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1. Introduction

Among verb-final languages which permit scrambling/apparent free word order, there have been a number of different claims about the syntactic structure of ditransitive constructions and whether a unique underlying/neutral word order can be identified. With regard to German, there is a consensus of opinion that the ordering Indirect Object > Direct Object (IO>DO) is basic, following detailed investigations of markedness restrictions governing the re-ordering of IO>DO as DO>IO (involving (in)definiteness and focus projection, Büring 1998). Concerning Turkish and Persian, however, Karimi (2003) and Issever (2003) report DO>IO to be the basic, underlying order, based on patterns of anaphor construal, weak crossover, prosody, and various other syntactic properties. Finally, a dual position is proposed in influential work on Japanese carried out by Shigeru Miyagawa (Miyagawa 1997). On the basis of binding and floating quantifier patterns it is argued that both IO>DO and DO>IO orders can be base-generated as underlying orders. Given such different conclusions about the structure of ditransitives, it is not clear whether there is any kind of universal hierarchical ordering of direct and indirect objects in verb-final (and other) languages, or if languages are open to parametrization in the structuring of double object constructions and the establishment of a neutral linear ordering of goal and theme arguments. The present paper seeks to add a further perspective on this universalist-particularist debate with a comparative study of ditransitives in Japanese, Korean and Turkish. The paper reports the first results of a larger ongoing project on ditransitives in the three languages and attempts to establish basic patterns relating to (a) the effect of (in)definiteness and (in)animacy on goal/theme ordering, (b) binding and reconstruction phenomena, (c) patterns with floating quantifiers, and (d) relative quantifier scope. The paper also considers a recent interesting analysis in Miyagawa and Tsujioka (2004), based on patterns in Japanese, that there may be two distinct goal positions present with many ditransitive verbs (a goal and a non-recipient end-point...
location), and investigates the potential consequences of such a possibility in Korean and Turkish. A key aim of the current investigation of ditransitives is to generate data which can be compared in the closest possible way in Japanese, Korean and Turkish, wherever the properties of these languages make this achievable, and to collect data on all patterns with three different ditransitive verbs: ‘give’, ‘send’, and ‘introduce’. Recent work on ditransitives (in particular Matsuoka 2003, Miyagawa and Tsujioka 2004, Bhattacharya and Simpson 2007) is beginning to suggest that different ditransitive verbs may project different underlying structures within a single language. It is therefore crucial that conclusions about the underlying structure of ditransitives as a group are not reached in a ‘mix-and-match’ investigative way, in which, for example, results from considerations of relative scope based solely on the verb ‘give’ are combined with results from patterns of binding and reconstruction or quantifier float obtained with the verb ‘introduce’. This has sometimes been the tendency in past work where it has been assumed that all the ditransitive verbs in a single language necessarily share a unique underlying structure. As such an approach has the potential to obscure and over-simplify important variation, new investigations should, wherever possible, attempt to use a full set of data from a range of different ditransitive verbs and endeavour to see whether the full patterning for each verb considered allows one to draw parallel or different conclusions.

2. Japanese

Considerably more work has been carried out on the syntactic properties of ditransitive verbs in Japanese than in Korean and Turkish. As a lead-in to the primarily new investigation of the latter two languages, this section reviews the key types of syntactic phenomena considered in Japanese ditransitives and the conclusions argued to result from the patterning found, making central reference to the insightful study in Miyagawa (1997).

Miyagawa (1997) suggests that both Goal > Theme and Theme > Goal surface orders can be base-generated as underlying orders in Japanese, with verbs such as ‘give’ (ageru) and ‘introduce’ (shookai suru). It is also claimed that surface Goal > Theme and Theme > Goal orders can arise from movement applying to either possible base structure:

(i) Goal_i > Theme_i > t_i

(ii) Theme_i > Goal > t_i

The principal patterns which are argued to support such an analysis relate to: (a) the interpretation of reciprocal anaphors, (b) the distribution of floating numeral quantifiers/NQs, and (c) relative scope phenomena, as discussed below.

With regard to binding phenomena, Miyagawa notes that when an object is repositioned before a reciprocal in subject position, the object patterns as if it occupied an underlying position following the subject and is reconstructed to its base position for interpretation:
In ditransitive constructions, the antecedent of a reciprocal can occur as either the Goal in Goal > Theme orders, or the Theme in Theme > Goal orders:

\[(2) \]
\[\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{John-ga } [\text{Hanako-to Mary}]_{-i-ni} (\text{paatii-de}) \text{ otagai}_{-i-o} \text{ shookai-shita.} \\
& \text{John-Nom Hanako-and-Mary-Dat party-at each other-Acc introduced} \\
& \text{’John introduced Hanako and Mary to each other at the party.’} \\
\text{b. } & \text{(?)} \text{John-ga } [\text{Hanako-to Mary}]_{-i-o} (\text{paatii-de}) \text{ otagai}_{-i-ni} t_i \text{ shookai-shita.} \\
& \text{John-Nom Hanako-and-Mary-Acc party-at each other-Dat introduced} \\
& \text{’John introduced Hanako and Mary to each other at the party.’} 
\end{align*}\]

Miyagawa reasons that, supposing only a Goal > Theme base order were to be possible, one might expect that the Theme in the surface Theme > Goal order (in 2b) would reconstruct to its base position for interpretation (in a similar way to (1a)), and that this would then NOT allow for co-reference between the Theme reciprocal and the Goal antecedent. As such co-reference seems to be licensed as acceptable, however, the conclusion may be drawn that BOTH the orders in (2a) and (2b) are possible underlying orders and not the result of movement.

Concerning numeral quantifiers/NQs, where an NQ occurs floated in a position separate from its associated NP, it is argued that the NQ marks the base position of the NP, and the NP occurs in its surface position due to movement away from the NQ (following much earlier work on floating quantifiers, Miyagawa 1989). In the Theme > Goal order in ditransitives, it is noted an NQ associated with the Theme can occur in a position following the Goal:

\[(3) \]
\[\text{John-ga pen-o Mary-ni ni-hon ageta.} \\
\text{John-Nom pen-Acc Mary-Dat 2.CL gave} \\
\text{’John gave two pens to Mary.’} 
\]

Miyagawa therefore suggests that this indicates the Theme can be base-generated in a position to the right of the Goal and moved to its surface position, stranding the NQ.

