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Shotaro Namiki

1. Introduction

This paper provides a new perspective on some options available to Japanese for encoding translational motion events. Talmy (2000) introduces an influential two-way typology, proposing that languages adopt either verb- or satellite-framed encoding of motion events. The two-way typology depends on where a language characteristically encodes path. In S(atellite)-framed languages (e.g. English) manner is encoded in the verb and path in a satellite such as particles and verb affixes. Conversely, in V(erb)-framed languages (e.g. Japanese), path is encoded in the verb, with manner encoded via a separate adjunct clause or a satellite.

This typology is based on the theoretical premise that in motion event the existence of the goal presupposes that of the path of a motion. In Japanese as a V-framed language, for instance, ni-phrases interpreted as the goal are compatible with only motion verbs which encode path (i.e. path verbs) but not those which encode manner (i.e. manner-of-motion verbs) (cf. Kawano (2006), Kitahara (1997), Ueno (2007), Mihara (2009) etc.). Examples are given in (1).

(1) a. Taro-ga eki-ni {it-ta/ki-ta}.
   Taro-NOM station-to go-PAST/come-PAST
   ‘Taro went/came to the station.’

b. ?* Taro-ga eki-ni hashit-ta.
   Taro-NOM station-to run-PAST
   ‘Taro ran to the station.’

The verbs *iku ‘go’ and kuru ‘come’ in (1a) are telic and inherently denote the path of a motion. The verbs hashiru ‘run’ in (1b) is atelic and denote only the manner of a
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I would like to express my thanks to the following people for their invaluable comments on earlier versions of this paper: Yukio Hirose, Nobuhiro Kaga, Masaharu Shimada, Naoaki Wada, Koichi Miyakoshi, and Tetsuya Kogusuri. I am also thankful to Akihiko Sakamoto, Tatsuhiro Okubo, Keita Ikarashi, and Daichi Watanabe for their helpful comments. Finally, I would like to thank my informants for their native speaker judgments. Needless to say, any remaining errors and shortcomings are mine.

The following abbreviations are used in the glosses of examples: ACC stands for accusative case marker, ASE for causative marker, ARE for adversative passive marker, COP for copular, DAT for dative case marker, EX for exclamation marker, GEN for genitive case marker, NEG for negative morpheme, NOM for nominative case marker, NOMI for nominalizer, PAST for past tense morpheme, QUOT for quotative particle, TOP for topic marker. I also gloss -ni as ‘to’ unless quoting directly from another source.

Tsukuba English Studies (2012) vol.31, 85-102
motion. In (1a) we can take a *ni*-phrase such as *eki-ni* ‘to the station’ to express the goal of the motion whereas in (1b) we cannot use it with the verbs. Thus, it may be said that the fact that in Japanese as a V-framed language, manner-of-motion verbs cannot co-occur with *ni*-phrases interpreted as the goal partially sustains Talmy’s typology.\(^2\)

There are cases, however, where some manner-of-motion verbs can co-occur with *ni*-phrases interpreted as the goal of a motion. As Ono (2010) points out, the co-occurrence can be found in causative constructions, as illustrated in (2).

\begin{enumerate}
\item a. Nobita-ga Jaian-o ichirui-ni hashir-ase-ta.
Nobita-NOM Jaian-ACC first-to run-ASE-PAST
‘Nobita caused Jaian to run to first.’

\hspace{1cm} (Ono (2010:117))

\item b. Iwakuma-ga Omatsu-o ichirui-ni aruk-ase-ta.
Iwakuma-NOM Omatsu-ACC first-to walk-ASE-PAST
‘Iwakuma caused Omatsu to walk to first.’

\hspace{1cm} (Usuki (2011:3))
\end{enumerate}

The *ni*-phrases in (2) can be construed as the goal of the running or walking event. Based on a general constraint on the non-stative verbs that no verb can encode both path and manner simultaneously (cf. Levin and Rappaport Hovav (1991, 1995, 2010)), the sentences in (2) lead to the indication that the manner-of-motion verbs which do not encode path co-occur with the *ni*-phrases interpreted as the goal. Given this fact, Ono (2010) argues that these examples are problematic for Talmy’s typology.

