A Cross-linguistic Study of the Argument Realization of Stative Experiencer Verbs[*]

by
Yuriko HATORI

Abstract

Stative Experiencer Verbs such as *need, lack, miss, like*, etc. have several ways of argument realization from cross-linguistic point of view. The most interesting and controversial among them is Dative Experiencer construction. This construction seems to be based on some common semantic structures, though languages differ as to the subjecthood of Dative Experiencer. In this paper, it is argued that Stative Experiencer Verbs share the underlying locative or possessive semantic structure, and cross-linguistic similarities and differences in the morphological case markings are due to the different rankings of some universal constraints on Case assignment. A well-known historical change that the English verb *like* underwent is regarded as restructuring the Locative lexical semantic structure to the Possessive semantic structure along with reranking some constraints. The paper is intended as a first step to an Optimality Theoretic analysis of the linking between lexical semantic structures and their syntactic realization.

Key Words: Dative Experiencer, Subjecthood, Lexical Semantic Structure, Case Marking, Optimality Theory

1. Introduction

Verbs of possession show some interesting properties in the argument realization of the underlying semantic roles from cross-linguistic point of view. Take, for instance, the predicates *need* and *lack* in English and the corresponding predicates *yoosuru* 'need', *hituyoo-to-suru* 'need' and *kaku* 'lack' in Japanese.

(1) a. John needs our help.
    b. John lacks thoughtfulness.
(2) a. John ga watasitati no tasuke o yoosuru/hituyoo-to-suru.
       John NOM we GEN help ACC need/need

11

'John needs our help.'
b. John ga omoiyari o kaiteiru.
   John NOM thoughtfulness ACC lack
   'John lacks thoughtfulness'

As seen in (1) and (2), both *need* and *lack* require Experiencer subject and Theme (Target) object. This is also shared by the Japanese instances, where Theme is marked with Accusative Case marker *o*. Hereafter, this type of sentences will be called Accusative Theme construction. Japanese native speakers, however, feel that (2ab) are a little bookish, and the following alternants are more preferable.

(3) a. John ga/wa watasitati no tasuke ga iru/hituyoo-da.
       John NOM/TOP we GEN help NOM need
    b. John ni (wa) watasitati no tasuke ga iru/hituyoo-da
       John DAT (TOP) we GEN help NOM need
       'John needs our help'
(4) a. John ga/wa omoiyari ga kakeru/kaketeiru/nai.
       John NOM/TOP thoughfulness NOM lack
    b. John ni (wa) omoiyari ga kakeru/kaketeiru/nai.
       John DAT (TOP) thoughtfulness NOM lack
       'John lacks thoughtfulness'

(3) and (4) show that there are two variants of this construction, one is what can be called Double Nominative construction and the other Dative Experiencer construction. In both types of sentences the Theme objects are marked with the nominative *ga*. All the constructions (2), (3) and (4) are semantically almost equivalent, differing only in the forms and/or categorial classification: *yoosuru*(verb) vs. *iru*(verb), *hituyo-to-suru* (verb) vs. *hituyoo-da* (nominal adjective) and *kaiteiru* (verb) vs. *kakeru* (verb) or *nai* (adjective).

It is well known that many other languages both in Europe and Asia also have Dative Experiencer constructions. For instance, Korean has the same two types of constructions as in Japanese: Dative Experiencer construction and Double Nominative construction. It also has the third type of construction with Experiencer marked with two consecutive Dative and Nominative markers.

(5) a. Haksaeng-til-eykey ton-i philyoha-ta
       student-pl-DAT money-NOM need-ind
    b. Haksaeng-til-i ton-i philyoha-ta
       student-pl-NOM money-NOM need-ind
    c. Haksaeng-til-eykey-ka ton-i philyoha-ta

student-pl-DAT-NOM money-NOM need-ind
'The students need money'

<div align="right">Gerdts & Youn (1988)</div>

Icelandic is well known to have more varieties of case markings. With 'verbs of lacking', Experiencer can be marked either with Accusative or Dative.