Floating quantifier and reciprocal-binding patterns are shown to interact with each other. If an NQ associated with the Theme occurs stranded/floating to the right of the Goal in a Theme > Goal order, this seems to force the Theme to reconstruct to the position of the NQ, and co-reference with the reciprocal is disallowed, as shown in (4). Such a patterning is strong confirmation of the hypothesis that NQs mark the base position of NPs they are associated with, and that a Theme > Goal base order is possible.

\[(4) \]
\[\text{*John-ga gakusei-tachi}_{-i-o} \text{ otagai}_{-i-ni} t_i \text{ futari shookai-shita.} \\
\text{John-Nom student-Pl-Acc each other 2.CL introduced} 
\]

With regard to surface Goal > Theme orders, it is not possible for an NQ associated with the Goal to occur following the Theme, even though a base order Theme > Goal is hypothesized to
be possible. The non-occurrence of Goal$_k$ > Theme > NQ$_k$ sequences is suggested to be due to a more general constraint that quantifier float is only licensed when the argument stranding the NQ is an NP, and not permitted when the moved argument is a PP. As locative Goals are realized as PPs in Japanese, they naturally disallow Q-float, as do all other PP constituents.¹

Relative scope phenomena involving Themes and Goals are also argued to support the claim that both Goal > Theme and Theme > Goal are possible base structures in Japanese. Miyagawa points out that both linear orders Theme > Goal and Goal > Theme may be ambiguous, as illustrated in (5). This may be accounted for if Theme > Goal and Goal > Theme orders may either be base-generated (resulting in scope of the structurally higher leftwards argument over the structurally lower argument to its right), or result from movement of the linearly first argument from a base position which is lower (and to the right of) the second argument. Such movement will allow for scope to be computed either from the surface or base position of the moved Goal/Theme.

Goal > Theme
(5) a. Hanako-ga daremo-ni dareka-o shookai-shita.
   Hanako-Nom everyone-Dat someone-Acc introduced
   ‘Hanako introduced someone to everyone.’
   everyone > someone
   someone > everyone

Theme > Goal
b. Hanako-ga dareka-o daremo-ni shookai-shita.
   Hanako-Nom someone-Acc everyone-Dat introduced
   ‘Hanako introduced someone to everyone.’
   everyone > someone
   someone > everyone

3. Korean
3.1 Discourse-relevant Factors and Word Order

With both Korean and Turkish, the present study decided to first consider the potential effects of definiteness, specificity and animacy on the ordering of Theme and Goal arguments (henceforth referred to as T and G), before investigating binding, scope and Q-float phenomena. Such discourse-related pragmatic factors are often reported to play a role in shaping neutral and preferred surface word orders (as are prosodic factors, for example comparative constituent length). The project therefore wanted to establish the degree to which such properties might be expected to affect surface outputs in the two languages. In line with the general goals of the project, the variables of in/definiteness and animacy were manipulated for both T and G arguments for each of the three verbs under broader consideration.

¹The special case of dative –ni-marked NP recipient-goals is discussed at length in Miyagawa and Tsujioka (2004). Such NP Goals actually do permit Q-float, but are argued to be base-generated in a higher position than locative goals, and never below Theme NPs. The two-goal hypothesis presented in Miyagawa and Tsujioka (2004) will be discussed later on.
With the verb ‘send’ (ponay-ta), the following results were recorded from informants responding to the manipulation of the parameters +/-definite and +/-animate on T/G. First, where T is indefinite and inanimate (e.g. ‘a letter’), and G is definite and animate (e.g. ‘John’), a G>T order was judged to be most natural. Note that this particular combination of properties on T and G arguments is the most common in occurrence, and may influence a perception of Korean as having a general neutral G>T order in ditransitives. With other combinations of properties on T and G, the order T>G was judged to be neutral/most natural in many instances, in particular when T was either specific indefinite or definite. Finally, whenever there was a clustering of definiteness and animacy on T or G, this tended to result in a neutral ordering of this argument before the other argument. Consequently, when there is a fair comparison of the properties of definiteness and animacy in ditransitives, no single ordering of G and T is found to be consistently neutral/most natural with ‘send’, and the neutral ordering of G and T will in each instance be shaped by the relative weighting of definiteness and animacy on T and G. Examples (6) and (7) show that when both G and T are inanimate, a definite argument is likely to precede an indefinite one, and result in either a neutral G>T or T>G order:

(6) John-i ku kos-ulo etten chayk-ul ponayssta.  
    John-nom that place-to some book-acc sent
    ‘John sent some book to that place.’

(7) John-i ku chayk-ul etten kos-ulo ponayssta.  
    John-nom that book-acc some place-to sent
    ‘John sent that book to some place.’

The length of T/G was also found to play a potentially important, over-riding role in constituent ordering, and a long argument is likely to precede a short one, even where this results in an indefinite>definite sequencing:

    John-nom height-nom tall student-acc Mary-dat sent
    ‘John sent Mary a tall student.’

(9) John-i khi-ka khun haksayng-eykey Mary-lul ponayssta.  
    John-nom height-nom tall student-dat Mary-acc sent
    ‘John sent Mary to a tall student.’

With the verb ‘introduce’ (sokay ha-ta), whose two arguments are necessarily animate, it was observed that when there is an imbalance in definiteness between T and G, a definite T/G often precedes an indefinite T/G in neutral word order, hence: T\text{Def} > G\text{Indef} and G\text{Def} > T\text{Indef}. When T and G are both definite or both indefinite, the order T>G was often indicated to be the most neutral order.

Finally, with the verb ‘give’ (cwu-ta), the following patterns were observed. First, when T and G are balanced in animacy (i.e. both animate or both inanimate), G>T is regularly identified as the neutral order of constituents. Second, when T and G differ in animacy, the neutral ordering of T and G was often indicated as being Animate > Inanimate, regardless of differences in definiteness, hence: T\text{Anim} > G\text{Inan} and G\text{Anim} > T\text{Inan}. Third, as with ‘send’, a highly frequent
combination of properties is that T is indefinite and inanimate (e.g. ‘a letter’) and G is definite and animate (e.g. ‘John’), and this results in a neutral ordering of $G_{\text{Def}/\text{Anim}} > T_{\text{Indef}/\text{Inan}}$.

In general then, it is difficult to identify any consistent neutral ordering of T and G in Korean ditransitives which is not a function of differences in animacy and definiteness present in the two arguments. When properties of T and G are balanced, ‘introduce’ seems to show a tendency towards a neutral T>G order, whereas ‘give’ presents the opposite picture, and a more common-neutral G>T ordering. However, both T>G and G>T orders regularly may occur and be judged to be neutral once slight imbalances in the relevant discourse properties are introduced. For the purposes of investigating the structure of ditransitives, the distribution of such properties on T and G needs to be controlled for as best as possible, and it needs to be recognized that appeals to neutral word order as a guide to the structure of ditransitives may have a limited usefulness, and may not be possible in the same way for all ditransitive verbs in Korean.