The purpose of this paper is to show that sentences such as (2) are not counterexamples to Talmy’s typology, but rather they can be regarded as evidence to support the two-way typology. We propose that the co-occurrence of manner-of-motion verbs with *ni*-phrases interpreted as the goal is permitted by the

\(\text{\textsuperscript{2} We, of course, can use a manner verb in the }-te\text{ participial form (e.g. }\text{hashit-te }\text{‘by running’}\text{ and a path verb (e.g. }\text{itta }\text{‘went’}\text{) to convey both manner and path in a single clause (e.g. }\text{hashitteitta }\text{‘went (by) running’}.\text{ According to Matsumoto (1996), these together form a complex predicate (although Yoneyama (1986) calls them ‘complex verbs’ and Tanaka (2002) lexical ‘TE-compounds’). This is illustrated as in (i).}

\begin{enumerate}
\item Sensei-ga kyoshitsu-ni {hashitte-it-ta/hashitte-ki-ta}.
Teacher-NOM classroom-to running-go-PAST/running-come-PAST
‘Our teacher went/came to the classroom running.’
\end{enumerate}

Although in this sentence the manner-of-motion verbs are used with the *ni*-phrase, the occurrence of the *ni*-phrase is allowed because of the existence of the path verbs, after all.
pragmatic support of "pragmatic path presupposition" which is a system independent of Talmy's typology.

The organization of this paper is as follows. Section 2 verifies that the \textit{ni}-phrases found with the manner-of-motion verbs in causative construction can be interpreted as the goal of a motion. Section 3 investigates what makes acceptable the co-occurrence of manner-of-motion verbs with \textit{ni}-phrases interpreted as the goal in causative constructions. Given the analysis in section 3, section 4 argues that our proposal holds for other cases where the manner-of-motion verbs are used with \textit{ni}-phrases interpreted as the goal; adversative passives and narrative contexts. Section 5 summarizes the paper and offers some conclusions.

2. Preliminary Discussion

Before entering directly into an investigation of causative constructions in which a manner-of-motion verb is used with a \textit{ni}-phrase, we would like to remark on the interpretation of the \textit{ni}-phrase. As observed in Kawano (2006) and Mihara (2009), \textit{ni}-phrases interpreted as the goal of a motion event is generally inconsistent with manner-of-motion verbs since these verbs are inherently atelic, i.e., they do not specify the goal of a motion. Given their observations, one might think that the \textit{ni}-phrases involved in (2) should not be interpreted as the goal. So s/he might suggest as an alternative that they are interpreted as the direction along which an entity moves, because \textit{ni}-phrases interpreted as the direction are compatible with manner-of-motion verbs, as exemplified in (3):

\begin{quote}
(3) Jiro-wa higashi-ni arui-ta.
Jiro-TOP east-to walk-PAST
‘Jiro walked to the east.’
\end{quote}

In this section, we firstly verify that the \textit{ni}-phrases in (2) are interpreted as the goal of motion events from the work of Kitahara (1997).

The nature of \textit{-ni} has been discussed by a number of researchers, and, in general, it is said that \textit{-ni} in motion expressions may be interpreted as the goal of a motion or the direction along which an entity moves (cf. Kitahara (1997), Mihara (2009), among others). Kitahara (1997) generalizes the two-way interpretation of \textit{-ni} in motion expressions, as summarized in (4):

\begin{quote}
(4) a. \textit{-ni} is interpreted as the direction;
(i) if the NP to which the dative case \textit{-ni} is assigned can be classified into the relative nouns (e.g. \textit{higashi} ‘east,’ \textit{migi} ‘right,’ \textit{shita}
‘downside,’ etc.) or;
(ii) if a marker denoting the direction of a motion connects to the NP
(e.g. -no-soba ‘aside,’ -no-ho ‘toward,’ etc.).

b. -ni is interpreted as the goal except for (i) and (ii).

(Kitahara (1997:46))

Based on this generalization, we can suggest that the goal interpretation of
ni-phrases is available in (2) because the sentences, repeated as (5), do not contain
such relative nouns or directional markers as in (4a).

(5) a. Nobita-ga Jaian-o ichirui-ni hashir-ase-ta. (= (2a))
Nobita-NOM Jaian-ACC first-to run-ASE-PAST
‘Nobita caused Jaian to run to first.’
b. Iwakuma-ga Omatsu-o ichirui-ni aruk-ase-ta. (= (2b))
Iwakuma-NOM Omatsu-ACC first-to walk-ASE-PAST
‘Iwakuma caused Omatsu to walk to first.’

