

# ARGUMENT GAPPING IN COORDINATE CONJUNCTION CONSTRUCTIONS IN JAPANESE

YOSHITERU ASANO

When two clauses are conjoined by a coordinate conjunction (e.g. *and*), an argument of a verb in the second clause which corresponds to an argument of the verb in the first clause can be deleted. Traditionally, the condition for this phenomenon (ARGUMENT GAPPING) is recoverability of the deleted argument from the first clause. However, in Japanese, recoverability is not the sole condition affecting the gapping in coordinately conjoined clauses. Based on a data analysis including sentences with verbs of various patterns, it was found that verbs keep their marked (undeletable) arguments even when they are recoverable from the context.\*

## THE PROBLEM

1.1. GAPPING ON VERBS. A sentence does not always have what we might always expect it to have. It often omits redundant information, or information that is available or salient in the context of speech. Hankamer states (1979:1):

'Every natural language has in its grammar devices which allow the reduction of redundancy in surface structure: that is, which allow surface structure to contain far fewer redundant constituents than their underlying deep structures.'

As is apparent from the above statement, Hankamer assumes that there are two levels of structures: surface and deep structures. The deep structure contains all information, however redundant, approximating surface structure only through the use of some rules which optionally DELETE the redundant information existed in constituents to generate the surface structure.<sup>1</sup>

This type of rule is known as a GAPPING rule because it creates a syntactic gap in the clause. (In fact, the notation used to represent a gap  $\emptyset$  assumes a missing constituent(s).) An example of an English sentence with a gap is as follows.

- (1) a. *John ate fish and Mary ate steak.*  
b. *John ate fish and Mary  $\emptyset$  steak.*

In this case, *ate* in the second clause (*Mary ate steak*) of 1a was deleted in 1b. A coordinate conjunction *and* or *or* has to be used to conjoin two clauses. This is an example of FORWARD GAPPING. Forward gapping is said to occur when a constituent is deleted from the second clause when there is a corresponding constituent in the first clause, under the assumption that such a constituent is RECOVERABLE from the context (the first clause in this case). In theoretical terms (Transformational Grammar), the CONJUNCTION REDUCTION rule (Goodall 1992:311) is applied to delete the second *ate*.

However, some languages do not allow forward gapping. For example, Japanese does not allow forward gapping of verbs (Shibatani 1990:259; the order of sentences is changed):<sup>2</sup>

- (2) a. 

<i>Taroo</i>	<i>ga</i>	<i>ringo</i>	<i>o</i>	<i>tabe,</i>	<i>sosite</i>	<i>Hanako</i>	<i>ga</i>
Taroo	AGT	apple	PAT	eat	and	Hanako	AGT
		<i>mikan</i>	<i>o</i>	<i>tabeta.</i>			
		orange	PAT	ate			

'Taro ate an apple, and Hanako ate an orange.'

\* I would like to thank Linda Nicita and Taimi Metzler for their editorial/grammatical comments as well as some points I overlooked. The original version of this paper was written in December 1993 for the course 'Topics in comparative linguistics' taught by Dr. Zygmunt Frajzyngier. —Throughout the paper, I use KUNREI-SIKI romanization for examples of Japanese words and sentences; however, for authors' names I use Hepburn romanization.

<sup>1</sup> Frajzyngier (p.c.) suggests that the word DELETE (and its nominal form DELETION) implies that something exists in a structure and that something disappears as a result of a certain operation on the structure, while the word OMIT (and its nominal form OMISSION) does not imply such an operation of making something disappear. Throughout this study, I assume DELETION because I posit a structure with all overt constituents to be basic and that some principles apply to make a final, surface structure which lacks some of those overt constituents.

<sup>2</sup> Shibatani uses NOM for a SUBJECT of both intransitive and transitive sentences, and ACC for a (direct) OBJECT of a transitive sentence, but I use SUB for a subject of an intransitive sentence, AGT for a subject of a transitive sentence, and PAT for a (direct) object of an intransitive sentence. Also, I use DAT for an (indirect) object or a recipient.