3.2 Patterns Potentially Bearing on the Underlying Structure of T and G
3.2.1 The Licensing and Interpretation of Reciprocals and Anaphors

Following Miyagawa (1997), patterns of binding phenomena were investigated for their potential value in identifying base structures in Korean ditransitives. The following two questions were considered for each verb, ‘send’, ‘introduce’ and ‘give’.

Question A: Are both of the sequences in (10) possible, where an anaphor/reciprocal present in the second Theme/Goal argument is bound by a referent in the first (using ‘each other’ and ‘self’ to represent Korean anaphoric elements)?

(10) a. \ldots\ldots[\text{Goal} \text{ NP}i]\ldots[\text{Theme} \ldots\text{each other}/\text{self}i\ldots].
    
    b. \ldots\ldots[\text{Theme} \text{ NP}i].[\text{Goal} \ldots\text{each other}/\text{self}i\ldots].

If both (a) and (b) can occur, this may support the assumption that both sequences of T/G can be base-generated (i.e. both T>G and G>T). If either (a) or (b) cannot occur, this may suggest that the relevant surface sequence cannot be base-generated, and that the linearly initial argument has to reconstruct to a lower base position from which it may not bind the anaphor/reciprocal.

Question B: Is it possible for either of the sequences in (11) to occur?

(11) a. \ldots\ldots[\text{Theme} \ldots\text{each other}/\text{self}i\ldots].[\text{Goal} \text{ NP}i]\ldots.
    
    b. \ldots\ldots[\text{Goal} \ldots\text{each other}/\text{self}i\ldots][\text{Theme} \text{ NP}i]\ldots.

If either (a) or (b) are well-formed, this would provide positive evidence that the argument containing the anaphor can be base-generated in a lower position (to which it would reconstruct for binding by the co-referential NP).

RESUTLS FOR QUESTION A. Both orders in (10) were found to be acceptable for all three verbs, supporting the possibility that T and G can be base-generated in either order for all three verbs. (12) below is a representative illustration of these possibilities:
by mistake, Bill-nom John and Mary-Dat each other’s photos-Acc sent
‘By mistake, Bill sent John and Mary each other’s photographs.’

(13) Silswulo Bill-i [John-kwa Mary]i-lul [selo-uiu cip]-ey ponayssta. T > G
by mistake, Bill-nom John and Mary-Acc each other’s house-Dat sent
‘By mistake, Bill sent John and Mary to each other’s houses.’

RESULTS FOR QUESTION B. Neither putative base order (T>G and G>T) with ‘send’, ‘introduce’ and ‘give’ seems to allow easy conversion into a sequence in which the reciprocal precedes the antecedent NP. However, it is significant to note that neither order was judged to be obviously better or worse than the other. This may therefore further support the hypothesis that both G>T and T>G base orders can be equally well projected by all three verb types. Examples (14) and (15) illustrate this common pattern with the verb ‘introduce’. It can also be noted that constituents containing reciprocals do not allow topicalization over the subject, hence perhaps seem to resist movement in general, as shown in (16) and (17).

John-nom each other’s teachers-dat Mary and Jane-acc introduced

John-nom each other’s teachers-acc Mary and Jane-dat introduced

each other’s teachers-acc John-nom Mary and Jane-dat introduced

each other’s teachers-dat John-nom Mary and Jane-acc introduced

3.2.2 Patterns with Floating Quantifiers

A numeral + classifier pair (NQ) can be separated from the NP it quantifies if the NP is a Theme. This gives rise to the sequencing: Theme NP, > Goal > NQ, and supports the hypothesis that a surface T>G order may be derived from an underlying G>T sequence via movement of the Theme NP, stranding the numeral and classifier in the base position, as in Japanese.

(18) John-i pen-ul Mary-eykey twu kay cwuessta.
John-nom pen-acc Mary-dat two-CL gave
‘John gave two pens to Mary.’

When the Theme relates to an NQ following the Goal, it seems to have to reconstruct to this position. (19) below is ungrammatical because reconstruction forces the Theme back to a lower

---

2 Use of a non-reciprocal anaphor results in an even lower degree of acceptability. In fact, the linear sequencing of non-reciprocal anaphors before their antecedents was judged unacceptable by all speakers for all configurations with all three verbs, and also when the argument containing the anaphor was in pre-subject topic position.
base position from which it cannot c-command the Goal and bind the reciprocal NP, similar to Japanese example (4):

(19) *John-i haksayng-tul ul selo-eykey twu myeng sokayhayssta.
    John-nom student-pl-acc each other-dat two-CL introduced
    Intended: ‘John introduced two students to each other.’

Dative-marked NPs which represent Goals cannot be separated from NQs, however, again as in Japanese. In (20), the numeral-classifier sequence ‘twu myeng’ cannot occupy a position following the Theme:

(20) *John-i haksayng-eykey pen-ul twu myeng cwuessta.
    John-nom student-dat pen-acc two-CL gave

In this patterning, dative-marked Goals behave like all other PPs in Korean in disallowing quantifier float.

    John-nom student-to two-CL package-acc sent
(22) *John-i hakkyo-ey twu kes sopo-lul ponayssta.
    John-nom school-to two-CL package-acc sent

Patterns with floating quantifiers consequently support the assumption that T>G orders may be derived from underlying G>T structures, but are uninformative with regard to the possibility that G>T sequences can be derived from underlying T>G structures. This possibility cannot be tested for properly with dative-marked Goals, as the ban on Q-float from PPs rules out all attempted separation of Goal and NQ when dative case occurs. One other case instantiation of ditransitive structures in Korean does allow for the testing of Q-float with Goals, however. As noted in Jung and Miyagawa (2004), certain verbs in Korean (e.g. ‘give’ cwu-ta, and ‘teach’ karuchi-ta) allow for a second case-marking pattern, and the Goals of these verbs may occur either with dative case or with accusative case. Significantly, when Goals occur with accusative case, they do permit Q-float, and when the Goal precedes the Theme, it is possible for a numeral-classifier pair associated with the Goal to occur following the Theme, resulting in the pattern in (23):

Goal NP-acc > Theme > NQi (give)

(23) John-i haksayng-ul chayk-ul twu myeng cwuessta.
    John-nom student-acc book-acc 2-CL gave
    ‘John gave books to two students.’