As shown in (5), these sentences do not have any elements which invoke the
directional interpretation of ni-phrases.

Moreover, our suggestion that the ni-phrases in (2) are interpreted as the goal
is supported by the occurrence of a measure phrase (e.g. 1km). As Kitahara (1997)
points out, a ni-phrase cannot co-occur with a measure phrase when it is interpreted
as the goal, while the co-occurrence is acceptable when it is interpreted as the
direction. This is exemplified in (6).

(6) a. * Jiro-ga Saburo-o Kyoto-ni 1km oikake-ta.
Jiro-NOM Saburo-ACC Kyoto-to 1km chase-PAST
‘Jiro chased Saburo 1km to Kyoto.’
b. Jiro-ga Saburo-o Kyoto-homen-ni 1km
Jiro-NOM Saburo-ACC Kyoto-in-the-direction-of 1km
chase-PAST
‘Jiro chased Saburo 1km in the direction of Kyoto.’

(Kitahara (1997:50))

Kitahara explains that the ungrammaticality of (6a) is attributed to Tenny’s (1994)
single delimiting constraint, according to which the event described by a verb only
has one measuring-out and is delimited only once. In (6a), the path of the chasing
event is delimited twice, i.e. by the measure phrase 1 km and by the ni-phrase \textit{Kyoto-ni}; Jiro may stop chasing Saburo when he goes 1 km from the start point or when he arrives in Kyoto. Because the delimited point is construed as the goal when a path is delimited, we can identify the ni-phrase in (6a) as the goal of the chasing event. The ban on the co-occurrence of the two phrases proves the ni-phrase to be the goal. The same holds for the cases of causative constructions where ni-phrases are found with manner-of-motion verbs, as shown in (7):

\begin{align*}
(7) & \quad * \text{Taro-wa Hanako-o eki-ni 100m hashir-ase-ta.} \\
& \text{Taro-TOP Hanako-ACC station-to 100m run-ASE-PAST} \\
& \text{‘Taro caused Hanako to run 100m to the station.’}
\end{align*}

Sentence (7) shows that the ni-phrase \textit{eki-ni} is incompatible with the measure phrase 100m. From this observation that the ni-phrases are not used with the measure phrases, it follows that they are interpreted as the goal of a motion.

To sum up, in this section we have verified how ni-phrases found with manner-of-motion verbs in causative constructions are interpreted. The two pieces of evidence suggest that ni-phrases used with manner-of-motion verbs in causative constructions are interpreted as the goal rather than the direction. In the next section we address our main discussion.

3. Manner-of-Motion Verbs with Ni-Phrases in Causative Constructions

As discussed in section 2, we can take ni-phrases interpreted as the goal of a motion with manner-of-motion verbs in causative constructions, although the co-occurrence is usually judged as ungrammatical as shown in (1b). A question arises here as to what makes acceptable the co-occurrence of ni-phrases interpreted as the goal with manner-of-motion verbs in causative constructions. For the first approximation of this question, we take into consideration the nature of causative constructions.

As Shibatani (1978) argues, the causative construction consists of two subevents of causing event and caused event. In (2a), for instance, the occurrence of the event of \textit{Jaian’s} running to first is triggered by that of \textit{Nobita’s} causing event. In this construction it is premised that the speaker believes that the occurrence of the caused event is wholly dependent on the occurrence of the causing event (cf. Shibatani (1978:239-240)). In other words, in the construction it is supposed that, as long as the causer assumes the achievement of the caused event, he may force or persuade the causee to perform an act that constitutes the caused event. In (2a), for instance, on the assumption that the event of \textit{Jaian’s} running to first is achieved,
Nobita forces him to perform the act of running. Given this observation, we can make a hypothesis about the co-occurrence of manner-of-motion verbs with ni-phrases in causative constructions as in (8):

(8) The co-occurrence of manner-of-motion verbs with ni-phrases interpreted as the goal is permitted by the pragmatic presupposition of the path which is involved in the subevent of the transition.

This hypothesis is supported by at least three types of evidence. First, the transition denoted by the causative construction using manner-of-motion verbs can be canceled, although the transition denoted by the path verbs cannot. Examples are given in (9).