(6) a. Mig brestur kjark
       me (ACC) lacks courage (ACC)
    b. Mér brestur kjarkur.
       me (DAT) lacks courage (NOM)
       'I lack courage'
(7) a. Mennina thrytur mat.
       the-men (ACC) lack food (ACC)
       'The men lack food'
    b. Honum thraut thróttur.
       him (DAT) lacked strength (NOM)
       'He lacked strength'
(8) a. Mig vantar hníf.
       me (ACC) lacks knife (ACC)
    b. Mér vantar hníf.
       me (DAT) lacks knife (ACC)
       'I lack a knife'

<div align="right">Smith (1994)</div>

According to Smith (1994), Double Nominative consruction is not allowed here.

A French verb *manquer* 'lack' also requires Dative Experiencer (or a corresponding prepositional phrase), but never allows Double Nominative construction.

(9) a. L'argent a manqué à nos parents.
       'Money has been lacking to our parents = Our parents have lacked money.'
    b. L'argent leur a manqué.
       'They have lacked money'

<div align="right">Legendre (1989)</div>

In the following sections, I will consider some cross-linguistic similarities and differences of these sentences, especially of Dative Experiencer constructions and attempt to take a lexcial semantic approach to explain their properties.

2. Some Properties of Dative Experiencer Constructions

2.1. Semantic Universality of Dative Experiencer Construction

We have already seen that the same verb 'lack' appears in a Dative Experiencer construction in all the above-mentioned languages. This verb can be considered as one of possessive verbs. A very basic verb of possession that appears in this consruction in Japanese is *aru* 'be=have'.

> (10)　Taro ni (wa) takusan no gyoseki ga aru.
> Taro-DAT (TOP) many GEN achievements NOM have
> 'Taro has many achievements'

Other typical predicates that appear in these constructions are predicates of psychological state as listed in (9).

> (11)　Japanese: *kowai* 'be afraid' *omosiroi* 'be interested' *fukai(-da)* 'be displeased'
> Korean: *coh-* 'like' *musep-* 'be afraid' *kayep-* 'be pitiful'
> French: *plaire* 'please' *deplaire* 'displease'

Predicates of ability also belong to the same class in Japanese.

> (12)a.　Watasi ga/wa rosiago ga dekiru/wakaru/yomeru
> I NOM/TOP Russian NOM can understand/can read
> b.　Watasi ni (wa) rosiago ga dekiru/wakaru/yomeru
> I DAT (TOP) Russian NOM can understand/can read
> 'I can understand/read Russian'

Kachru (1990) points out that Dative Experiencer is taken by a set of predicates denoting perception, liking, need, transient physical and mental states, knowledge, gain and obligation. These semantic properties seem to be universally common among the predicates taking Dative Experiencer. The cruical semantic features shared by these predicates are stativity and involitionality. This is in accord with the facts pointed out by Verma (1990) on Bhojpuri and Magahi, Gair (1990) on Sinhala, and Bashir (1990) on Kalasha, all of which are studies of South Asian languages. For instance, Verma (1990) notes that the crucial idea underlying oblique subject sentences is stativeness, which is also closely connected to non-volitionality, happenstance or accidental happening. Gair (1990) shows that in Sinhala, too, involitionality is associated with non-Nominative subjects. This is illustrated by (13bc) below.

(13) a. mamə natənəwa
    I-NOM dance-PRES
    'I dance.'

  b. mata nætuna.
    I-DAT dance-P-PAST
    'I danced (by impulse).'

  c. maawə nætuna.
    I-ACC dance-PAST
    'I danced (for some external reason)'.

<div align="right">Gair (1990)</div>

How can these facts be accounted for? It cannot be considered as a mere accidental coincidence that the same classes of predicates take the same construction. It is more plausible to assume some common lexical semantics underlying these predicates in all the above languages.

2.2 Subjecthood of Dative Experiencer

The second point to note is that Dative Experiencer behaves differently among languages as to its subjecthood. As Shibatani (1977) has pointed out, the *ni*-marked NP behaves as subject with respect to honorification and reflexivization in Japanese.