- b. \**Taroo ga ringo o tabe, sosite Hanako ga*  
       Taroo AGT apple PAT eat and Hanako AGT  
           *mikan o*  
           orange PAT  $\emptyset$ .

(lit.) 'Taro ate an apple, and Hanako an orange.'

- c. *Taroo ga ringo o*  $\emptyset$  *sosite Hanako ga*  
       Taroo AGT apple PAT and Hanako AGT  
           *mikan o tabeta.*  
           orange PAT ate

(lit.) 'Taro an apple, and Hanako ate an orange'

There must always be a verb in its clause-final position in Japanese. Since a verb should always be final, only BACKWARD GAPPING is possible as in 2c. In right-branching languages such as Japanese and Turkish, backward gapping is possible; however, in German, which is left-branching on the surface but is supposed to have DEEP SOV order, has also been observed to evoke backward gapping (Maling 1972).

The difference between forward and backward gapping is represented in the following diagram (Shibatani et al. 1992:299).

- (3) Forward A ... A  $\rightarrow$  A ...  $\emptyset$   
       Backward A ... A  $\rightarrow$   $\emptyset$  ... A

(where A is a constituent)

In fact, forward gapping is natural [sic] with respect to communicative function (Shibatani et al. 1992) because of the recoverability of the deleted constituent(s), and it is observed in Japanese also.

1.2. ARGUMENT GAPPING refers to a phenomenon in which one or more arguments (constituents) are deleted when two conjoined clauses have such arguments in common. In Japanese, the backward gapping observed for verbs cannot be applied to argument gapping:<sup>3</sup>

- (4) a. \**Taroo ga*  $\emptyset$  *tabe-te, Hanako ga mikan o tabe-ta.*  
       Taroo AGT eat-CONJ Hanako AGT orange PAT eat-PAST  
       (lit.) 'Taro ate, and Hanako ate an orange.'  
       b. \**Ringo o tabe-te, Hanako ga mikan o tabe-ta.*  
           apple PAT eat-CONJ Hanako AGT orange PAT eat-PAST  
           (lit.) 'Ate an apple, and Hanako ate an orange.'

Exx. 4a-4b are considered ungrammatical because those sentences evoke questions asking for the missing arguments (for 4a, 'What did Taroo eat?' and for 4b, 'Who ate the apple?'). This is because the missing arguments (PAT in 4a and AGT in 4b) are unrecoverable from the context at the time the first clause is being processed. In these cases, only forward gapping is possible:

- (5) *Taroo ga ringo o tabe-te,  $\emptyset$  mikan o tabe-ta.*  
       Taroo AGT apple PAT eat-CONJ orange PAT eat-PAST  
       'Taro ate an apple and (Taro) ate an orange.'

Moreover, Japanese is known to allow a subjectless sentence but such subjectlessness may depend on the construction (cf. exx. 4b and 5).

However, not all arguments can be deleted in this way. Consider this sentence:

- (6) \**Taroo ga ringo o tabe-te, Hanako ga*  $\emptyset$  *tabe-ta.*  
       Taroo AGT apple PAT eat-CONJ Hanako AGT eat-PAST  
       (for 'Taro ate an apple, and Hanako ate [an apple].')

Although the PAT in the second clause is recoverable from the context (supposedly *ringo o* 'apple PAT'), Ex. 6 is regarded as ungrammatical. Therefore, recoverability from the context cannot be the only condition for argument gapping.

#### A HYPOTHESIS

2.1. SOME EXPLANATIONS OF ARGUMENT GAPPING. Shibatani et al. 1992 give two conditions under which arguments may be deleted (not restricted to a coordinate conjunction construction): (a) when co-referential elements are involved; that is, the element(s) deleted can be recovered from the corresponding elements of the other part of the construction, as seen above; and (b) when a specific lexical item [sic] is deleted; for example, in the case of

imperatives in English, a subject *you* is almost always deleted in the surface structure.<sup>4</sup> In both conditions, the recoverability of the deleted argument(s) is assumed: construction-internal recoverability for (a) and construction-external one for (b).