(9) a. Taro-wa Hanako-o eki-ni hashir-ase-ta-ga,
Taro-TOP Hanako-ACC station-to run-ASE-PAST-but,
asifu-o oiteit-ta-koto-ni kizuki, tochude
wallet-ACC leave-PAST-fact-DAT realized on-the-way
hikikae-sase-ta.
go-back-(S)ASE-PAST
‘Taro caused Hanako to run to the station, but he found her leaving the wallet, so he caused her to go back.’

b. ?? Taro-wa eki-ni {it-ta/ki-ta]-ga, saifu-o
Taro-TOP station-to go-PAST/come-PAST-but wallet-ACC
wasure-ta-koto-ni kizuki, tochude hikikaeshi-ta.
leave-PAST-fact-DAT realized on-the-way go-back-PAST
‘Taro went/came to the station, but on the way he found his leaving his wallet, so he went back.’

Interestingly enough, the sentences in (9) show that the two ni-phrases have a difference although both of them refer to the goal of a motion event. The transition (i.e. going/coming to the station) in (9a) can be canceled by the subsequent sentence, while the transition in (9b) cannot. As Levinson (1983), among others, states, the pragmatic presupposition of a sentence or lexicon can be canceled while the entailment (or semantic presupposition) cannot. Thus, this makes it clear that the translational motion events are lexically entailed or pragmatically presupposed. From this observation, it follows that the transition denoted in the causative construction is pragmatically presupposed and the occurrence of ni-phrases as the goal found with manner-of-motion verbs in causative constructions is permitted just
pragmatically. The second piece of evidence is related to the presupposition/assertion distribution, discussed by Husband (2011). Observe the following discourses given in (10-11):

(10) A: Was King Luis XVI guillotined?  
B: No, he was strangled to death!  

(11) # A: Was King Luis XVI guillotined?  
B: No, he didn’t die.

(Husband (2011:6))

When a polarity question is asked as in (10-11), the question being asked is not about whether King Luis XVI died, but about whether he was killed by guillotined. Unacceptable is a continuation of discourse which attempts to argue that he did not die. Levinson (1983) observes that assertion can be questioned and negated while presupposition cannot. From his observation, Husband claims that in the manner-of-death verbs result is just presupposed and only manner is asserted.

Given the work of Husband (2011), it can be found that the path of the transition in causative construction using manner-of-motion verbs cannot be questioned and negated. Observe the following examples:

(12) A: Taro-wa Hanako-o eki-ni hashir-ase-ta-no?  
B: Iya, aruk-ase-ta-yo.  
‘Did Taro cause Hanako to run to the station?’

(13) # A: Taro-wa Hanako-o eki-ni hashir-ase-ta-no?  
B: Iya, kanojo-wa doko-ni-mo itte-inai-yo.  
‘Did Taro cause Hanako to run to the station?’

---

3 Because our observation is that the *ni*-phrase in the construction is not taken by the verbs, it does not conflict with the previous observations by Kawano (2006) and Mihara (2009) that *ni*-phrases interpreted as the goal is generally inconsistent with manner-of-motion verbs since these verbs are inherently atelic, i.e., they do not specify the goal of a motion.

4 This paper uses ‘#’ to express the utterance to be odd.

5 This paper is based on the parallelism of change of state and change of location in which result in change of state domain corresponds to path in motion domain (Levin and Rappaport Hovav (2010), among others).
No, she-TOP anywhere-to went-NEG-I-tell-you
‘No, she did not go anywhere.’

In these examples the question being asked is about whether the manner in which Hanako moved was walking, but not about whether she moved or not. In other words, in these sentences manner can be questioned and negated, whereas path cannot. From this observation it turns out that in causative constructions only the manner of the motion is asserted and the transition is just presupposed.

Finally, our proposal in (8) can predict that the manner-of-motion verbs used with *ni-phrases interpreted as the goal is restricted to those which have the path meaning. These manner-of-motion verbs are called path-oriented verbs (Kitahara (2009)). The prediction is demonstrated in (14).

(14) a. Otori-o suiro-ni oyog-ase-ta. (A. Oshima “Kanto Folk”)
decoys-ACC conduit-to swim-ASE-PAST
‘Someone caused the decoy to swim to the conduit.’
Taro-TOP Hanako-ACC station-to hover-ASE-PAST
‘Taro caused Hanako to hover to the station.’
c. * Jiro-wa Akemi-o eki-ni odor-ase-ta.
Jiro-TOP Akemi-ACC station-to dance-ASE-PAST
‘Jiro caused Akemi to dance to the station.’

