

**Caused-Motion Verbs and the Ditransitive Construction**  
**- a Verb Classification in Terms of Goal-Orientedness -**  
 Hiromitsu Akashi

In this research, I am concerned with the phenomenon of the dative alternation in English. As exemplified in the following examples, verbs that describe the event in which the causer directly causes the theme to move to a certain goal (henceforth “caused-motion verbs”) are divided into two classes with respect to the ability to participate in the alternation.

- (1) a. John brought/took the package to his boss.  
 b. John brought/took his boss the package.
- (2) a. John carried/dragged the box to Pamela.  
 b. ok/?\*John carried/dragged Pamela the box.

As shown above, *bring* and *take* are allowed to participate in the alternation, whereas *carry* and *drag* are not. Then, what criterion can we set up to distinguish verbs which can participate in the alternation (henceforth “dativizable verbs”) from those which cannot (henceforth “non-dativizable verbs”)? I claim that a decisive factor for the distinction is whether a verb lexicalizes Goal. Let us take the verbs in (1) and (2) for example and see whether they in fact differ in this point. First of all, they differ as to delimitedness, which is verified by the *for/in* test (cf. Tenny 1987). The verbs *bring* and *take* are compatible with an *in*-phrase but not with a *for*-phrase. The verbs *carry* and *drag*, on the other hand, are the other way round. This difference suggests that *bring* and *take* are delimited verbs, whereas *carry* and *drag* are non-delimited verbs. Since a delimited verb involves a certain endpoint, we may say that *bring* and *take* lexicalize Goal, while *carry* and *drag* do not. Another piece of evidence comes from the fact that the verbs differ as to whether they can occur with a *toward*-phrase. Since this expression denotes only a direction and does not imply an explicit Goal, it is incompatible with verbs which lexicalize Goal.

- (3) a. Sam carried/dragged a box toward Bill.  
 b. ? Sam brought/took a box toward Bill.

The examples show that *bring* and *take* are less felicitous compared with *carry* and *drag*, when they occur with a *toward*-phrase. In this connection, it is interesting to note that (3b) is perfectly acceptable in a sentence such as the following:

- (4) Sam brought/took a box toward Bill, but halfway he dropped it.

The reason why (4) is more acceptable than (3b) seems to be attributed to the word *halfway*; since this word strongly suggests the presence of a goal, the event described by the whole sentence is more easily interpreted as a delimited event. On the basis of the evidence above, we may safely conclude that while *take* and *bring* lexicalize Goal, *carry* and *drag* do not. In order to capture this difference, I introduce here a new notion, “goal-orientedness.” I claim that

the four verbs can be divided into two types from the viewpoint of goal-orientedness: one is “strongly goal-oriented verbs,” which lexicalize Goal, and the other is “weakly goal-oriented verbs,” which do not lexicalize Goal. Then, we may say that *take* and *bring* belong to strongly goal-oriented verbs and *carry/drag* to weakly goal-oriented verbs. Note here that as for these verbs, the distinction in terms of goal-orientedness exactly corresponds to the dativizable/non-dativizable distinction. In this respect, goal-orientedness works as a criterion: only strongly goal-oriented verbs can participate in the dative alternation. Adopting this criterion, we can also predict whether or not other caused-motion verbs such as *push*, *throw*, and *move* are allowed to participate in the alternation. For example, *push* cannot appear in the ditransitive construction, but this is because the verb does not imply movement to start with (cf. Kusayama and Miyata 1999). As for *throw* and *move*, I conclude that they do not lexicalize Goal based on some evidence, which I cannot give here for lack of space. This, however, gives rise to a problem, since *throw* can occur in the construction. To solve this problem, I assume that Goal of *throw* is complemented by background knowledge (i.e., “frame”) specific to this verb. In this light, we may say that the verb still satisfies the criterion.

Lastly, I would like to briefly mention that there are some examples that we cannot explain by using the criterion based on goal-orientedness. For example, although both *carry* and *move* belong to weakly goal-oriented verbs (thus, we predict that these verbs are equally excluded from the construction), most English native speakers judge that ditransitive sentences with *carry* are more acceptable than those with *move*. Then, how can we explain this fact? I claim that *carry* and *drag* differ from *move* in that they contain some information that strongly evokes Actor. For example, we can imagine some specific manners of carrying or dragging, but in the case of *move* the manner of the action seems to be undetermined. Furthermore, these verbs also differ as to whether they can participate in the causative alternation.

- (5) a. He moved the box./The box moved.  
 b. He {carried/dragged} the box./\*The box {carried/dragged}.

It is generally agreed that the causative alternation cuts off Actor from the event described by a transitive verb (cf. Jackendoff 1983, Kageyama 1996, Maruta 1999, among others). Taking this point into consideration, we may say that *carry* and *drag* cannot participate in the alternation since the actions denoted by the verbs are strongly associated with Actor. Based on the evidence above, I claim that whether a verb has some properties that strongly evoke Actor may also serve as another criterion. That is, among weakly goal-oriented verbs, those which satisfy this criterion (*carry/drag*) are more compatible with the construction than those which do not (*say*). To summarize, the two criteria based on goal-orientedness and actor-orientedness not only predict whether a verb can participate in the alternation but also explain the subtle difference in acceptability.