(14) a. Takada-sensei ni (wa) okane ga o-iri-ni-naru/go-hituyoo-da.
    Prof. Takada DAT(TOP) money NOM need-HON
  . 'Prof. Takada needs some money.

  b. 'Takada-sensei ni (wa) gakusei e no omoiyari ga o-kake-ni-natte-iru/
    o-ari-ni-nara-nai.
    Prof. Takada DAT (TOP) students-to-GEN thoughtfulness lack-HON
    'Prof. Takada lacks thoughtfulness to the students.'

  c. Taroo ni wa Masao ga zibun no kaisya de hituyoo-da.
    Taroo DAT TOP Masao NOM oneself GEN company need
    'Taroo$_i$ needs Masao at his$_i$ own company'

These properties are not restricted to the predicates of possession but also shared by those denoting some ability, desire and psychological states.

(15) a. Takada-sensei ni rosiago ga o-wakari-ni-naru/o-deki-ni-naru .
    Prof. Takada GEN Russian NOM understand-HON
    'Prof. Takada understands Russian.'

  b. Takada-sensei ni wa uti no inu ga o-kowai-rasii.
    Prof. Takada DAT TOP we GEN dog be afraid-EVID

'Prof. Takada seems to be afraid of our dog.'

(16) a. Taroo ni wa Masao ga zibun no ani yori wakaru.
    Taroo DAT TOP Masao NOM self GEN than understand
    'Taroo$_i$ knows Masao better than he knows his$_i$ brother'

   b. Taroo ni wa Masao ga zibun no titi yori kowai.
    Taroo DAT TOP Masao NOM self GEN than be fearful
    'Taroo$_i$ fears Maso more than he fears his$_i$ father'

Korean is known as behaving similarly to Japanese with respect to the subjecthood of the Dative Experiencer: it determines Subject Honorification, Reflexivization and Control. It is also well known that Modern Icelandic has attested Oblique subjects. In contrast, French Dative Experiencers behave very differently and never show any grammatical subjecthood. For instance, Dative Experiencers do not occur sentence initially and it cannot be an antecedent of a reflexive pronoun nor PRO.

English is interesting in this respect, because OE used to have non-Nominative (Dative or Accusative) Experiencers that show some properties of subjecthood, for instance, the ability to control the coordinated subject.[1] The relevant predicates were stative and usually involitional, such as the verbs expressing 'desire, loss, causing/feeling pity, pleasure, and so on'. After the loss or neutralization of Dative-Accusative distinction, all these verbs no longer take non-Nominative subjects. The change that took place with the verb 'like' has especially attracted interest of linguists' because the surface argument realization of the underlying semantic roles have totally changed or reversed throughout the history of English. Its earlier meaning was 'Theme pleases Experiencer' with the Experiencer behaving as the object, which later acquired the subject status and the meaning has changed to 'Experiencer likes Theme'. In the next section I will see these facts a little more carefully.

2.3 Lexical Polysemy

As to the linking properties of OE *lician* and ModE *like*, linguists have not agreed on how and why the change took place. Jespersen (1927) and Lightfoot (1979, 1991, 1999) argue for the syntactic reanalysis. When the basic word order became fixed as SVO and the Dative case distinction was lost, the originally preposed Dative Experiencer could plausibly be reanalysed as Nominative Subject. On the other hand, Fischer and Van der Leek (1982) took a non-reanalysis position claiming that verbs like *lician* already appeared in two or three constructions in OE, namely Impersonal construction, Experiencer-Subject construction and Cause-Subject construction. Their claim is that the difference among the constructions signals the difference in the degree of 'the affectedness of Object'. *Lician* in OE had two different meanings: 'to please' and 'to receive/have pleasure' and the former meaning was lost along with the loss of Impersonal construction. The loss of Impersonal construction was due to the loss of

the ability to assign two lexical Cases. Historically, lexical case assignment was replaced by structural case assignment. Allen (1986) assumes that the verb 'like' had two lexical entries: one with Experiencer as object and the other with Cause as object. She agrees with Fischer and Van der Leek (1982) in assuming that the loss of Dative subject is due to the loss of the lexical case marking of the subject, but differs from them in assuming that the preposed Dative Experiencer should be the underlying subject not the object. Allen claims that her analysis could account for the gradual disappearance of preposed datives and the idiosyncratic differences among verbs as to the time of the loss of Dative subjects. These gradualness and idiosyncracies among verbs can be better explained by the lexicalist approach which allows the optionality of the lexical case marking of Experiencer subjects.