The acceptability of examples such as (23) supports the possibility that both T>G and G>T may be generated as base structures in Korean (at very least with verbs such as ‘give’ and ‘teach’).
3.2.3 Patterns with Quantifiers and Relative Scope

When both Theme and Goal are quantifier phrases/QPs, it might be anticipated that relative scope phenomena would provide information about the underlying structure of ditransitives in Korean, in a way similar to Japanese (as discussed in Hoji 1988, Miyagawa 1997, and Miyagawa and Tsujioka 2004). However, relative quantifier scope among (at least) Theme and Goal appears to be strongly driven by surface linear order in Korean. When the interaction of universally-quantified NPs (‘\(\forall_{NP}\)’) and existentially-quantified NPs (‘\(\exists_{NP}\)’) is considered, linear sequences of (a) \(\forall_{NP} \ldots \exists_{NP}\) and (b) \(\exists_{NP} \ldots \forall_{NP}\) consistently result in distinct types of interpretations, regardless of the instantiation of the \(\forall_{NP}\) and \(\exists_{NP}\) as either Theme or Goal. The generalization which strongly governs such sequences is given in (24).

(24) Linear Scope Patterns
a) When an existentially-quantified T/G precedes a universally-quantified T/G, the former necessarily takes scope over the latter.
   Linear \(\exists_{NP} \succ \forall_{NP}\) \(\Rightarrow\) unambiguous ‘linear scope’: \(\exists_{NP} \succ \forall_{NP}\)
b) When a universally-quantified T/G precedes an existentially-quantified T/G, either the former takes scope over the latter, or the latter takes inverse scope over the former.
   Linear \(\forall_{NP} \succ \exists_{NP}\) \(\Rightarrow\) ambiguous scopal relation, (i) or (ii):
   (a) ‘linear scope’: \(\forall_{NP} \succ \exists_{NP}\)
   (b) inverse scope: \(\exists_{NP} \succ \forall_{NP}\)

These generalizations are found to hold in a fully parallel way with all three ditransitive verbs: ‘send’, ‘introduce’, and ‘give’ (ponay-ta, sokay ha-ta, cwu-ta). Examples (25) – (28) are illustrations of the interpretations available with Theme and Goal occurring as different QP types with the verb ‘send’ (ponay-ta), and accurately represent the interpretations available with ‘introduce’ and ‘give’ when the same variation of T and G as \(\exists_{NP}\) and \(\forall_{NP}\) is considered.

   John-nom everybody-dat something-acc sent
   ‘John sent everybody something.’
   Linear \(\forall_{NP}\) (Goal) \(\succ\) \(\exists_{NP}\) (Theme) \(\Rightarrow\) scope relation:
   either: \(\forall_{NP} \succ \exists_{NP}\)
   or: \(\exists_{NP} \succ \forall_{NP}\)

   John-nom something-acc everybody-dat sent
   ‘John sent everybody something.’
   Linear \(\exists_{NP}\) (Theme) \(\succ\) \(\forall_{NP}\) (Goal) \(\Rightarrow\) scope relation:
   only: \(\exists_{NP} \succ \forall_{NP}\)
Unlike in Japanese, a consideration of the relative scope patterns of Themes and Goals in Korean does NOT naturally lead to any conclusions about the underlying structure of ditransitives, and seems to be computed on the basis of surface linear order rather than argument type and the possibilities of reconstruction to underlying base positions. For example, a universally-quantified NP can never take scope over an existentially-quantified NP which linearly precedes it, no matter whether the former is a Theme or a Goal. If scope could be computed from a reconstructed base position and not on the basis of surface linear ordering, it might be expected that at least one of the orders (a) $\forall_{\text{NP}}$ (Theme) $\rightarrow$ $\exists_{\text{NP}}$ (Goal), (b) $\forall_{\text{NP}}$ (Goal) $\rightarrow$ $\exists_{\text{NP}}$ (Theme) would allow for the $\forall_{\text{NP}}$ to take reconstructed scope in a base position lower than the other Theme argument. This does not seem to be possible. Relative scope relations among Theme and Goal consequently do not seem to provide information about possible underlying structures in ditransitives in Korean, and do not favor any theory of the base positions of Theme and Goal.

3.2.4 Overt ‘Two Goal’ Structures

Miyagawa and Tsujioka (2004) point out that verbs such as ‘send’ (okuru) in Japanese permit two Goal arguments to occur overtly, one encoding a location towards which the Theme is transferred, and a second Goal indicating the Recipient of the act of transfer. The former Locative Goal (henceforth referred to as L-Goal) is marked with –e or sometimes –ni, and the Recipient Goal (R-Goal) is (always) marked with –ni, as illustrated in (29):

\[(29) \text{Taroo-Nom Hanako-Dat Tokyo-to package-Acc sent} \]

‘Taroo sent a package to Hanako in/to Tokyo.’

In Korean, it also possible and not unnatural for two overt Goals to occur.\(^4\) The R-Goal is

\(^3\) Note that Baek and Lee (2004) suggest that structures of the type $\forall_{\text{NP}}$ (Theme) $\rightarrow$ $\exists_{\text{NP}}$ (Goal)) are unambiguous, only allowing for the scope relation Theme $\rightarrow$ Goal. However, the range of informants consulted in the present study all found sequences such as (28) ambiguous, with all three verbs.

\(^4\) Unlike English, where two Goal structures are often quite awkward:

(i) 'John sent Mary the packet to Fresno.'
marked with –eykey, and the L-Goal is marked with either –ey or –lo. When both an R-Goal and an L-Goal co-occur, there seems to be a preference for the L-Goal to be marked with –lo. When both Goals are overt, they may occur in either linear order before the Theme:

(i) R-Goal > L-Goal > Theme (example 30)
(ii) L-Goal > R-Goal < Theme (example 31)

    John-nom Mary-dat Seoul-to package-acc sent
    ‘John sent a package to Mary to Seoul.’

    John-nom Seoul-to Mary-dat package-acc sent
    ‘John sent a package to Mary to Seoul.’

In this patterning, Korean seems to be less restrictive than Japanese, where a more rigid ordering is imposed and the R-Goal must precede the L-Goal. Compare (29) with (32) below:

(32) *Taroo-ga Tokyo-ni/-e Hanako-ni nimotsu-o okutta.
    Taroo-Nom Tokyo-to Hanako-Dat package-Acc sent
    Intended: ‘Taroo sent a package to Hanako in/to Tokyo.’

