

## Not so Simple as *Ik-* Sounds: Verbs of Motion and Purpose *Ni* in Japanese

**Questions:** Japanese verbs of motion such as *ik-* ‘go’, *kur-* ‘come’, and verbs of location *ir/ar-* ‘be, exist’ take a goal/place complement marked with the same morpheme *ni* as in (1a) (cf. Sadakane and Koizumi 1995, Beavers 2008). As is well-known, no other verbs like verbs of manner select this type of *ni*, as in (1b).

- (1) a. Taro-ga kooen-ni ik/kur/ir-ta.  
 T.-Nom park-NI go/come/is-Past  
 ‘Taro went/came to/was in the park.’  
 b. \*Taro-ga kooen-ni hasir/aruk-ta.  
 run/walk-Past  
 ‘Taro ran/walked to the park.’

*Ni* has another use, among others, which marks purpose: attaching to either a noun (2a) or a verb (2b). Notice that purpose *ni* is only possible with the verbs of motion, as in (3). In particular, it is incompatible with the verbs of location, as in (3a).

- (2) a. Taro-ga kunren/choosa-*ni* ik-ta.  
 training/research-NI  
 ‘Taro went for training/research.’  
 b. Taro-ga kunren/choosa-si-*ni* ik-ta.  
 training/research-do-NI  
 ‘Taro went to do training/research.’  
 (3) a. \*Taro-ga kunren/choosa-(si)-*ni* ir-u.  
 training/research-(do)-NI  
 ‘Taro are (here) to do training/research.’  
 b. \*Taro-ga kunren/choosa-(si)-*ni* hatarak/odor-ta.  
 training/research-(do)-NI work/dance-Past  
 ‘Taro worked/danced for training/research.’

How come the verbs of motion pattern with the verbs of location in (1) but not in (2, 3)? Why is the patterning related with the function of *ni*? Two more striking properties of purpose *ni* are to be noted: it is a V’-internal complement which can be replaced with *soo-sur* ‘do so’ (4a) (like V in a similar English construction *go/come+V*; Zubizarreta and Oh 2007) but it cooccurs with goal *ni* (4b) (unlike in *go/come+V*):

- (4) a. Taro-ga kooen-*ni* kunren-ni ik-i  
 go-and  
 \*Jiro-ga choosa-*ni* soo-sita/<sup>OK</sup>Jiro-mo soo-sita.  
 so-did  
 ‘Taro went to the park for training and Jiro did so (for research).’  
 b. Taro-ga kooen-*ni* kunren/choosa-*ni* ik-ta.  
 ‘Taro went to the park for training/research.’

**Proposals:** Suzuki 2011 argues that the verbs of motion (*ik-* ‘go’, *kur-* ‘come’) and the verbs of location share an existential predicate BE<sub>LOC</sub> (cf. Randall 2010) and that BE<sub>LOC</sub> assigns the inherent locative case *ni* to its locative argument, as in (5):

- (5) a. Taro-ga kooen-ni ik-ta.  
 T.-Nom park-NI go-Past ‘Taro went to the station.’  
 [VP [VP [SC Taro [DP kooen]] BE<sub>LOC</sub>] BECOME]  
 ↑ inherent Loc case

- b. Taro-ga kooen-ni ir.u.  
 exist.Pres 'Taro is in the park.'  
 [VP [SC Taro [DP kooen]] BE<sub>LOC</sub>]  
 ↑ | inherent Loc case

This analysis captures the fact that both types of verb take the *ni*-marked locative complement, attributing the semantic difference to BECOME. It, however, fails to account for the distribution of purpose *ni*. Partially maintaining the complex predicate analysis of *ik-* 'go' I propose an alternative. **First**, *ik-* is a simple unaccusative verb when no physical goal cooccurs. It is the verb of the initiation of directed-motion GO<sub>INIT</sub> which selects an abstract target, namely, a purpose (or a destination), as in (5), to which it assigns *ni*. **Second**, *ik-* becomes a complex unaccusative through conflation with BE<sub>LOC</sub>. Conflation can be considered the lexical-structural merge. I adopt Zubizarreta and Oh's (2007) rule which merges a verbal I-structure with the head of another verbal I-structure. Thus, the phrase GO<sub>INIT</sub> heads is merged with the second predicate BE<sub>LOC</sub>. The *ni*-case assigned by GO<sub>INIT</sub> roughly corresponds to English *for* and the other, *at* (coindexing indicates coreference just for convenience):

- (5) a. Taro-ga choosa-ni ik-ta. 'Taro left for research.'  
 b. [VP [Taro choosa] GO<sub>INIT</sub>]  
 (6) a. Taro-ga kooen-*ni* kunren-*ni* ik-ta.  
 b. [VP [[ [Taro<sub>i</sub> kunren] GO<sub>INIT</sub>] [[Taro<sub>i</sub> kooen] BE<sub>LOC</sub>]]]  
 ↑ | ↑ |

(6b) implements an idea that *ik-* consists of a verb of the initiation of motion and a verb of location, each of which selects a 'locative' complement but only the former of which can select a purpose. From this follow all the properties of purpose *ni* discussed above: (a) its compatibility with the verbs of motion but not the others including verbs of location, (b) its being a complement, and (c) its cooccurrence with locative *ni*.

**More Advantages:** While English *go* is a simple activity/process verb, Japanese *ik-* in (5) encodes no process. This is supported, e.g., by the unacceptability of the progressive \**Taro-ga kooen-ni ik-te-iru*. In addition, Suzuki 2011 claims that the ambiguity of (7) (the time of either departure or arrival) follows because *ik-* is the complex verb which has two predicates that can be modified by the time adverbial.

- (7) Taro-ga 10 ji-ni gakkoo-ni ik-ta.  
 10 o'clock-at school-Loc go-Past  
 'Taro left for school at 10.' or 'Taro went to school and was there at 10.'

However, modifying BECOME by the temporal adverb would yield the meaning of the arrival, not the departure, at that time. GO<sub>INIT</sub> solves the problem. Furthermore, consider (8), with the meaning in which the time is that of departure:

- (8) Taro-ga 10 ji-ni (eki/kunren-*ni*) ik-ta. 'Taro left (for the station/training) at 10.'

With the departure meaning, the *ni*-phrase means the destination or the purpose, but not the place where Taro was. This follows from GO<sub>INIT</sub>, which yields the destination/purpose/departure readings (while BE<sub>LOC</sub> gives the locative/arrival readings).

**Selected References:** Beavers. 2008. On the nature of goal marking and delimitation. *JL* 44//Randall. 2010. *Linking*. Springer//Sadakane and Koizumi. 1995. On the nature of the "dative" particle *ni* in Japanese. *Linguistics* 33//Suzuki. 2011. No place/goal Ps in argument positions in Japanese. Presented at WAFL 8//Zubizarreta and Oh. 2007. *On the syntactic composition of manner and motion*. MIT Press.