The verbs oyogu ‘swim,’ urotsuku ‘hover,’ and odoru ‘dance’ in (14) fall into the manner-of-motion verbs (cf. Levin (1993)). According to the verb classification proposed by Kitahara (2009), however, oyogu for instance, is subclassified into path-oriented verbs whereas urotsuku and odoru are not. As shown in (12-13), the

---

6 Although (14b) may be acceptable if the phrase eki-ni means the place where the motion urotsuku happened, this sentence does not mean that Hanako went to the station by hovering.

7 We can verify whether a manner-of-motion verb is classified into path-oriented verbs by using at least two types of linguistic tests. One is that the path-oriented verbs can be used with path phrases which are marked by the accusative case o (Kawano (2006), among others), as shown in (i):

(i) a. Akira-wa ni-kosu-o arui-ta/hashit-ta.
Akira-TOP course-2-ACC walk-PAST/run-PAST
‘Akira walked/ran the course 2.’
Akira-TOP course-2-ACC hover-PAST/stumble-PAST
‘Akira hovered/stumbled the course 2.’

In (i), the NP nikosu ‘course 2’ denotes the path along which he walked. In (ia), the path-oriented verbs aruku ‘walk’ and hashiru ‘run’ can co-occur with the path phrase, while the verbs urotsuku
path of the transition denoted by the verb is presupposed in the causative construction. Considering that Japanese belongs to the V-framed language, we can easily predict that if the verb does not have the path meaning, it cannot be presupposed in causative constructions. Therefore, the verb’s restriction as shown in (14) leads us to find our proposal in (8) plausible.

To sum up, we have investigated what makes acceptable the co-occurrence of manner-of-motion verbs with *ni*-phrases in causative constructions. Based on the nature of causative constructions, we have proposed that the pragmatic support that the path of the transition is pragmatically presupposed enables the *ni*-phrases interpreted as the goal to be used with manner-of-motion verbs even if these verbs do not take the phrases.

4. Further Data on Manner-of-Motion Verbs with *Ni*-Phrases

In the previous section, we have argued that in causative construction the co-occurrence of *ni*-phrases interpreted as the goal with manner-of-motion verbs is permitted by the pragmatic presupposition of the transition. Having a close look at data, we can find more two sorts of cases where manner-of-motion verbs can be used with *ni*-phrases interpreted as the goal; adversative passives and narrative contexts. Examples are given in (15, 16).8

    Hanako-TOP station-until walk-PAST/run-PAST
    ‘Hanako walked/ran until the station.’

    Hanako-TOP station-until hover-PAST/stumble-PAST
    ‘Hanako hovered/stumbled until the station.’

The sentence in (iia) indicates that the distance of her walking or running is from the start point to the station. In this sentence, the verbs *aruku* and *hashiru* are compatible with the *made*-phrase. In (iib), however, the verbs *urotsuku* or *yoromeku* cannot be used with the phrase. Following Beavers (2008), we take *made*-markers to express general delimitation, providing a static boundary point for some event participant that has physical or abstract extent, i.e., *-made* may indicate temporal, spatial, numerical, and propositional boundaries. The precise form of delimitation is inferred from the nature of the event and the complement of the *-made*: when a motion predicate takes a delimiter with a place as complement, the inference is that the complement names the endpoint of the path of motion, i.e., it is understood as the goal. In motion expressions, therefore, *-made* functions to delimit the path of the motion. From the function of *made*-phrases, in motion expressions we cannot use *made*-phrases without the path of a motion. Recall that in Japanese path is encoded in the verb, as stated in the section 1; if a motion verb cannot co-occur with *made*-phrase, it follows that this verb does not involve the path, i.e., it is not a path-oriented verb. Thus, from (i-ii) it can be found that the verb in (14a) are path-oriented verbs, while those in (14b, c) are not.

8 I deliberately use the more informal token in (15) because it is intended that the
Example (15) involves the adversative passive *nirui-ni hashirareta*; there is no active sentence corresponding to either of this passive (Howard and Niyekawa-Howard (1976)), and it often denotes that a participant referred to by the subject is subject to adversity. In the adversative passive the manner-of-motion verbs (e.g. *hashiru* ‘run’) can co-occur with the *ni*-phrase (e.g. *nirui-ni* ‘to second’) as well as the causative construction. Example (16) is found in narrative contexts. Interestingly enough, although the expression *eki-ni hashitta* is regarded as ungrammatical in colloquial as seen in (1b), this sentence is judged as fully acceptable when used in narrative contexts. To the best of my knowledge, there is no exploration into the co-occurrence of manner-of-motion verbs with *ni*-phrases as in (15, 16).