In Japanese, Miyagawa and Tsujioka (2004) show that there are interesting differences in relative scope relations with a QP-Theme when the Recipient/Locative-nature of a Goal is manipulated. When an R-Goal precedes the Theme and both are QPs, there is unambiguous scope of the Goal over the Theme, as in (33):

(33) Taroo-ga dareka-ni dono-nimotsu-mo okutta.
    Taroo-Nom someone-Dat every-package-even sent
    ‘Taroo sent every package to someone.’ (Hoji 1985)
    Only: Goal > Theme

However, when an L-Goal precedes a Theme, the structure is ambiguous, and either the Goal takes scope over the Theme, or the Theme can take scope over the Goal:

(34) Taroo-ga dokoka-ni dono-nimotsu-mo okutta.
    Taroo-Nom some place-to every-package-even sent
    ‘Taroo sent every package to some place.’
    EITHER: Goal > Theme
    OR: Theme > Goal

Miyagawa and Tsujioka (2004) attribute the different patterns to a significant difference in the base positions of R-Goals and L-Goals. The former are suggested to be ALWAYS base-generated in a position structurally higher than both L-Goal and Theme. Their surface position can therefore never result from movement from a base position below the Theme (and R-Goal > Theme sequences are consequently unambiguous, with no reconstructed scope position available for the R-Goal below the Theme). L-Goals, it is suggested, can be base-generated EITHER
structurally above or below the Theme, as outlined in section 2. This allows for a surface sequence of L-Goal > Theme to potentially be derived by movement of the Goal from a base position c-commanded by the Theme, and results in the scopal ambiguity found between L-Goal and Theme when the former precedes the latter. Relative scope phenomena therefore seem to offer very useful insights into the different positions occupied by R-Goals and L-Goals in Japanese, and distinguish these two types of argument in a principled and revealing way.

Korean, it has already been noted, appears to operate in a rather different way from Japanese in the computation of Theme/Goal relative scope, and scopal relations seem result from the surface linear order of QPs, not any different base position which movement might have occurred from. When two goal structures are considered, relative scope phenomena pattern in an expected way, and seem to follow the linear scope generalizations noted earlier in (24). Specifically, when the Theme and one of the two Goals are both QPs, their relative scope is consistently dictated by (24), as illustrated in (35) – (38).

Linear sequence: R-Goal \( \exists \) L-Goal \( \forall \) Theme

(35) Kim kyoswu-ka etten haksayng-eykey USC email-lo motwun (allim) mail-ul ponayssta.
Prof. Kim-nom some student-dat USC email-to every notice-acc sent

‘Prof. Kim sent some student every notice to USC email.’

Scope: \( \exists_{\text{NP}} \) (R-Goal) \( \forall_{\text{NP}} \) (Theme)

Linear sequence: R-Goal \( \forall \) L-Goal \( \exists \) Theme

(36) Kim kyoswu-ka motun haksayng-eykey USC email-lo etten mail-ul ponayssta.
Prof. Kim-nom every student-dat USC email-to some notice-acc sent

‘Prof. Kim sent every student some notice to USC email.’

Scope: \( \forall_{\text{NP}} \) (R-Goal) \( \exists_{\text{NP}} \) (Theme)
\( \exists_{\text{NP}} \) (Theme) \( \forall_{\text{NP}} \) (R-Goal)

Linear sequence: R-Goal > L-Goal \( \exists \) Theme

(37) Kim kyoswu-ka John-eykey etten USC account-lo motun mail-ul ponayssta.
Prof. Kim John-dat some USC account-to every-notice-acc sent

‘Prof. Kim sent John every notice to some USC account.’

Scope: \( \exists_{\text{NP}} \) (L-Goal) \( \forall_{\text{NP}} \) (Theme)

Linear sequence: R-Goal > L-Goal \( \forall \) Theme

(38) Kim kyoswu-ka John-eykey motun USC account-lo etten mail-ul ponayssta.
Prof. Kim John-dat every USC account-to some-notice-acc sent

‘Prof. Kim sent John some notice to every USC account.’

Scope: \( \forall_{\text{NP}} \) (L-Goal) \( \exists_{\text{NP}} \) (Theme)
\( \exists_{\text{NP}} \) (Theme) \( \forall_{\text{NP}} \) (L-Goal)
If the L-Goal precedes the R-Goal, and the Theme and one of the Goals are QPs, the patterns are again as expected and follow the generalizations in (24).

Considering scopal relations between the R-Goal and L-Goal when both of these are QPs and occur in the sequencing: R-Goal > L-Goal, the interpretations available are also as expected from (24):

Linear sequence: R-Goal-∀ > L-Goal-∃ > Theme

(39) Kim kyoswu-ka motun haksayng-eykey etten email account-lo
    Prof. Kim-i every-student-dat some account-to
    ku message-lul ponayssta.
    the-message-acc sent
‘Prof. Kim sent every student the message to some email account.’
Scope: ∀_NP (R-Goal) > ∃_NP (L-Goal)
∃_NP (L-Goal) > ∀_NP (R-Goal)

Linear sequence: R-Goal-∃ > L-Goal-∀ > Theme

(40) Kim kyoswu-ka etten haksayng-eykey motun USC account-lo
    Prof. Kim some-student-dat every USC account-to
    ku message-lul ponayssta.
    the-message-acc sent
‘Prof. Kim sent some student the message to every USC email account.’
Scope: ∃_NP (R-Goal) > ∀_NP (L-Goal)

However, when the L-Goal precedes the R-Goal, it was found that there are curious exceptions to the expected patterning.

Linear sequence: L-Goal-∀ > R-Goal-∃ > Theme

(41) Kim kyoswu-ka motun USC account-lo etten haksayng-eykey
    Prof. Kim every USC account-to some student-dat
    ku message-lul ponayssta.
    the-message-acc sent
‘Prof. Kim sent some student the message to every USC account.
Scope: ∃_NP (R-Goal) > ∀_NP (L-Goal)

Linear sequence: L-Goal-∃ > R-Goal-∀ > Theme

(42) Kim kyoswu-ka etten USC account-lo motun haksayng-eykey
    Prof. Kim some USC account-to every student-dat
    ku message-lul ponayssta.
    the-message-acc sent
‘Prof. Kim sent every student the message to some USC account.’
Scope: ∃_NP (R-Goal) > ∀_NP (L-Goal)
∀_NP (R-Goal) > ∃_NP (L-Goal)
In (41), it is expected that the $\forall_{NP} > \exists_{NP}$ linear sequence should be ambiguous, as $\forall_{NP} > \exists_{NP}$ sequences regularly allow for two scopal interpretations, as noted in (24). However, (41) does not permit the universally-quantified L-Goal to take scope over the existentially-quantified R-Goal. In (42), it is expected that there should be one scopal interpretation only, and that this should be $\exists_{NP} > \forall_{NP}$. But, (42) is actually ambiguous and allows for both $\exists_{NP} > \forall_{NP}$ and an inverse scope reading $\forall_{NP} > \exists_{NP}$. This is again quite unexpected, as elsewhere linear sequences of a universally-quantified NP following an existentially-quantified NP do not allow for the former to take scope over the latter. L-Goal > R-Goal sequences like (41) and (42) therefore show that there may be regular exceptions to the otherwise very uniform linear scopal patterning of QPs in Korean, which may possibly call into question whether a purely linear approach to scope is necessarily (always) correct for the language. One interesting interpretation of the patterns in (41) and (42), which would allow their scopal relations to be partially reconciled with (24) is as follows. It can be observed that the unexpected scopal relations licensed in both (41) and (42) would naturally follow the linear principles in (24) if the L-Goal were to be assumed to undergo movement to its surface position and be subject to obligatory reconstruction to a position following the R-Goal. In other words, the scopal interpretations in (41) and (42) seem to be exactly those of the same QPs in a linear sequence R-Goal > L-Goal in both instances. If a movement analysis of the L-Goal over the R-Goal is assumed, so as to be able to maintain the uniform application of (24), the hypothetical movement of the L-Goal would have the important property that it does not feed into interpretative rules (such as scope resolution), and might therefore seem to qualify as an occurrence of movement at PF, invisible to the syntactic component.

