that Agent is not present in cases where Affectee appears. Moreover, Pylkkänen (1999) argues that CAUSE is present in adversity causatives by showing the contrast in (8) as evidence. Specifically, (8a), but not (8b), is infelicitous in contexts where there is no external cause.[9] Given that a causative morpheme does not select Agent, she assumes, following Kratzer (1996), that Agent is selected by an independent head, *v*, and the rule of Event Identification in (10d) below conjoins Agent and the event described by the complement of *v*. See Pylkkänen (1999) and Kratzer (1996) for further details.

Given these assumptions, we can straightforwardly explain the distribution of Affectee in terms of Case. Specifically, transitive verbs obligatorily selecting Agent cannot select Affectee for one of the following two reasons. Suppose that a verb is required to take Agent and Theme as its arguments. If the verb takes Affectee instead of Agent, then the sentence results in ungrammaticality due to the absence of Agent, which is obligatory in this case. Alternatively, if the verb takes both Agent and Affectee in addition to Theme, then one of them cannot be licensed by Case, thereby yielding the sentence to be ungrammatical. Either way, Affectee cannot appear with these verbs, and Agent and Theme must be selected. On the other hand, in cases where alternating transitive verbs are involved, either Agent or Affectee can appear, given the assumption that a causative morpheme does not select Agent, but both Agent and Affectee cannot appear in the same clause due to the Case reason, as is the case with verbs obligatorily selecting Agent. Therefore, Case theory offers us a straightforward explanation of the descriptive generalization in (2).

It should be made clear that a Case-theoretic solution is the null hypothesis. We saw just above that Case theory can explain the distribution of Affectee in Japanese and English. Recall that we have an ancillary assumption on the selectional property of a causative morpheme: a causative morpheme does not select Agent. This assumption is an additional cost. However, the assumption of this kind is necessary in the lexical semantic approach as well, and, as illustrated in (9), a similar assumption is made in Kageyama's analysis, though it seems that the causative morpheme is a case of homophony, denoting either CAUSE or EXPERIENCE (HAPPEN in Marantz 1985 and Harley 1995). Compare (9a) and (10a).

---

[9] However, it is not clear to me at present whether the infelicity of (8a) can only be attributed to the presence of CAUSE, though I adopt the claim for purposes of the paper. It should be noted that the argument to be presented below does not hinge upon this claim, and that what is crucial in this paper is the fact that Agent is not present in the construction under consideration and the assumption that a causative morpheme plays an essential role in checking accusative Case, no matter what it may turn out to denote.

(9) Lexical Semantic Approach: Kageyama (1996)

a. *-(s)ase-*:

i. [x CAUSE […]]; x = Agent

ii. [x EXPERIENCE […]]; x = Affectee (his Experiencer)

(10) Syntactic Approach

a. *-(s)ase-*: $\lambda f_{<s, t>}.\lambda e.$ [($\exists$ e')f(e') & CAUSE (e, e')]

b. *v*(oice): $\lambda e.\lambda x.$ [Agent (e, x)]

c. APPL(ICATIVE): $\lambda e.\lambda x.$ [Affectee (e, x)] (Pylkkänen 1999, with minor changes)

d. Event Identification: <e, <s, t>> <s, t> → <e, <s, t>> (Kratzer 1996)

Note that Affectee is not an argument of a verb and it is treated in the same way as Agent in the syntactic approach, while it is an argument of *-(s)ase-* (EXPERIENCE) in the lexical semantic approach. Though there are crucial differences, it turned out that the ancillary assumption in the Case-theoretic approach is a necessary cost in the lexical semantic approach. On the other hand, as we saw above, Kageyama and Amano make recourse to the change-of-state semantics. Reference to change of state is a real cost, since the Case-theoretic solution does not need to invoke such a semantic notion at all. Therefore, other things being equal, the Case-theoretic analysis is preferred over the lexical semantic approach because the former is more economical and more explanatory in the sense that it does not make as many assumptions as the latter.

This said, we have a situation in which two competing analyses based on two different approaches are (almost) equivalent in their empirical coverage, as far as English and Japanese are concerned, and considerations of simplicity/economy tell us that one approach is preferred over the other. However, it is true that the fact that one analysis is preferred over the other because it is the null hypothesis does not mean that the latter is untenable. Therefore, I would like to show that the lexical semantic approach is empirically incorrect and cannot be maintained in order to explain the distribution of Affectee.