In this section we argue that the essence of our proposal in (8) that the pragmatic path presupposition makes *ni*-phrases emerge with manner-of-motion verbs also holds for the two cases of the adversative passive and the narrative contexts.9

### 4.1. Manner-of-Motion Verbs with Ni-Phrases in Adversative Passives

We start by investigating the adversative passive. As Washio (1997) states, the adversative passive consists of two subevents; the subevent in which the

---

9 Stringer (2003) mentions that *ni*-phrases found with manner-of-motion verbs that imply displacement may be interpreted as the goal of a motion in colloquial Japanese.

---

(i)  
<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Akira-TOP</td>
<td>sea-GEN-inside-to</td>
<td>run-PAST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Akira ran into the sea.’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Hidari-ni</td>
<td>tobu.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>left-to</td>
<td>leaps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘(He) leaps to the left.’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Beavers et al. (2010:365), cited from Stringer (2003:46-53))

The sentences in (i), however, can hardly be judged as grammatical at least when they are used in colloquial. Thus, this paper treats the examples in (i) as narrative contexts but not as colloquial.
participant marked by dative case -ni encompasses adversity and that in which the participant referred to by the subject receives it. Observe the following examples:

(17) a. Mohaya iwaba-ni oyog-are-te-wa muri-ni
   Any more rock-to swim-ARE-when forcedly
   ageru-koto-wa deki-nai.
   land-doing-TOP can-NEG
   ‘When the fish swim to the rock, I can’t land it forcedly anymore.’

   b. Motamotashiteru-kara nirui-ni hashir-are-ta-janaika! (= (16))
   Hesitating-because second-to run-ARE-PAST-EX
   ‘Because you were hesitating, we had second run to by the runner!’

In (17a), for instance, the occurrence of the event of receiving the adversity is triggered by the event fish’s swimming to the rock. Likewise, in (17b) the occurrence of the event of receiving the adversity is wholly dependent on the event of runner’s running to first. Crucial here is the fact that the adversative passives always denote that the person referred to by the subject receives the adversity from the occurrence of the subevent. The event of receiving the adversity cannot be established without the occurrence of the subevent in which adversity arises. Given the nature of adversative passives, we can assume that in the adversative passives the subevent which triggers the event of receiving the adversity is presupposed to be achieved; hence our proposal in (8).

That our proposal holds true for the adversative passives can be verified by the three types of evidence as shown in section 3. First, the transition denoted by the adversative passives using manner-of-motion verbs can be canceled as well as the case of causative constructions. This is exemplified in (18).

(18)  Kodomo-ni shinshitsu-ni hashir-are-ta-ga, roka-de
    Kid-DAT bedroom-to run-ARE-PAST-but in the corridor
    tsukamae-ta.
    catch-PAST.
    ‘I had my bedroom run to by my kid, but I caught him in the corridor’

From the observation of the cancelability in (18), it turns out that the transition denoted in the adversative passive is pragmatically presupposed and the occurrence of ni-phrases as the goal found with manner-of-motion verbs is permitted just pragmatically.
Second, the transition which is described in the subevent of the adversative passive cannot be questioned and negated, as shown in (19-20):

(19) A: Darvish-wa Ichiro-ni nirui-ni hashir-are-ta-no?
   Darvish-TOP Ichiro-DAT second-to run-ARE-PAST-NOMI
   ‘Did Darvish have second run to by Ichiro?’
   B: Iya, yuyuto aruk-are-ta-yo.
   No, at ease walk-ARE-PAST-I-tell-you
   ‘No, Darvish had second walked to at ease by him.’

(20) A: Darvish-wa Ichiro-ni nirui-ni hashir-are-ta-no?
   Darvish-TOP Ichiro-DAT second-to run-ARE-PAST-NOMI
   ‘Did Darvish have second run to by Ichiro?’
   B: Iya, kare-wa ugoite-inai-yo.
   No, he-TOP move-NEG-1-tell-you
   ‘No, he did not move from first.’