Further consequences of the patterns discussed here and a PF-movement approach will be examined in a separate work. For the moment, two remarks can be made. First, it can be noted that the linear scope principles in (24) can be maintained as regular in their application, but there may be surface orders created by PF-movement which are not the proper linear input to (24). Second, the patterns in (41) and (42) and their analysis as necessarily resulting from movement of the L-Goal seem to suggest that there is a single underlying order for L-Goal and R-Goal which is: R-Goal > L-Goal.

Having investigated a range of different phenomena bearing on the structure of Korean ditransitives, we will now move on to consider Turkish, postponing a summary of the Korean patterns until the end of the paper.

4. Turkish
4.1 Discourse-relevant Factors and Word Order

In the investigation of ditransitives in Turkish, the same procedures adopted with Korean were followed. The first step in this process was an attempt to clarify what effects the properties of definiteness and animacy might have on the ordering of Theme and Goal in neutral word order. Accordingly, all possible combinations of the values +/-definite and +/-animate on T and G were considered, and the presence/absence of Accusative case on the Theme was also controlled for as an extra factor in each combination. Informants were asked to identify the neutral ordering of T and G in each instance.

With all three verbs considered, göndermek ‘send’, tanıtmek ‘introduce’, and vermek ‘give’, the same results were found. The most crucial property regulating the neutral relative
positioning of Theme and Goal was consistently found to be the occurrence (or absence) of accusative case on the Theme. For all three verbs, the patterning schematized in (43) was regularly identified as the neutral ordering of Theme and Goal. Other orders were noted to be possible, but were associated with special emphasis on the pre-verbal constituent. ‘Theme-∅’ indicates an object NP with no case-marking.

(43) Neutral ordering of Theme and Goal in Turkish ditransitives

…Theme-\text{Acc} > \text{Goal} > \text{Theme-∅} \ V_{(send/introduce/give)}

Hence if the Theme is marked with Accusative case and interpreted as either a specific indefinite or a definite NP, it is regularly positioned before the Goal in neutral word order, for the most part regardless of other factors such as animacy and definiteness. If it is not marked with Accusative case, it was always positioned following the Goal. This bears out the observation in Kornfilt (2003:140) that ‘...native speakers tend to report that oblique objects have to follow, rather than precede, overtly case-marked structural objects in unmarked utterances.’ Illustrative examples are provided below.

‘send’ \quad G > T_∅

(44) Ahmet kütüphane-ye/ bir muhabir-e bir mektub gönder-di
    Ahmet library-dat a reporter-dat a letter send-past
    ‘Ahmet sent a letter to the library.’

‘send’ \quad T_-\text{Acc} > G

    Ahmet a letter-acc library-dat a reporter-dat send-past
    ‘Ahmet sent a letter to the library.’

‘introduce’ \quad G > T_-∅

    Ahmet Japan a student-dat China a student introduced
    ‘Ahmet introduced a Chinese student to a Japanese student.’

‘introduce’ \quad T_-\text{Acc} > G

(47) Ahmet Çinli bir öğrenci-yi Japon bir öğrenci-ye tanıtırdı.
    Ahmet China a student-acc Japan a student-dat introduced
    ‘Ahmet introduced a Chinese student to a Japanese student.’

‘give’ \quad G > T_-∅

(48) İmparator cariyesi-ne bir bebek verdi
    emperor concubine-dat a baby gave
    ‘The emperor gave a baby to the concubine.’
‘give’ T-Acc > G

(49) İmparator bir bebeği cariyesine verdi.
   emperor a baby-acc concubine-dat gave
   ‘The emperor gave a baby to the concubine.’

The only exception to the above generalizations was found to be in instances where the Goal was both definite and animate and the Theme was indefinite and inanimate. In such configurations, even if the Theme bore Accusative case, informants indicated that the neutral ordering of Theme/Goal arguments was felt to be: Goal > Theme:

G_{Def/Anim} > T_{Indef/Inan/Acc}

(50) Ali Ahmet-e adam-a bir mektub-u gönderdi.
   Ali Ahmet-dat/man-dat a letter-Acc sent
   ‘Ali sent Ahmet/the man a letter.’

4.2 Patterns Potentially Bearing on the Underlying Structure of T and G

As with Korean, the attempt was made to check the kinds of patterns considered by Miyagawa (1997) in Japanese, which have the potential to provide very useful insights into the structure of ditransitives. However, in Turkish, one of the three main diagnostics of underlying structure used to probe Japanese is unavailable for use: Turkish does not permit quantifier float. Consequently, the results of the study of Turkish reported here concern only the other two patterns investigated in Japanese and Korean: the behavior of anaphors in ditransitives, and relative scope phenomena.

4.2.1 The Licensing and Interpretation of Reciprocals and Anaphors

The two questions (A and B) described in section 3.2.1 on Korean were applied to data in Turkish. As noted in 3.2.1, Question A asks whether an anaphor/reciprocal present in the second Theme/Goal argument in structures (10a) and (10b) can be bound by a referent in the first.

(10) a. ………[Goal NP]…. [Theme ..each other/self,..]..
   b. ………[Theme NP]…. [Goal ..each other/self,..]..

In Turkish, responses to the data constructed to investigate this question showed differences which relate to whether the anaphor/reciprocal present in the second Theme/Goal is the head noun of this constituent, or a possessor. A first general observation was that both orders in (10a/b) were judged to be acceptable when the anaphor/reciprocal occurred as the possessor of some other nominal head of the Theme/Goal, as illustrated for all three verbs in (51) – (53):

‘send’

(51) Ali-ye kendi yastık-ı-nı gönder-di-m.
   Ali-dat self pillow-3sg-acc send-past-1sg
   ‘I sent Ali his own pillow.'
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(52) Ali-yi kendi evi-ne gönder-di-m. T > G = 10b
Ali-acc self house-dat send-past-1sg
‘I sent Ali to his own house.’

