Multiple Accusative Constructions: the case of \textit{V+tate} in Japanese

Category: formal syntax

The Japanese nominal morpheme \textit{-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):

\begin{enumerate}
\item a. sibori-tate-no gyuunyyuu activity verb: creation
squirt-tate-Gen milk \textit{‘fresh milk’}
\item b. age-tate-no tenpura activity verb: change-of-state
fry-tate-Gen tempura \textit{‘freshly-fried tempura’}
\end{enumerate}

\begin{enumerate}
\item a. tukuri-tate-no koora-o nom-asete kururu basyo-ga aru.
make-tate-Gen cola-Acc drink-Caus give place-Nom exist
\textit{‘There is a place where you can drink freshly made cola.’}
\item b. taki-tate no gohan-o tabete itadakemasu.
steam-tate-Gen rice-Acc eat be.able.to.Hon
\textit{‘You can eat freshly steamed rice.’}
\end{enumerate}

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

\begin{enumerate}
\item a. ?koora-o tukuri-tate-o nom-asete kururu basyo-ga aru.
cola-Acc make-tate-Acc drink-Caus give place-Nom exist
\textit{‘There is a place where you can drink freshly made cola.’}
\item b. ?gohan-o taki-tate-o tabete itadakemasu
rice-Acc steam-tate-Acc eat be.able.to.Hon
\textit{‘You can eat freshly steamed rice.’}
\end{enumerate}

In (3) the case-marking suggests that \textit{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 -\textit{o} for a focus marker as in (4a), or by clefting or scrambling the two phrases apart as in (4b-c) (Hiraiwa 2010):

\begin{enumerate}
\item a. Taroo-ga koora-mo/sae/da/ke tukuri-tate-o nom-ase-te kureta. Focus
Taro-Nom cola-also/even/Top/only make-tate-Acc drink-Caus give
\item 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
\item c. Koora-o, Taroo-ga tukuri-tate-o nom-ase-te kureta. Scrambling
coa-Acc Taro-Nom make-tate-Acc drink-Caus give
\end{enumerate}

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):

\begin{enumerate}
\item [kolla-lul] [kumpang mantu-n kes-ul] keki-eyse sa-l swu iss-ta
[kola-Acc] [just make-Past Nm-Acc] there-at buy can
\end{enumerate}

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 \textit{-tate} phrases such as (3), we note that an example like (3a) has a variant as in (6), with the object marked by \textit{-no}.

\begin{enumerate}
\item koora-no tukuri-tate-o nom-asete kururu basyo-ga aru.
cola-Gen make-tate-Acc drink-Caus give place-Nom exist
\end{enumerate}

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

\begin{enumerate}
\item \text{[VP \text{[NP koora-no tukuri-tate]-o …]\text{[VP koora]-o [NP t, tukuri-tate]-o …] -tate}}
\text{cola-Gen make-tate-Acc cola-Acc make-tate-Acc}
\end{enumerate}
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\textsubscript{1} \text{tukuri-tate-o}_{\text{t}} k} \text{koora}_{\text{o}} \text{t sube kureta.}
    \text{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) \[\text{NP} \{\text{pro koora-o tukuri-[tate]-o} \}
    \text{ cola-Acc make-tate-Acc}
    \text{(koora-o is the internal head)} \quad \text{IHRC}

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. *{\text{Taro-}wa \text{oisii koora-o tukuri-tate-o nom-ase-te kureta.}} \quad \text{IHRC}
    \text{Taro-Top delicious cola-Acc make-tate-Acc drink-Caus-gave}
    ‘Taro gave me freshly made delicious cola.’

b. {Taro-\text{wa oisii koora-o tukutta-no-o}} \text{nom-ase-te kureta.} \quad \text{IHRC}
    \text{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. *{\text{aki-kan-o tubusi-tate-o suteta.}} \quad \text{IHRC}
    \text{empty.tin-Acc squash-tate-Acc throw.away}
    ‘(I) threw away a newly squashed tin.’

b. [\text{aki-kan-o tubusita-no-o suteta.} \quad \text{IHRC}
    \text{empty.tin-Acc squashed-Nom throw.away}

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

(12) a. *{\text{koora-ga deki-tate-o nom-ase-te kureru basyo-ga aru.}} \quad \text{IHRC}
    \text{cola-Nom be.made-tate-Acc drink-Caus give place-Nom exist}
    ‘There is a place where you can drink freshly made cola.’

b. [\text{koora-ga dekita-no-o nom-ase-te kureru basyo-ga aru.} \quad \text{IHRC}
    \text{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. Taro-\text{wa koora-o koozyoo-de tukuri-tate-o nonda.} \quad \text{IHRC}
    \text{Taro-Top cola-Acc factory-in make-tate-Acc drank}
    ‘Taro drank freshly made cola in the factory.’

b. Taro-\text{wa koora-o koozyoo-de tukutta-no-o nonda.} \quad \text{IHRC}
    \text{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.
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