What we do in the rest of the paper is to test predictions that each of the two analyses makes. In so doing, we will broaden the scope of the discussion somewhat, into including another type of dichotomy, which has been implicit in the preceding discussion, i.e., a causation-based approach vs. a Case-theoretic approach (under which a transitivity-based approach is subsumed). A crucial difference between these two approaches is that the presence of CAUSE or EXPERIENCE (or, whatever ensures the Affectee interpretation) is crucial in deriving the distribution of Agent or that of Affectee, respectively, in analyses based on causation, whereas the availability of Case, be it structural or inherent, is crucial in determining the appearance of Affectee in analyses based on Case, in conjunction with the argument structure specification of a verb. Introducing this dichotomy, we basically have two more logical possibilities: a lexical semantic, Case-based approach and a syntactic,

causation-based approach. However, I do not know of any studies that are framed in terms of lexical semantics and are based on Case, and it is impossible in principle to propose such an analysis, given that Case is a syntactic property. On the other hand, since it is possible to assume CAUSE and EXPERIENCE as syntactic heads and proposals along this line have been made in the previous literature by Marantz (1985) and Harley (1995), I will consider this approach in the following discussion. Note that this approach also derives the descriptive generalization in (2), since it assumes that a causative morpheme is homophonous between CAUSE and HAPPEN.[10] A crucial difference between the lexical semantic approach and the syntactic approach is merely the locus of composition, and thus, something like (9) is assumed in the syntactic approach as well. (11) summarizes the discussion so far.

(11) a. lexical semantic, causation-based: Amano (1995), Kageyama (1996)
b. lexical semantic, Case-based: None (impossible)
c. syntactic, causation-based: Marantz (1985), Harley (1995)
d. syntactic, Case-based: the present analysis

Now, let us see predictions that the three analyses make. First, if one assumes a causative morpheme to denote CAUSE (that selects Agent) or EXPERIENCE/HAPPEN, i.e., homophony of a causative morpheme, as in (9), it is predicted that Agent and Affectee never co-occur. On the other hand, if a causative morpheme is a phonological realization of CAUSE and it does not select Agent, as in (10), Affectee can appear in a causative context, as we saw in section 2, and moreover, the co-occurrence of Agent and Affectee is also possible, if both of them are licensed by Case.

Closely related to the aforementioned difference, a second difference is expected to emerge in the distribution of Affectee in relation to that of Agent. Due to the other necessary condition on the relation between the subject and the object, the Affectee interpretation is not always available, unlike the Agent interpretation. If the co-occurrence of Agent and Affectee is impossible, as (11a) and (11c) predict, the distribution of Affectee is expected to be a subset of the distribution of Agent. On the other hand, if the distribution of Affectee is determined in terms of Case ((11d)), we expect that Affectee can appear in an environment where Agent cannot appear but Case is available.

Thirdly, as a simple corollary of (11d), it is predicted that Affectee cannot appear if Case is not available. (11a) and (11c) do not predict anything in this respect.

A fourth and last difference is whether verbs that contribute to the distribution of Affectee can be characterized in terms of the change-of-state semantics or not ((11a) vs.

[10] This statement holds only for so-called lexical causatives.

(11d)). This is in fact a crucial difference between the lexical semantic approach and the syntactic approach. The analyses in (11c) do not make an explicit claim in this respect unless they assume that the transitivity alternation (or, the causative alternation) and the change-of-state semantics are tightly related in their analyses.

With these predictions in mind, let us turn to Romance and other languages in the next section.

3. Beyond Japanese and English: Possessor Datives in Romance and Other Languages

We have seen that the distribution of Affectee is restricted to sentences that involve transitive verbs entering into the transitivity alternation in Japanese and English, and that we have at least three possibilities to explain this restriction. In this section, we will see that a syntactic, Case-based approach correctly captures the distribution of Affectee. Evidence in favor of this approach comes from possessor datives in Romance and other languages. Possessor datives are Affectee in the sense that they are required to be associated with an argument internal to VP in terms of the notion of possession, as in Japanese and English, and they can co-occur with Agent, as we will see in the next subsection.[11] An independent difference between Japanese and English on the one hand, and French, German, Modern Hebrew and Spanish on the other, is whether dative Case is available freely or not. More specifically, dative Case is so freely available in the latter group of languages that it can be assigned even in non-3-place predicates generally, in addition to 3-place predicates and 2-place predicates that lexically assign/check dative. On the other hand, such an "extra" Case feature is not available to Japanese and English, to the exclusion of a set of 2-place predicates in English (i.e., double object constructions).

