

Removing Accusative Marked Object from Verbal Root: A Case of Motion Verb in Japanese

The aims of this paper is to show that *o*-marked NPs, which introduces path or situation with motion verbs, are arguments, not adjuncts. Moreover, this paper discusses the way of introducing argument and claims that the internal arguments are not introduced by verb, rather it is introduced as an external argument of function heads (cf, Wood 2014, Oseki 2015, Wood and Marantz 2017 among others).

In most languages motion verbs like “walk” or “run” are intransitive and in Japanese they have been believed to be so. Thus, *o*-marked nominal appearing with motion verbs as in (1) has been analyzed as an adjunct/adverb which introducing the path or location.

- (1) a. Penguin-ga {aruita/hasitta}.
Penguin-NOM {walked/ran}.
'A penguin {walked/ran}.'
- b. Penguin-ga hamabe-o {aruita/hasitta}.
Penguin-NOM beach-ACC {walked/ran}.
'A penguin {walked/ran} on the beach.'

However, close look of this data shows that the relevant *o*-marked nominal violates Doble *o*-constraint (2) (cf. Shibatani 1978, Hiraiwa 2009), that is normally observed with ACC-marked nominal.

- (2) a. *Taro-wa katteiru-penguin-o sakana-o tabe-sase-ta.
Taro-TOP pet-penguin-ACC fish-ACC eat-CAUS-PST
'Taro have his penguin eat fish.'
- b. *Taro-wa katteiru-penguin-o hamabe-o aruk-ase-ta.
Taro-TOP pet-penguin-ACC beach-ACC walk-CAUS-PST
'Taro have his penguin walk on the beach.'

Furthermore, Normally, the *o*-marked nominal is rescued if it is truly adjunct/adverb and it is clefted, but (2b) cannot.

- (3) a. ?Taro-ga penguin-o aruk-ase-ta no-wa ame-no-naka-o da.
Taro-NOM penguin-ACC walk-CAUS-PST C-TOP rain-of-middle-ACC COP
'Taro have his penguin walk in rain.'
- b. ??Taro-ga penguin-o aruk-ase-ta no-wa michi-o da.
Taro-NOM penguin-ACC walk-CAUS-PST C-TOP street-ACC COP
'Taro have his penguin walk on the street in rain.'

This shows that the some of the *o*-marked nominal are not simply path-introducing adjunct. Moreover, the floating quantifier (cf. Miyagawa 1989) also supports that the relevant *o*-marked nominal is argument. According to Miyagawa, Floating quantifier from argument is allowed while scrambling from PP does not. The current *o*-marked nominal exhibit parallel behavior to argument pattern.

- (4) a. Penguin-ga ni-kasyo puuru-de oyoi-da.
Penguin-NOM two-CL pool-in swim-PST
- b. *Puuru-de Penguin-ga ni-kasyo oyoi-da.
Pool-in Penguin-NOM two-CL swim-PST

- ‘Penguin swam in two pools.’
- (5) a. Penguin-ga ni-hiki sakana-o tabe-ta.
Penguin-NOM two-CL fish-ACC
b. Sakana-o Penguin-ga ni-hiki tabe-ta.
fish-ACC Penguin-NOM two-CL-
‘Penguin ate two fish.’
- (6) a. penguin-ga ni-kasyo hamabe-o arui-ta.
penguin-NOM two-CL beach-ACC walk-PST
b. Hamabe-o Penguin-ga ni-kasyo arui-ta
Beach-ACC Penguin-NOM two-CL walk-PAST
‘Penguin walks on the beach.’

Furthermore, this in addition to the Floating Quantifier, *o*-marked yields sloppy reading and also quantificational reading in argument ellipsis.

- (7) a. Taro-ga jibun-no hamabe-o arui-ta. Jiro-mo *e* arui-ta.
Taro-NOM self-GEN beach-ACC walk-PST. Jiro-also walk-PST
‘Taro walked TARO’S beach and Jiro walks {JIRO’S / TARO’S } beach.’
b. Taro-ga 3-kasyo-no hamabe-o arui-ta. Jiro-mo *e* arui-ta.
Taro-NOM three-CL-GEN beach-ACC walk-PST Jiro-also walk-PST
Taro walked 3 beaches and Jiro walked different 3 beaches.

These shows **o**-marked nominal in motion verb construction in Japanese are arguments not adjuncts.

If the *o*-marked NP is an argument, what licenses the NP? This paper claim that the *o*-marked NP is introduced by functional category, just like an external argument. Under the recent approaches within Distributed Morphology, following Kratzer (1996), an external argument is introduced by *i**, or its variant, Voice head, which has [+D] feature (Wood and Marantz 2017). In the case of transitive verb, an agent introducing voice head is introduced just above vP and it takes agent/causer. For instance, in Japanese, Oseki proposes three distinct Voice heads depending on their specification of [D]-feature as in (8) and they are spell-out as -S-, -R-, -E- respectively.

- (8) Voice:
- a. $[[\mathbf{Voice}_{+D}]] = \lambda x \lambda e. \text{CAUSER}(x.e)$: Specified as the obligatory presence of DP in Spec Voice.
b. $[[\mathbf{Voice}_{-D}]] = \lambda P_{\langle s,t \rangle}. P$: Specified as the obligatory absence of DP in Spec Voice.
c. $[[\mathbf{Voice}]] = \lambda x \lambda e. \text{AGENT}(x.e) / \lambda P_{\langle s,t \rangle}. P$: presence/absence of DP in Spec Voice is not specified.

Similar to external arguments, internal arguments are introduced by a functional category (cf, Lodal 2014) and if it does not have [D] feature, it does not require NPs in its specifier.