‘introduce’

(53) Ali [John ve Mary-e] [birbirler-i-nin arkadaş- lar-i-nı] tanı- tur-di G > T = 10a
Ali John and Mary-dat each other-poss-gen friend-plu-poss-acc meet-caus-past
‘Ali introduced John and Mary to each other’s friends.’

(54) Ali [John ve Mary-i] [birbirleri-nin arkada- lar-ı-nı] tanı-tur-di. T > G = 10b
Ali John and Mary-acc each other’s friend-plu-poss-dat introduced
Ali introduced John and Mary to each other’s friends.’

‘give’

(55) Ali [Ayşe ve Mehmet-e] [birbirlerinin fotoğraflarını] verdi. G > T = 10a
Ali Ayşe ve Mehmet-dat each other-s photographs-acc gave
‘Ali gave Ayşe and Mehmet photographs of each other.’

(56) Ali [Ayşe ve Mehmet-i] [birbirleri-nin ebeveynleri-ne] verdi. T > G = 10b
Ali Ayşe ve Mehmet-acc each other’s photographs-dat gave
‘Ali gave Ayşe and Mehmet photographs of each other.’

However, when the anaphor/reciprocal was the head noun of the Theme/Goal, there was a contrast between structures (10a) and (10b). The former configuration was judged to be degraded in contrast with the latter, which was felt to be fully acceptable. This is illustrated in (57) – (60) for ‘introduce’ and ‘give’. It was not possible to create semantically plausible examples to test ‘send’ in the same way:

‘introduce’

(57) Ali [Ayşe ve Mehmet-i] parti-de birbirleri-ne tanış-tur-di T > G = 10b
Ali-nom Ayşe ve Mehmet-acc party-loc each other-dat know-recip-caus-past
‘Ali introduced Ayşe and Mehmet to each other at the party.’

Ali-nom Ayşe and Mehmet-dat party-loc each other-acc know-recip-caus-past
‘Ali introduced Ayşe and Mehmet to each other at the party.”

‘give’

(59) Ali [Ayşe ve Mehmet-i] birbirleri-ne ver-di. T > G = 10b
Ali-nom Ayşe and Mehmet-acc each other-dat give-past
‘Ali gave Ayşe and Mehmet to each other.’

(60) ?Ali [Ayşe ve Mehmet]-e birbirleri-ni ver-di. ?G > T = 10a
Ali-nom Ayşe and Mehmet-dat each other-acc give-past
‘Ali gave Ayşe and Mehmet to each other.’
This kind of asymmetry might be taken to suggest that $G > T$ surface orders result from an underlying $T > G$ sequence in which the Theme c-commands the base position of the Goal and induces a Chain Condition effect (Rizzi 1986). As surface $T > G$ sequences do not show any comparable unacceptability, it might be assumed that such linear sequences do not necessarily result from any movement and can be base-generated with the Theme c-commanding the Goal. When an anaphor occurs as the possessor of the Theme/Goal in the $G > T$ sequences (51) and (53), no Chain Condition effect is expected to occur, as the possessor will not c-command any position outside the Theme/Goal in which it occurs.

With regard to Question B, whether the elements in structures (10a) and (10b) can occur in the inverse order to that in (10a/b), it was found that there was considerable resistance to all sequences in which anaphors/reciprocals linearly preceded their binders, as in Korean (and Japanese too, Miyagawa and Tsujioka 2004), and such configurations were regularly judged to be unacceptable, as illustrated in (61) and (62). It was therefore not possible to reach any conclusions about the structures underlying ditransitives from the Question B-type data and responses. As with Korean, both kinds of sequence (10a) and (10b) were felt to be equally ill-formed.

(61) *Ali yanlışlıkla [birbirler-i-nin giysi-ler-i-ni] [John ve Mary-e] gönder-di
      Ali by mistake each other’s clothes-Acc John and Mary-acc sent
      Intended: ‘By mistake, Ali sent John and Mary each other’s clothes.’

(62) *Ali yanlışlıkla [birbirlerinin evleri-ne] [John ve Mary-i] gönderdi.
      Ali by mistake each other’s houses-dat John and Mary-acc sent
      Intended: ‘By mistake, Ali sent John and Mary to each other’s houses.’

4.2.2 Patterns with Quantifiers and Relative Scope

The relative scope of QPs in subject and object positions in Turkish has been characterized by Meltem Kelepir (2001) as following a set of linear order constraints which are actually fully parallel to the generalizations about scope between Themes and Goals in Korean ditransitives, described in (24). When an existentially-quantified subject/object NP precedes a universally-quantified subject/object NP, this results in unambiguous scope of the former over the latter, and when a universally-quantified subject/object NP precedes an existentially-quantified subject/object NP, there are two scope readings available (sometimes with different strengths). Either the universally-quantified subject/object NP can take scope over the existentially-quantified subject/object NP, or the latter can take wide scope. This is summarized in (63).

(63) Linear Scope Patterns in Turkish
      When $\exists_{-NP}$ precedes $\forall_{-NP}$ $\Rightarrow$ unambiguous: linear scope: $\exists_{-NP} > \forall_{-NP}$
      When $\forall_{-NP}$ precedes $\exists_{-NP}$ $\Rightarrow$ ambiguous: (a) linear scope: $\forall_{-NP} > \exists_{-NP}$
      (b) inverse scope: $\exists_{-NP} > \forall_{-NP}$

When the interactional patterning of Theme and Goal in ditransitives was considered, the relative scope of Theme and Goals QPs was found to follow the linear generalizations in (63) (and
Korean (24)), and to be fully predictable from the linear sequencing of existentially- and universally-quantified NPs, regardless of the way this linear sequence corresponded to argument type. Hence manipulation of the Theme/Goal role of the linearly-first and second QP did not affect the interpretations available in any instance. This is illustrated in examples (64) – (71), for göndermek ‘send’ and tanıtmek ‘introduce’. Entirely parallel results were recorded for vermek ‘give’. As with Korean therefore (with the exception of L-Goal > R-Goal sequences), and arguably unlike Japanese, Theme/Goal relative scope relations do NOT provide information about the underlying structures which may be projected in ditransitives in Turkish, and do not support any particular hypothesis of the base positions of Theme and Goal.