Assuming this difference to be crucial in the cases at hand, we can explain the distribution of Affectee in a principled way, as suggested in section 2. In the following subsections, we will see three sets of data from French, German, Hebrew and Spanish in terms of the predictions discussed in the last section and show that the causation-based approach, be it syntactic or lexical semantic, are empirically disqualified from a possible mode of explanation for the distribution of Affectee.

3.1 The Co-occurrence of Agent and Affectee

The co-occurrence of Agent and Affectee is possible, as clearly shown by the following examples with verbs selecting Agent. Thus, (11a) and (11c) make the wrong prediction.

---

[11] See Branchadell (1992) for an overview of lexical and non-lexical datives (including possessor datives) in Romance.

Note also that a causative verb is not necessarily involved.[12]

(12) a. ?J'ai cassé le bras à Jean [French]
I-have broken the arm Dat Jean
'I broke Jean's arm'
b. Son bébé lui a pleuré *(dans les bras) toute la nuit
his baby 3sg.Dat has cried in the arms all the night
'His baby cried in his arms all night' (M. -C. Boivin, M. Paradis p.c.)

(13) a. Les revisé los informes a los estudiantes [Spanish]
3pl.Dat I-revised the reports Dat the students
'I revised the students' reports' (Kempchinsky 1992)
b. Juan le nadó en la piscina a Ricardo
Juan 3sg.Dat swam in the pool Dat Ricardo
'Juan swan in Ricardo's pool' (P. Ruiz, E. Valenzuela p.c.)

(14) a. Ich habe dem Peter gestern sein Bild ruiniert [German]
I-Nom have the-Dat Peter yesterday his-Acc picture-Acc ruined
'I ruined Peter's picture yesterday' (Krause 1999)
b. Hans hat dem Peter gestern im Haus geraucht.
Hans has the-Dat Peter yesterday in-the house smoked.
'Hans smoked in Peter's house yesterday' (T. Grüter, S. Wurmbrand p.c.)

(15) a. ha-yeladim zarku le-Gil 'et ha-kadur le-tox ha-gina [Modern Hebrew]
the-boys threw Dat-Gil the ball into the garden
'The boys threw Gil's ball into the garden'
'The boys threw the ball into Gil's garden'
'The boys threw Gil's ball into his (Gil's) garden' (A. Shaked p.c.)
b. Gil yašav le-Rina ba-mitbax
Gil sat Dat-Rina in-the-kitchen
'Gil sat in Rina's kitchen' (Landau 1999)

3.2 The Distribution of Affectee is not a Subset of the Distribution of Agent

Possessor datives can appear in cases where Agent cannot be selected. (7a) and (7c) do not capture the distribution of Affectee properly, since they predict that the distribution of Affectee is a subset of that of Agent. Examples with non-alternating unaccusative verbs are provided below.

[12] Thus, the Causer/Affectee ambiguity (Takehisa 1999) should be renamed the Agent/Affectee ambiguity, since the former implies that Affectee appears only in the causative context, which is not the case.

(16) a. Sa femme lui est morte dans les bras [French]
His wife 3sg.Dat is died in the arms
'His wife died in his arms'
b. Des pierres lui tombaient sur la tête
Stones 3sg.Dat fell over the head
'Stones fell on his head' (M.-C. Boivin, M. Paradis p.c.)

(17) a. El niño se le murió a Lola [Spanish]
The child SE 3sg.Dat died Dat Lola
'The child died on Lola/ Lola's child died'
b. Nos llovió en la casa
1pl.Dat rained in the house
'It rained in our house' (P. Ruiz, E. Valenzuela p.c.)

(18) a. Mir beschlägt die Brille [German]
1sg.pron-Dat mists up the glasses
'My glasses are misted up'
b. Es regnete uns gestern ins Haus
It rained 1pl.pron-Dat yesterday in the house
'It rained in our house' (T. Grüter, S. Wurmbrand p.c.)

