Multiple Accusative Constructions: the case of V+*tate* in Japanese

Category: formal syntax

The Japanese nominal morpheme *-tate* attaches to a transitive or unaccusative verb, to highlight the resultant state of the action (Yamada 2004). Typical examples are given in (1), with canonical uses in (2):

(1) a. sibori-tate-no gyuunyuu   <u>activity verb: creation</u>
          squirt-*tate*-Gen milk   'fresh milk'

     b. age-tate-no tenpura   <u>activity verb: change-of-state</u>
          fry-*tate*-Gen tempura   'freshly-fried tempura'

(2) a. tukuri-tate-no koora-o nom-asete kureru basyo-ga aru.
          make-*tate*-Gen cola-Acc drink-Caus give place-Nom exist
          'There is a place where you can drink freshly made cola.'

     b. taki-tate-no   gohan-o tabete itadakemasu.
          steam-*tate*-Gen rice-Acc eat   be.able.to.Hon
          'You can eat freshly steamed rice.'

Here we consider the related examples in (3), which have previously remained unnoticed. V+*tate* is marked accusative and appears to stand as a nominal phrase, preceded by its own object, also accusative:

(3) a. ?koora-o tukuri-tate-o   nom-asete   kureru basyo-ga   aru.
           cola-Acc make-*tate*-Acc drink-Caus give   place-Nom exist
          'There is a place where you can drink freshly made cola.'

     b. ?gohan-o taki-tate-o   tabete itadakemasu
           rice-Acc steam-*tate*-Acc eat   be.able.to.Hon
          'You can eat freshly steamed rice.'

In (3) the case-marking suggests that V+*tate* is nominal, yet its object is also accusative. The examples are slightly degraded, but due only to the presence of two accusatives. This is verified by exchanging the first *-o* for a focus marker as in (4a), or by clefting or scrambling the two phrases apart as in (4b-c) (Hiraiwa 2010):

(4) a. Taroo-ga koora-mo/sae/wa/dake tukuri-tate-o nom-ase-te kureta.   ***Focus***
           Taro-Nom cola-also/even/Top/only make-*tate*-Acc drink-Caus-give

     b. [Taroo-ga   tukuri-tate-o   nom-ase-te   kureta-no]-wa   koora(-o)-da. ***Clefting***
          Taro-Nom   make-*tate*-Acc drink-Caus-give-Nm-Top   cola-Acc-Cop

     c. Koora-o, Taroo-ga tukuri-tate-o   nom-ase-te kureta.   ***Scrambling***
          cola-Acc Taro-Nom make-*tate*-Acc drink-Caus give

Before looking at (3) in detail, it is instructive to compare to Korean, which routinely allows double accusatives. The closest Korean counterparts to (3) are like (5):

(5) [kolla-lul]   [kumpang mantu-n kes-ul]   keki-eyse   sa-l swu iss-ta
     [cola-Acc]   [just   make-Past Nm-Acc]   there-at   buy can

Due to space restrictions, we can only assert here that it can be shown that the two bracketed phrases in (5) need not form a constituent, and the relation between the two is rather like a Host and Floated Quantifier. The surface independence of the two accusative phrases is the basis of our account of Japanese as well.

Considering the structure of *-tate* phrases such as (3), we note that an example like (3a) has a variant as in (6), with the object marked by *-no*.

(6) koora-no tukuri-tate-o   nom-asete kureru basyo-ga   aru.
     cola-Gen make-*tate*-Acc drink-Caus give   place-Nom exist

(6) is independently interesting as it looks like an inverse of (2a). We now propose the derivation of (3a) from (6), as in (7). *-tate* can head a nominal phrase (see Sugioka 1986), and then its object *koora* is (internally-)merged at VP, which accounts for why it is marked *-o* and not *-no* in (3a):

(7) [$_{VP}$ [$_{NP}$ koora-**no** tukuri-tate]-**o** …]➔[$_{VP}$ koora$_i$-**o** [$_{NP}$ t$_i$ tukuri-tate]-**o** …]   <u>***-tate***</u>
          cola-Gen make-*tate*-Acc   cola-Acc   make-*tate*-Acc

If *koora-o* is raised out of the *-tate*-phrase, this accounts for *(8) (compare with (4c)) as an instance of a Proper Binding Condition violation.