The question being asked in (19-20) is about whether the manner in which Ichiro moves to second was running, but not about whether he moved from first to second or not. From these discourses it can be found that manner is asserted and path involved in the transition is presupposed.

Finally, the manner-of-motion verbs which have no path meaning cannot be used with ni-phrases interpreted as the goal in adversative passives. This is illustrated in (21).

(21) * Tomodachi-ni heya-ni urotsuk/yoromek-are-ta.
    Friend-DAT room-to hover/stumble-ARE-PAST
    ‘I had my room was hovered/stumbled into by my friend.’

The verb, for instance, oyogu or hashiru in (17) which falls into the path-oriented verb can be found with ni-phrases interpreted as the goal in adversative passives whereas the verb urotsuku or yoromeku in (21) which does not have the path meaning cannot. As is the case with causative constructions, the verb’s restriction may support our proposal in (8).

In this subsection we have verified that our proposal can be still valid for the adversative passives in which manner-of-motion verbs are found with ni-phrases interpreted as the goal. In the next subsection, we further show that the proposal holds true for the case with narrative contexts.

4.2. Manner-of-Motion Verbs with Ni-Phrases in Narrative Contexts
In this subsection we investigate the narrative contexts in which the manner-of-motion verbs can be used with *ni*-phrases interpreted as the goal.\footnote{There is a case where the co-occurrence of manner-motion verbs with *-ni is acceptable in a spoken-form. It is often used in the so-called live coverage style, as shown in (i):}

There are two points to be noted about narrative contexts. First, as Labov (1972) states, narrative is one method of recapitulating past experience by matching a verbal sequence of clauses to the sequence of events which (it is inferred) actually occurred. In narrative, therefore, the events are characteristically ordered in consecutive. In other words, narrative is a discourse that consists of more than one event, i.e. a series of events in which the story develops in consecutive. Observe the following examples:

\begin{verbatim}
(22) Koban-o deta hutari-wa mugon-no-mama
      Police-box-ACC went-out the-two-TOP in-silence
  eki-ni arui-ta.  (Y. Sou “Incoherent Earth”)
    station-to walk-PAST
  ‘The two going out the police box walked to the station in silence.’
\end{verbatim}

Example (22) consists of two subevents; the subevent in which the two went out the police box, and that in which they walked to the station in silence. These subevents are ordered in consecutive. This is designated in Figure below. The squares represent the places of the police box and the station. The dashed square refers to the outside of the police box. The circles represent the movers (i.e. the two). The dashed circles denote that the two existed before they moved out of the police box.

\begin{verbatim}
10 There is a case where the co-occurrence of manner-motion verbs with *-ni is acceptable in a spoken-form. It is often used in the so-called live coverage style, as shown in (i):

(i) Aa, Ranna-ga sanrui-ni hashit-ta! ‘Lit. Look, the runner runs to third!’

This type, however, is not counted as our target in the paper because *-ni is interpreted as the direction of a motion rather than the goal. This type of sentence has a function of “presentational constructions,” in which a scene which happens in front of the speaker is set and a referent is introduced on the scene to become the new focus of attention (cf. Bresnan (1994), among others). In this type, as Hasegawa (2008) points out, the subject must be marked by nominative marker *-ga and the personal expression is restricted to the third person, as illustrated in (ii).

(ii) a. Ranna-{ga / wa} sanrui-ni hashit-ta.
    b. {*Boku / kimi / ranna}-ga sanrui-ni hashit-ta.

From the examples in (ii), it can be found that the sentence in (i) involves the function of the presentational construction. The function forces us to interpret *ni*-phrases as the direction because the scene in (i) described in the presentational construction is only a part of the motion event.
\end{verbatim}
Moreover, narrative has the other characteristics with respect to the viewpoint of a narrator. This is called the viewpoint of the omniscient narrator (e.g. Hirose (2007)). In usual we express an event with respect to our perspectives. In narrative, however, we can express it from the viewpoint of the omniscient narrator. Based on the existence of the perspective of the omniscient narrator, we can assume that the sentence in which the manner-of-motion verb is found with *ni*-phrase interpreted as the goal in narrative contexts has to be described from the perspective of the omniscient narrator. This assumption is supported by the following examples:

(23) a. Futari-wa damatte eki-ni arui-ta.
   The-two TOP in-silence station-to walk-PAST
   ‘The two walked to the station in silence.’

b. * Futari-wa damatte eki-ni arui-ta-to
    The-two TOP in-silence station-to walk-PAST-QUOT
    Hanako-wa omot-ta.
    Hanako-TOP think-PAST
    ‘Hanako thought that the two walked to the station in silence.’