(19) a. ha-kelev ne'elam le-Rina [Modern Hebrew]
the-dog disappeared Dat-Rina
'Rina's dog disappeared' (Landau 1999)
b. ha-mitriya nafla le-Nina
the-umbrella fell Dat-Nina
'Nina's umbrella fell down' (Arad 1998)

3.3 Affectee Cannot Occur if Case is not Available

The fact that Affectee cannot occur if Case is not available has been shown by the data from Japanese and English in section 2. This point is reinforced in languages that allow Agent and Affectee to co-occur, given that there is a certain restriction on Case. Specifically, suppose that two dative phrases cannot appear in a language where Affectee appears with dative Case, it is expected that verbs that lexically select dative-marked arguments (e.g., 'talk' or 'give') do not allow Affectee to appear. The following examples show that this is indeed the case.

(20) a. *On a donné beaucoup d'argent à sa/la compagnie à Jean [French]
They have given much of-money Dat his/the company Dat Jean
'They gave much money to Jean's company'

b. *Jean a parlé à sa/la femme à Yves
Jean has talked Dat his/the wife Dat Yves
'Jean talked to Yves's wife' (M.-C. Boivin, M. Paradis p.c.)

(21) a. *Maria le dio un proyecto grande a la oficina a Juan [Spanish]
Maria 3sg.Dat gave a big case Dat the office Dat Juan
'Maria gave a big case to Juan's office'

b. *Hablo a la mujer a Ricardo
I-talk Dat the wife Dat Ricardo
'I talk to Ricardo's wife' (P. Ruiz, E. Valenzuela p.c.)

(22) a. *Sie haben dem Peter gestern seiner Firma den Fall gegeben [German]
They have the-Dat P. yesterday his-Dat company-Dat the-Acc case-Acc given
'They gave Peter's company the case'

b. *Ich habe der Karin gestern ihrem Kind geholfen
I have the-D Karin yesterday her-Dat child-Dat helped
'I helped Karin's child' (T. Grüter p.c.)

(23) a. ?*Gil hirbic le-Rina la-yeled [Modern Hebrew]
Gil beat-up Dat-Rina Dat-the-child
'Gil beat up Rina's child'

b.?*Gil natan le-Rina la-misrad konanit sfarim gdola
Gil gave Dat-Rina Dat-the-office case books big
'Gil gave Rina's office a big bookcase' (Landau 1999)

3.4 No Semantic Characterization is Possible

The examples presented so far have shown that Affectee can appear with all the verb classes, which resist receiving a coherent semantic characterization. At best, the eventive/stative distinction might be made, but it would not be particularly interesting in accounting for the distribution of Affectee in Japanese and English. Therefore, it can be concluded that no semantic characterization is possible for verbs in sentences where Affectee can appear and that the distribution of Affectee is determined solely in terms of the availability of Case in a language.

Moreover, it has been observed in the previous literature that the Germanic languages can form telic predicates such as resultatives to a varying degree by means of combining atelic verbs and telic phrases, whereas the Romance languages generally cannot. Japanese and Hebrew behave like the latter in this respect (Kageyama 1996, Rapoport 1986, Levin and Rappaport Hovav 1995). Though it remains to be explained why and how they differ the way they are, it is no doubt that the notion of telicity, which subsumes change of state, is significantly relevant in accounting for this aspect of variation. To the extent that this

observation is correct, we would end up with a puzzling picture. Specifically, we can classify the languages into two groups in terms of the distribution of Affectee: Japanese and English, on the one hand, and French, German, Hebrew and Spanish, on the other. The possibility of the composition of telic predicates tells us a different classification: English and German, on the one hand, and the rest, on the other. It seems impossible that a coherent lexical semantic theory is achieved that makes it possible to account for both the distribution of Affectee and the composition of telic predicates in terms of telicity or change of state without having internal conflicts in the theory.