(8)   *[t_j tukuri-tate-o]$_k$ Taroo-ga   koora$_j$-o t_k nom-ase-te kureta.
            make-*tate*-Acc Taro-Nom cola-Acc   drink-Caus give
        '(Lit.) Freshly made, Taro gave me cola.'

Bearing in mind what we also know to be possible in Korean, it is not possible to analyze (3a) as an internally-headed relative clause (IHRC), with the structure in (9), with one accusative phrase inside another:

(9)   [$_{NP}$ [$_{IP}$ *pro* koora-**o**   tukuri]-tate]-**o**   (*koora-o* is the internal head)   **IHRC**
                cola-Acc make-*tate*-Acc

There are many syntactic/semantic differences between *-tate* constructions and IHRCs. First, the initial *-o* phrase cannot be modified, whereas this is generally possible in IHRCs, as shown in (10):

(10)   a.   *Taroo-wa   oisii   koora-o tukuri-tate-o   nom-ase-te kureta.   ***-tate***
                 Taro-Top   delicious cola-Acc make-*tate*-Acc drink-Caus-gave
                'Taro gave me freshly made delicious cola.'

        b.   Taroo-wa [oisii   koora-o tukutta-no]-o   nom-ase-te kureta.   **IHRC**
                Taro-Top delicious cola-Acc made-Nm-Acc drink-Caus-gave

Second, *-tate* constructions have strong semantic restrictions, which are not found in IHRCs; the examples in (11) contain the accomplishment verb *tubusu* 'squash,' which is bad with *-tate* but is fine in the IHRC:

(11)   a.   *aki-kan-o   tubusi-tate-o   suteta.   ***-tate***
                 empty.tin-Acc squash-*tate*-Acc threw.away
                '(I) threw away a newly squashed tin.'

        b.   [aki-kan-o   tubusita-no]-o suteta.   **IHRC**
                empty.tin-Acc   squashed-Nm threw.away

Third, the core argument in *-tate* constructions cannot be nominative, but this is fine in IHRCs in (12):

(12)   a.   *koora-ga deki-tate-o   nom-asete   kureru basyo-ga   aru.   ***-tate***
                 cola-Nom be.made-*tate*-Acc drink-Caus give   place-Nom exist
                'There is a place where you can drink freshly made cola.'

        b.   [koora-ga dekita-no]-o   nom-asete   kureru basyo-ga   aru.   **IHRC**
                cola-Nom was.made-Nm-Acc drink-Caus give   place-Nom exist

Fourth, when a PP intervenes between *koora-o* and *tukuri-tate*, the PP only modifies the matrix verb, as shown in (13a), but such a reading is not possible in the IHRC in (13b). These facts clearly show that the two accusative phrases in (3/7) do not form a constituent, unlike the IHRC in (9).

(13)   a.   Taroo-wa koora-o koozyoo-de tukuri-tate-o   nonda.   ***-tate***
                Taro-Top cola-Acc factory-in   make-*tate*-Acc drank
                'Taro drank freshly made cola in the factory.'

        b.   Taroo-wa [koora-o koozyoo-de tukutta-no]-o   nonda.   **IHRC**
                Taro-Top cola-Acc factory-in make-Nm-Acc drank
                'Taro drank cola freshly made in the factory.'

Hence, the derivation in (7) is justified as the most viable account of the relevant data with *-tate*. The current study will further investigate the unexpected data in (3) and aim to provide theoretical insights regarding raising to object-like predication relations in comparison with floated quantifier constructions and secondary predicates.

References

Hiraiwa, K. (2010) Spelling out the double-*o* constraint. *Nat. Language and Linguistic Theory* 28, 723-770.
Sugioka, Y. (1986) *Interaction of Derivational Morphology and Syntax in Japanese and English*. Garland.
Yamada, M. (2004) Event-koozoo-ni okeru asupekuto-tenkan: 'tate' koobun-no bunseki. [Aspectual
    alternations in event structures: analysis of *-tate* constructions]. *Scientific Approaches to Language* No.3,
    pp. 241-262, Center for Language Sciences, KUIS.