Example (23a) is described from the perspective of the omniscient narrator. In this example the co-occurrence of the manner-of-motion verb with the *ni*-phrase interpreted as the goal is judged as acceptable. Contrastively, example (23b) is described from the perspective of *Hanako* because of the existence of the expression to *Hanako-wa omotta* ‘Hanako thought that.’ In this case the manner-of-motion verb cannot be used with the *ni*-phrase. From this observation, it turns out that the perspective of the omniscient narrator is essential for the co-occurrence of the manner-of-motion verb with the *ni*-phrase interpreted as the goal to be judged as acceptable. The analysis can be attributed to the nature of the omniscient narrator.
It is generally said that the omniscient narrator already recognizes what event happens in the narrative contexts. In other words, for the narrator it is presupposed that a series of events in which the story develops in consecutive occurs. Thus, from this analysis, we can conclude that our proposal still holds for the case with narrative contexts.

Lastly, as is the case with causative constructions and adversative passives, we can predict that the verb which has no path meaning cannot be used with the *ni*-phrase interpreted as the goal in narrative contexts. This prediction is verified by the fact that the manner-of-motion verbs found with *ni*-phrases interpreted as the goal in narrative contexts are restricted to the path-oriented verbs. This is illustrated in (24).

(24) *Koban-o deta hutari-wa mugon-no-mama
detect two police-box-ACC went-out the-two station-in-silence
eki-ni odot-ta.
dance-PAST to-station
‘The two going out the police box danced to the station in silence.’

Example (24) shows that the verb *odoru* ‘dance’ which has no path meaning cannot be permitted to be used in this sentence. From this observation, it follows that the pragmatic presupposition of the path of the transition enables the manner-of-motion verb to be used with the *ni*-phrase interpreted as the goal.

To sum up, in this section we have argued that our proposal of the paper is valid for the cases with adversative passives and narrative contexts. The co-occurrence of the manner-of-motion verb with the *ni*-phrase interpreted as the goal is permitted by the pragmatic presupposition of the path of the transition.

5. **Concluding Remarks**

In this paper we have investigated the data in which manner-of-motion verbs can be used with *ni*-phrases interpreted as the goal; causative constructions, adversative passives, and narrative contexts. We have proposed that, independent of the types of expressions, the co-occurrence of manner-of-motion verbs with *ni*-phrases interpreted as the goal is permitted by a pragmatic support, i.e. pragmatic presupposition of the path involved in the transition.

The fact that independent of Talmy’s typology, goal interpretations of locative adpositions are available with the appropriate pragmatic support even in the absence of morphosyntactic devices for directly expressing direction in a PP has been pointed out by Beavers, Levin, and Tham (2010). The point to be noted is that
based on this significant fact, Beavers et al. criticizes Talmy’s typology as just a tendency. However, as shown in the paper, in Japanese the co-occurrence of manner-of-motion verbs with *ni*-phrases interpreted as the goal cannot be regarded as a counterexamples to Talmy’s typology because the verb still encode path, and the *ni*-phrase interpreted as the goal is not taken by the manner-of-motion verbs but permitted by the pragmatic presupposition of path. The co-occurrence as seen in this paper can be explained by Talmy’s typology and a pragmatic support which is a linguistic system independent of the typology. Our conclusion, therefore, leads to an argument for Talmy (1985, 2000).

REFERENCES


Kitahara, Hiroo (1997) “Ichihenka-Doshi to Kyokusuru Basho-Ni-kakuku no Imiyawari (The Semantic Role of the Locative Ni-Case Phrase Co-Occurring with Motion Verbs),” *Kokugogaku-Kenkyu* 36, 43-52, Tohoku University, Miyagi.

Constructions and Resultative Constructions Based on the Lexical Conceptual Structure and the Scale Structure and Syntactic Structure of ‘Ni’ Phrases,” *Kekkakobun no Taiporoji* (Typology of Resultatives), 315-364, Hituzi-Syobo, Tokyo.


Doctoral Program in Literature and Linguistics
University of Tsukuba
e-mail: shotarou0925@yahoo.co.jp