Furthermore, since we know Affectee does not only appear with so-called lexical causatives but also with other predicates when it can receive Case, it is wrong to suppose that the head responsible for Affectee is encoded in the lexical representation of a verb, as Kageyama does. We cannot assume an independent lexical rule that augments a verb's lexical representation by adding EXPERIENCE or HAPPEN either, because such an account cannot provide a unified account for the two groups of languages under consideration. This leads us to the conclusion that Affectee is not an argument of a verb and hence that it is assigned by an independent syntactic head as in (10c), most probably a head akin to the one assumed for Agent as in (10b) (Kratzer 1996, Marantz 2001, Pylkkänen 1999).

4. Summary

In this paper, we have considered two competing approaches to the distribution of Affectee in Japanese and English. Although it seemed initially plausible to seek an explanation in terms of the lexical semantic approach in the face of the data from Japanese and English, it has been shown that the lexical semantic approach makes wrong predictions and the Case-theoretic approach fares much better when we look at other languages such as French, German, Hebrew and Spanish.

As a further issue, the syntactic approach in (10) predicts that Affectee can appear whenever CAUSE is present. However, so-called syntactic causatives never allow Affectee to appear instead of Agent. To provide a complete account for the distribution of Affectee, it remains to be explained why and how syntactic causatives differ from lexical causatives in this respect.

References

Amano, Midori (1995) "Zyootai Henka Syutai no Tadoosi Bun (The Transitive Sentences with Focus on Change of State)," *Doosi no Zita (The Transitivity of Verbs)*, ed. by Kazuyoshi Suga and Emiko Hayatsu, 151-175, Hitsuzi Shobo, Tokyo.

Arad, Maya (1998) *VP-Structure and the Syntax-Lexicon Interface*, Doctoral dissertation, University College London.

Branchadell, Albert (1992) *A Study of Lexical and Non-lexical Datives*, Doctoral dissertation, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.

Chomsky, Noam (1995) *The Minimalist Program*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.

Harley, Heidi (1995) *Subjects, Events, and Licensing*, Doctoral dissertation, MIT.

Inoue, Kazuko (1974) "Experiencer," *Descriptive and Applied Linguistics* 7, 139-182.

Inoue, Kazuko (1976) *Henkei-bumpoo to Nihongo Ge: Imikoozoo o tyuusin-ni (Transformational Grammar and Japanese Volume II: Semantic Interpretation)*, Taishukan, Tokyo.

Kageyama, Taro (1996) *Doosi Imiron (Verb Semantics)*, Kurosio Publishers, Tokyo.

Kempchinsky, Paula (1992) "The Spanish Possessive Dative Construction: θ-Role Assignment and Proper Government," *Romance Languages and Modern Linguistic Theory: Papers from the 20th Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages*, ed. by Paul Hirschbühler and Konrad Koerner, 135-149, John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia.

Kratzer, Angelika (1996) "Severing the External Argument from its Verb," *Phrase Structure and the Lexicon*, ed. by Johan Rooryck and Laurie Zaring, 109-137, Kluwer, Dordrecht.

Krause, Cornelia (1999) "Two Notes on Prenominal Possessors in German," *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 33, 191-217.

Landau, Idan (1999) "Possessor Raising and the Structure of VP," *Lingua* 107, 1-37.

Levin, Beth and Malka Rappaport Hovav (1995) *Unaccusativity: At the Syntax-Lexical Semantics Interface*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.

Marantz, Alec (1985) "Lexical Decomposition vs. Affixes as Syntactic Constituents," *CLS 21Part 2: Papers from the Parasession on Causative and Agentivity at the 21st Regional Meeting*, 154-171.

Marantz, Alec (2001) "Words," Paper delivered at *WCCFL* 20, held at the University of Southern California on Feb 23rd.
[available at <http://www.usc.edu/dept/LAS/linguistics/wccfl/program1.html>]

Pesetsky, David (1995) *Zero Syntax: Experiencers and Cascades*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.

Pylkkänen, Liina (1999) "Causation and External Arguments," *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 35, 161-183.

Rapoport, Tova (1986) "Nonverbal Predication in Hebrew," *WCCFL* 5, 207-218.

Takehisa, Tomokazu (1999) "A Preliminary Note on the Causer/Affectee Ambiguity," *Linguistic Research 16: Working Papers in English Linguistics*, 85-102, The University of Tokyo English Linguistics Association, Tokyo.

Williams, Edwin (1981) "Argument Structure and Morphology," *The Linguistic Review* 1, 81-114.