One problem with these analyses is that they still don't explain why certain type of verbs allow different subcategorizations while some other type of verbs do not. For instance, another verb *cweman* meaning 'please' in OE never allowed Experiencer subject until it disappeared from English and was replaced by a new verb from French. Allen (1995) points out that in OE the two verbs *lician* and *cweman* differed in the topicality of the argument, in the sense that Theme is more topical with *cweman*, while Experiencer is more topical with *lician*. If this is true, why did only the verb *lician* have more than one subcategorization frame? There must be some deeper and more semantic based explanation for these facts.

The same type of parallel subcategorization frames are seen with other verbs in other languages, too, and the change from one frame to the other seems to be gradual and lexically specific in accord with Allen's claim. As already seen in (6)~(8) all the Icelandic verbs meaning 'lack' occur in two types of constructions. This is also true in Japanese and French. Along with the Dative Experiencer construction and Double Nominative construction shown in (4) and (9), the verb 'lack' in both languages has another Experiencer subject construction where the Theme takes an oblique marker.

(17) a. John ga/ni (wa) omoiyari ga kakeru.
    b. John ga (wa) *omoiyari ni* kakeru.
       'John lacks thoughtfulness'

(18) a. La patience lui manque.
    b. Il manque *de patience.*
       'He lacks patience'

With some predicates there are more idiosyncratic variations among speakers. In Japanese, some speakers allow *wakaru* 'understand' and *suki-da* 'like' to take an Accusative *o* marked object as well as Nominative *ga* marked object.

(19) a. Sono gakuseitati ga/ni (wa) doitugo ga wakaru.
         the students NOM/DAT (TOP) German NOM understand
     b. Sono gakuseitati ga (wa) *doitugo o* wakaru.
         the students NOM (TOP) German ACC understand
         'The students understand German'

(20) a. Watasi ga (wa) kaimono ga suki-da.
         I NOM (TOP) shopping NOM like
         'I like shopping'
     b. Watasi ga k*aimono o* suki-na koto
         I NOM shopping ACC like fact
         'the fact that I like shopping ...'
         cf. ?? Watasi wa *kaimono o* suki-da.

The Accusative Target construction is sometimes more natural in a subordinate clause than in a main clause. As seen above, (20b) is less acceptable if the sentence ends with *suki-da*. Another thing to note is that DAT-ACC pattern is not allowed with any predicates in Japanese. Dative Experiencer is possible only with Nominative Theme.

(21)   *Sono gakuseitati ni doitugo o wakaru (koto)
         the students DAT German ACC understand

These facts suggest that the direction of change is from DAT-NOM, NOM-NOM to NOM-ACC and the change is lexically specific. The next section will be an attempt to give a lexical semantic account of these properties based on the idea of constraint rankings in Optimality Theory.[2]

3. Lexical Semantics of Stative Experiencer Verbs

Based on the above observations of Japanese stative Experiencer predicates, I propose the basic lexical semantic structures (22a) and (22b) for Dative Experiencer predicates and Accusative Theme predicates, respectively. Some relevelant predicates are listed in (23).

(22) a. x BE AT-y   y:+Exp
     b. y HAVE x   y:+Exp   (HAVE = BE WITH)
(23) a. *aru* 'have', *iru* 'need', *hituyoo-da* 'need', *nai* 'lack', *kakeru* 'lack',
         kowai 'fearful', *omosiroi* 'interested'
     b. *kaku* 'lack', *hituyoo-to-suru* 'need', *osoreru* 'fear', *kirau* 'dislike'