**göndermek ‘send’**

(64) Ali bir-i-ne her kitab-ı gönder-di.
    Ali-nom someone-3s-dat every book-acc sent
    ‘Ali sent every book to someone.’
    Linear $\exists_{NP}$ (Goal) > $\forall_{NP}$ (Theme) $\Rightarrow$ scope relation:
    only: $\exists_{NP}$ > $\forall_{NP}$

(65) Ali her kitab-ı bir-i-ne gönder-di
    Ali-nom every book-acc someone-3s-dat sent
    ‘Ali sent every book to someone.’
    Linear $\forall_{NP}$ (Theme) > $\exists_{NP}$ (Goal) $\Rightarrow$ scope relation:
    either: $\exists_{NP}$ > $\forall_{NP}$
    or: $\forall_{NP}$ > $\exists_{NP}$

(66) Prof Ali her öğrenc-iye bir makale gönderdi.
    Prof. Ali every student-dat one paper sent
    ‘Prof. Ali sent some paper to every student.’
    Linear $\forall_{NP}$ (Goal) > $\exists_{NP}$ (Theme) $\Rightarrow$ scope relation:
    either: $\exists_{NP}$ > $\forall_{NP}$
    or: $\forall_{NP}$ > $\exists_{NP}$

(67) Prof Ali bir makale-yi her öğrenc-iye gönderdi.
    Prof. Ali one paper-acc every student-dat sent
    ‘Prof. Ali sent some paper to every student.’
    Linear $\exists_{NP}$ (Theme) > $\forall_{NP}$ (Goal) $\Rightarrow$ scope relation:
    only: $\exists_{NP}$ > $\forall_{NP}$

tañtmek ‘introduce’

    Ali-nom everyone-dat someone-acc introduced
    ‘Ali introduced someone to everyone.’
    Linear $\forall_{NP}$ (Goal) > $\exists_{NP}$ (Theme) $\Rightarrow$ scope relation:
    either: $\exists_{NP}$ > $\forall_{NP}$
    or: $\forall_{NP}$ > $\exists_{NP}$
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(69) Ali bir-i-ni herkes-e tan-ṣ-tr-dı.
Ali-nom someone-3s-acc everyone-dat introduced
‘Ali introduced someone to everyone.’

Linear \( \exists_{NP} \) (Theme) > \( \forall_{NP} \) (Goal) ➔ scope relation:
only: \( \exists_{NP} > \forall_{NP} \)

(70) Ali bir professor-e her öğrenci-yi tanıtırdı.
Ali one professor-dat every student-acc introduced
‘Ali introduced every student to some professor.’

Linear \( \exists_{NP} \) (Goal) > \( \forall_{NP} \) (Theme) ➔ scope relation:
only: \( \exists_{NP} > \forall_{NP} \)

(71) Ali her öğrenci-yi bazı profesörler-e tanıtırdı.
Ali every student-acc some professor-dat introduced
‘Ali introduced every student to some professor.’

Linear \( \forall_{NP} \) (Theme) > \( \exists_{NP} \) (Goal) ➔ scope relation:
either: \( \exists_{NP} > \forall_{NP} \)
or: \( \forall_{NP} > \exists_{NP} \)

4.2.3 Overt ‘Two Goal’ Structures

Finally, the investigation of Turkish considered whether the kinds of two goal structures possible in Japanese and Korean might also occur in Turkish and allow for possible insights into the extended Theme-Goal structuring of ditransitives. The judgement of informants was, however, that it is NOT possible for two overt Goals to occur naturally in Turkish, unlike Korean and Japanese. As indicated in (72) - (74) below, two goal structures were felt to be clearly degraded and not acceptable, however the R-Goal and L-Goal were ordered relative to each other and the Theme. Consequently, two goal structures seem to be unavailable as a mechanism to probe the structure of Turkish ditransitives further.⁵

R-Goal > L-Goal

(72) ?Ali Ayşe-ye İstanbul-a paket-i gönder-di
Ali-nom Ayşe-dat İstanbul-dat packet-acc send-past
Intended: ‘Ali sent a package to Ayşe to Istanbul.’

The inability of both a recipient and a locative goal to occur overtly together in a single clause might perhaps be attributable to case reasons, as both recipient and a locative goals are marked with the same dative case. However, although two dative-marked NPs cannot co-occur in a two goal structure, more than one dative-marked NP can occur in causative structures, so it is not fully clear whether case reasons should be invoked as an explanation of the unacceptability of (72-74):

(i) Ali Ayşe-ye Mehmet-e kitab-ı gönder-t-ti
“Ali had Ayşe to send the book to Mehmet.”

⁵ The inability of both a recipient and a locative goal to occur overtly together in a single clause might perhaps be attributable to case reasons, as both recipient and a locative goals are marked with the same dative case. However, although two dative-marked NPs cannot co-occur in a two goal structure, more than one dative-marked NP can occur in causative structures, so it is not fully clear whether case reasons should be invoked as an explanation of the unacceptability of (72-74):
5. Summary of the Investigation of Korean and Turkish

The aim of this investigation of Korean and Turkish was to apply various diagnostic tests developed in studies of Japanese (in Miyagawa 1997 and Miyagawa and Tsujioka 2004) as a way to establish basic, preliminary information about ditransitives in Korean and Turkish, and lay the foundations for further comparative studies with Japanese. We also considered the issue of whether there may be a general neutral word order in ditransitive structures in the two languages.

With regard to Turkish, the study confirmed that the determination of neutral ordering of the Goal and Theme is strongly driven by the presence or absence of accusative case on the latter, and less obviously dictated by other pragmatic factors such as animacy and definiteness. Due to this important role of accusative case, neutral word orders are not necessarily a reflection of the underlying base positions and sequencing of Theme and Goal arguments with any of the three verbs examined. With tests involving anaphors/reciprocals and binding, the patterns found with ‘give’ and ‘introduce’ suggested that a single base may occur with these verbs, T > G, and that surface G > T sequences may be derived by movement. This could not be further confirmed by other diagnostics used in Japanese, however, such as floating quantifier patterns and relative quantifier scope, as the former are not licensed to occur in Turkish, and the latter property is regularly a function of linear order and does not provide useful information about underlying structures. Conclusions about the underlying hierarchical organisation of Theme and Goal in Turkish consequently remain rather tentative at this point.

Concerning Korean, it was first noted that the varying influence of definiteness and animacy on non-focused orders of Theme and Goal indicates that the idea of neutral word order is of limited usefulness in determining the base structures of ditransitives, and where identifiable in certain circumstances, may be different for different verbs. When other syntactic tests were applied to Korean, both binding patterns and the distribution of floating quantifiers provided evidence in favour of the conclusion that two different base structures may be possible, as has been argued by Miyagawa (1997) for Japanese: T > G and G > T. Relative scope phenomena were found to be generally constrained by linear rules, as in Turkish, and hence less useful for the investigation of underlying structures, but did produce interesting results with regard to two goal structures, and suggest that R-Goals are always projected higher in the base syntactic structure than L-Goals. In the future continuation of the present project initiated on Turkish and Korean, these two goal structures will be a primary focus of attention, as will the extended patterns of accusative-marked Goals in Korean. Both of these aspects of the patterning of ditransitives in Korean have the potential to lead to useful further insights into argument structure in ditransitives and the interaction of this structure with movement and the licensing of case.
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