HAVE is regarded here as a cover term for BE WITH. It is possible for some predicates to lexicalize only BE followed by an oblique phrase corresponding to [WITH x]. Both BE and HAVE are regarded here as highly abstract semantic predicates. Each lexical item must have more lexically specific content of its own asssociated with it. For instance, *kowai* 'fearful/frightening' must be specified as 'x BE FEARFUL AT-y', while *osoreru* may be specified as 'y HAVE FEAR OF x'.[3] As represented by the predicates BE and HAVE, (22a) is a locative semantic structure, and (22b) a possessive semantic structure. In both structures y is characterized as having the feature [+Exp], which is assumed to represent a human possessor of a certain ability, a psychological state or a physical object such as money. Another assumption is that Case is determined by the lexical structure of each predicate, both from structural and semantic points of view. The structurally highest argument of the lexical structure should realize as Nominative, and the second highest argument Accusative. Other Cases are semantically determined. For instance, Dative Case is the realization of the predicate AT or TO, indicating Location or Goal. Since BE is stative, only AT is relevant here. It is assumed that the first argument of BE and HAVE is structurally higher than the second one and will be assigned Nominative Case. AT-y realizes as Dative NP or Oblique PP. The second argument of HAVE, which is the second highest argument, will be assigned Accusative Case.

The lexical structures (22ab) represent the [+stative] property of the predicates in question. Since (22a) is basically a locative structure, it is most typically associated with the verbs of existence *aru/iru* 'be, exist'. In the following examples the Nominative NP is definitely the subject of the sentence and the *ni* marked phrase indicates the location. The locative phrases are very often topicalized and occur sentence initially. The subjecthood, however, is associated with the Nominative Theme NP and not with the preposed Locative NP.

(24) a. Titi ga/wa syosai ni iru.
         father NOM/TOP study in be
         'My father is in his study'

    b. Ookina hunsui ga kooen no mannaka ni aru.
        big fountain NOM park GEN center in be
        'There is a big fountain in the center of the park.'

(25)   Kenkyuusitu ni wa Yamada-sensei ga irassyai-masu.
         office in TOP   Prof. Yamada NOM be(HON)'
         'Prof. Yamada is in the office.'

In (25) the honorification agrees with the Nominative Theme *Yamada-sensei*. This is in sharp contrast with (14)~(16) and (26), where the subjecthood is manifested by the Locative phrase(=Experiencer).

(26) Yamada-sensei ni (wa) daizi na osigoto ga aru/oarini-naru
      Prof. Yamada at (TOP) important job NOM have/have (HON)
      'Prof. Yamada has an important job to do'

The locative marker *ni* is grammaticalized as Dative Case marker here. It cannot be replaced by any other complex postpositions as in (27).

(27) Kenkyuusitu no naka/soba/mae ni Yamada-sensei ga irassyai-masu.
      office GEN inside/near/front at Prof. Yamada be (HON)
      'Prof. Yamada is inside/near/in front of the office.'

The difference in subjecthood beween (25) and (26) is clearly due to the Experiencerhood. Japanese shows a strong preference to Experiencer Subject in general, and once the NP is defined as Experiencer, it must become the subject even if it is marked as Dative. The second NP remains as Nominative just like Nominative subjects in (24) and (25). The claim here is that this *ga* is not a special Object marker which is licensed only with stative predicates.[4] It is assigned Nominative Case just because it is associated with the highest argument of the semantic structure. Based on the Optimality Theoretic idea I propose the following two constraints on the association of morphological Case with the arguments of the lexical semantic structure.

[A] The highest argument of the Lexical Semantic Structure should be
    assigned Nominative Case.
[B] Experiencer must be Subject

Because of the constraint [A], the first argument of BE is assigned Nominative Case, but because of the constraint [B] the second argument of BE becomes the subject. We have seen that Japanese respects both [A] and [B].

Then where does the first Nominative *ga* of Double Nominative construction (19a) and (20a) come from? It has generally been assumed that it is a subject marker. Another view is that it is strongly associated with the preposed NP that is assigned Nominative in IP. The contrast between (29a) and (29b) is due to the non-preposed Experiencer *ga*-phrase.

(29) a. Daizi na osigoto ga Yamada-sensei ni aru/oarini-naru.
     b. ?? Daizi na osigoto ga Yamada-sensei ga aru/oarini-naru
         'Prof. Yamada has an important job to do'

(30) shows, however, that mere preposing of Locative phrase cannot license *ga* marking. Furtheremore, (31) shows that non-preposed Experiencer *ga*-phrase does not always result in an unacceptable sentence.

(30) *Kenkyuusitu ga Yamada-sensei ga iru/irassyaru
      office NOM   Prof. Yamada NOM be/be(HON)'
      'Prof. Yamada is in the office.'
(31) Watasitati no tasuke ga Yamada-sensei ga hituyoo-da.
      our help NOM   Prof. Yamada NOM need
      'Prof. Yamada needs our help.'

Along with the traditional view, I assume that the first Nominative Case of the Double Nominative construction is associated with Subject obeying the following third constraint.

[C]   Subject must be case marked as Nominative.

If [C] is the strongest among the three constraints, then the language does not allow Dative Subject. If [B] is the strongest, then Experiencer should always be Subject regardless of its Case. If [A] is the strongest, Nominative Case is always associated with the structurally highest argument. Another plausible constraint for Case marking is to prohibit Double case marking. The following constraint on Double Nominative is relevant here.

[D]   Avoid Double Nominatives.

The possible surface realizations of (22a) and (22b) and how each of them violate the four constraints are shown in (32) and (33), respectively.[5] The availability of each realization in French, English (ModE and OE) and Japanese is also shown by marking with or without an asterisk.[6]

(32)   x BE AT-y[+Exp]

x	y	[A]	[B]	[C]	[D]			
Subj/NOM	Non-Subj/DATorACC	✓	*	✓	✓	Fr	Eng	*Jap
Subj/DAT or ACC	Non-Subj/NOM	*	*	*	✓	*Fr	*Eng	*Jap
Subj/NOM	Non-Subj/NOM	✓	*	✓	*	*Fr	*Eng	*Jap
Non-Subj/NOM	Subj/NOM	✓	✓	✓	*	*Fr	*Eng	Jap
Non-Subj/DATorACC	Subj/NOM	*	✓	✓	✓	*Fr	OE	*Jap
Non-Subj/NOM	Subj/DATorACC	✓	✓	*	✓	*Fr	OE	Jap
Non-Subj/DATorACC	Subj/DATorACC	*	✓	*	✓	*Fr	OE	*Jap

(33)   y[+Exp] HAVE x

y	x	[A]	[B]	[C]	[D]			
Subj/NOM	Non-Subj/ACC	✓	✓	✓	✓	Fr	Eng	Jap

Assuming the four constraints [A] ~ [D], the difference among Japanese, French and English can be explained as follows. Japanese respects [A] and [B] more highly than [C] and [D], so Experiencer must always be Subject, either Nominative or Dative. Theme must be Nominative because it is the highest argument of the semantic structure (22a). In contrast, French respects [A] and [C] more highly than [B], which explains why Dative Experiencer in French cannot be Subject. What happened in English is more complicated and interesting. I have the following rough scenario in mind. In older English, [B] used to be respected more highly than [C], which allowed Dative Experiencer Subject. It also allowed various 'quirky cases' that violate [A]. With the loss of Dative case, [A] became stricter than before. This means that the first Theme argument x in (32) must become Nominative. Since the constraint [D] must be respected in English, the second argument y cannot be Nominative. Then it cannot be Subject because of [C]. This violates the constraint [B] as in French. The best way not to violate any of the four constraints is to change the underlying semantic structure from the locative to the possessive; from (22a) to (22b). Then, the structurally highest argument is Experiencer and it can realize as Nominative Subject as the most unmarked case.

It is generally said that Case marking of English underwent the change from lexically conditioned to positionally conditioned assignment. In my terms it is the change in the rankings of the constraints [A] and [C], both of which could be violated in OE but not in ModE. All the verbs that used to take Dative Experiencer in OE now belong to the class of possessive verbs with the structure (22b): *need, lack, miss, see, like, hate*, etc. (33) shows that this semantic structure underlies the more unmarked NOM-ACC realization in any language. Then the historical change that took place with the verb *like* in English is regarded as the alternation of the semantic structure from locative to possessive, which directs the most optimal surface realization.

Allen (1986, 1995) has pointed out that the historical change that the verb *liken* underwent was rather gradual. It is also plausible to assume in our terms that the shift of underlying semantic structures were gradual and lexically idiosyncratic. This is why some predicates show lexical polysemy in every language. The shift takes place as a result of the total loss of one of the two alternative lexical structures associated with a predicate.

4. Conclusion

I have argued above that there are both some cross-linguistic similarities and differences in the argument realization of stative experiencer verbs. Languages show some common patterns in the case marking of the arguments that are semantically based. So-called Dative Experiencer predicates are analyzed as having Locative semantic structure and their arguments are associated with syntactic Grammatical Relation and

morphological Case according to some universal principles or constraints. The constraints proposed are as follows:

[A] The highest argument of the Lexical Semantic Structure should be assigned Nominative Case.

[B] Experiencer must be Subject.

[C] Subject must be case marked as Nominative.

[D] Avoid Double Nominatives.

Following the idea of Optimality Theory, I have shown that the cross-linguistic variations in the surface argument realization is due to the relative ranking difference among the constraints.

Japanese has a strong orientation to Experiencer Subject, while English has undergone some crucial change in the ranking of the constraints accompanying the loss of Dative case marking. This results in the shift of the underlying semantic structure of Stative Experiencer predicates from locative to possessive, so that earlier Dative Experiencer predicates have now become typical transitive verbs with Nominative Experiencer subject and Accusative Theme object.

The alternation between locative and possessive constructions or BE-HAVE alternation is not a new idea at all. It has been repeatedly suggested or claimed in many previous works. For instance, Ikegami (1981) argues on some typological difference between BE languages and HAVE languages. Kageyama (1997) argues that locative-possessive alternating structures underlie the two different subcategorization frames associated with the verbs *supply, load, swarm* etc.

It is generally said that Japanese is a BE-type language while English is a HAVE-type language. The fact that Japanese stative Experiencer verbs have the underlying locative structure more preferrably than the possessive structure and the corresponding English stative Experiencer verbs mostly have the possessive structure is in accord with this generalization. The difference between the two languages may partly be due to the difference in the availability of the Dative Case marking and Double Nominative construction in general. Both of them are highly frequent in Japanese but totally lacking in Modern English.

I have not shown in this paper precisely how the constraints [A]~[D] are ranked in each language and how it changed in the history of English. It goes without saying that the four constraints have to interact with other constraints, all of which must be shown to be universally motivated. This is beyond the scope of the present paper and will be taken up elsewhere.[7]

NOTES

*   This is part of my research conducted during my stay at Stanford University. I am indebted to Peter Sells, Joan Bresnan, Paul Kiparsky, Helge Lødrup, Myong-hi Chai and Hanjung Lee for their helpful comments and suggestions.

1   This is discussed in Allen (1986, 1995).

2   I do not intend to give a full Optimality Theoretic analysis of stative experiencer predicates here, though I assume that cross-linguistic variations are due to the difference in the rankings of some universal constraints on argument realizations in general.

3   The validity of the function BE WITH or HAVE is discussed in Pinker (1989) and Kageyama (1997), among others.

4   Kuno (1973) regards this construction as 'transitive' with *ni/ga* marking Subject and *ga* marking Object. My view is more in accord with Shibatani's (1999) who argues that this sort of Double Nominative construction should be analyzed as another type of Double Subject construcion. I am not claiming, however, that the second *ga* is marking Subject.

5   I assume here that each surface realization is the combination of Grammatical Relation (Subject vs. Non-Subject) and Morphological Case (NOMinative, DATive, ACCusative). Double Dative case markings and Double Accusative case markings are theoretical possiblities that are actually attested in OE. They are not covered by the four constraints here.

6   '*Eng' means that the realization is not allowed either in OE or ModE and 'Eng' without an asterisk means it is allowed in both. 'OE' means that it is allowed only in OE not in ModE.

7   This paper is not concerned with Causative Experiencer Verbs which behave very differently among the three languages, French, English and Japanese. Hatori (1999) is an attempt to give an Optimality Theoretic account of the argument realization of both Stative Experiencer predicates and Causative Experiencer predicates of the three languages.

·REFERENCES

Allen, Synthia L. 1986. "Reconsidering the history of *like*", *Journal of Linguistics* **22**. 375–409.

Allen, Synthia L. 1995. *Case marking and reanalysis.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Bashir, Elena. 1990. "Involuntary experience in Kalasha", In *Experiencer Subjects in South Asian languages*, ed. Verma and. Mohanan. 297–318. CSLI, Stanford University.

Bresnan, Joan. to appear. "Optimal syntax", In *Optimality Theory: phonology, syntax and acquisition*, ed. Josst Derrer, Frank van der Leeuw and Jeroen van de Weijer. Oxford University Press.

Cole, Peter, Wayne Harbert, Gabriella Hermon, and S.N. Sridhar. 1980. "The acquisition of subjecthood", *Language.* **56**: 719–743.

Fischer, Olga C.M. and Frederike C. van der Leek. 1982. "The demise of the Old English impersonal construction", *Journal of Linguistics.* **19**. 337–368.

Gair, James W. 1990. "Subject, Case and INFL in Sinhala", In *Experiencer Subjects in South Asian languages*, ed. Verma and Mohanan. 13–41. CSLI, Stanford University.

Gerdts, Donna B. and Cheong Youn. 1988. "Korean psych constructions: advancement or retreat?" *CLS* **24**, 155–175.

Hatori, Yuriko. 1999. "Where do Experiencers want to go?: an OT approach to the argument realization of Experiencer Verbs", Paper presented at SSSG. Stanford University.

Ikegami, Yoshihiko. 1981. *'Suru' to 'naru' no gengogaku* (Linguisitcs of 'do' and 'become') Tokyo: Taishukan.

Jackendoff, Ray. 1990. *Semantic structures.* Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Jespersen, Otto. 1922. *Language: its nature, development and origin.* Allen and Unwin.

Kachru, Yamuna. 1990. "Experiencer and other oblique subjects in Hindi", In *Experiencer Subjects in South Asian languages,* ed. Verma and Mohanan. 59–75. CSLI, Stanford University.

Kager, René. 1999. *Optimality Theory.* Cambridge University Press.

Kageyama, Taro. 1997. "Denominal verbs and lexical salience in lexical conceptual structure", In *Verb semantics and syntactic structure,* ed. Taro Kageyama. 45–96. Tokyo: Kurosio Publishers.

Kiparsky, Paul. 1997. "The rise of positional licensing", In *Parameter of Morphosyntactic change,* ed. Van Kemenade and Vincent, 460–494. Cambridge University Press.

Kiparsky, Paul. 1999. "Remarks on structural case", Paper presented at OT Syntax Seminar. Stanford University.

Lee, Hanjung. 1999. "Markedness and word order freezing: an OT account", Ms. Stanford University.

Legendre, Géraldine. 1989. "Inversion with certain French experiencer verbs", *Language* **65**. 752–782,

Lightfoot, David. 1991. *How to set parameters: arguments from language chance.* MIT Press.

Lightfoot, David. 1999. *The developmentof language: acquisition, change, and evolution.* Blackwell Publishers.

Pinker, Steven. 1989. *Learnability and cognition: the acquisition of argument structure.* MIT Press.

Prince, Alan, and Paul Smolensky. 1993. *Optimality theory: constraint interaction in generative grammar.* Ms. Rutgers University. [to appear, MIT Press]

Shibatani, Masayoshi. 1977. "Grammatical relations and surface cases", *Language.* **53**: 789–809

Shibatani, Masayoshi. 1999. "Non-canonical constructions in Japanese", In Coursebook of LSA Institute, University of Illinois.

Smith, Henry. 1994. "'Dative sickness' in Germanic", *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* **12**: 675–736.

Verma, Manindra K. 1990. "Experiencer Subjects in Bhojipuri and Magahi", In *Experiencer Subjects in South Asian languages,* ed. Verma and Mohanan. 85–103. CSLI, Stanford University.

Zaenen, Annie, J. Maling and H. Thráinsson, 1985. "Case and grammatical function: the Icelandic passive", *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* **3**, 441–483.