However, as mentioned in the previous section, recoverability does not always explain the phenomenon of argument gapping, at least not in Japanese. For example, the evidence offered in 5 and 6 above suggests the hypothesis that gapping may be possible only for AGT, but not for PAT, in the second clause. However, this hypothesis would have to be modified to reflect the fact that AGT is not only the argument that is deleted in argument gapping. Consider these sentences:<sup>5</sup>

- (7) a. A      *ga*      B      *o*      C      *ni*      *syookaisi-te*,  
                  AGT                   PAT                   DAT                   introduce-CONJ  
                  D      *ga*      E      *o*      F      *ni*      *syookaisi-ta*.  
                                  AGT                   PAT                   DAT                   introduce-PAST  
                  'A introduced B to C, and D introduced E to F.'
- b. A      *ga*      B      *o*      C      *ni*      *syookaisi-te*,  
                  AGT                   PAT                   DAT                   introduce-CONJ  
                  Ø      E      *o*      F      *ni*      *syookaisi-ta*.  
                                  PAT                   DAT                   introduce-PAST  
                  'A introduced B to C, and A introduced E to F.'
- c. A      *ga*      B      *o*      C      *ni*      *syookaisi-te*,  
                  AGT                   PAT                   DAT                   introduce-CONJ  
                  D      *ga*      E      *o*      Ø      *syookaisi-ta*.  
                                  AGT                   PAT                   introduce-PAST  
                  'A introduced B to C, and D introduced E to C.'
- d. ?A      *ga*      B      *o*      C      *ni*      *syookaisi-te*,  
                  AGT                   PAT                   DAT                   introduce-CONJ  
                  D      *ga*      Ø      F      *ni*      *syookaisi-ta*.  
                                  AGT                   DAT                   introduce-PAST  
                  (for 'A introduced B to C, and D introduced B to F.')

Here AGT and DAT are possible candidates for argument gapping. Therefore it is not the case that the argument in a specific grammatical relation (such as AGT or PAT) should undergo gapping. What, then, is a plausible constraint for argument gapping?

**2.2. HYPOTHESIS.** The hypothesis examined in the present study is as follows: each verb in the study has its own MARKED (obligatory) argument(s) and when that argument(s) is deleted, the clause will become ungrammatical even when it is (or they are) recoverable from the context. For instance, in the case of 5, 6 and 7 above, PAT is the marked argument, which cannot be deleted from the second clause. This hypothesis is to look at the phenomenon of argument gapping from the opposite side of recoverability. That is, while recoverability explains which argument(s) CAN be deleted, this hypothesis should explain which argument(s) CANNOT be deleted.

**2.3. BACKGROUND.** This hypothesis finds support in the concept of lexical categories (especially, nouns, adjectives, and verbs) as discussed in Frajzyngier 1985. By using coordinate conjunction construction, Frajzyngier showed (1985:118) that '[T]he distinction between the categories consists in their ability to describe relationships between objects and the states or qualities that the objects have' His diagram for verbs used to describe the relationships (propositional properties) which are maintained between verbs and their arguments (implied in the non-linguistic reality), is shown in Figure 1 (taken from Diagram 2 of Frajzyngier 1985:116). This diagram illustrates a construct in which the category VERB describes one 'action' (or 'state') and one obligatory object (connected by dark lines) and optional objects (connected by light lines).

<sup>4</sup> That is, deletion of a specific argument is STRUCTURALLY CONDITIONED in this case.

<sup>5</sup> In these examples, A, B, C, ... are all persons. They can be replaced by proper names such as *Taroo* and *John*.



- g. *suru* 'to do' — (something[PAT] at somewhere)  
 h. (ditto) — (something[PAT] with someone [ASSociative])  
 i. (ditto) — (something[PAT] at certain time [TeMPoral])  
 j. *iku* 'to go (somewhere[LOC] with someone[ASS])'  
 k. *neru* 'to sleep (somewhere[LOC] at certain time[TMP])'

In terms of template 8, these verbs were inserted into the following argument structures:

(11)	a.	(11a-d)	AGTi	DATi	PATi	Vi-te,	AGTj	DATj	PATj	Vi-ta.
	b.	(11e)	AGTi	INSTRi	PATi	Vi-te,	AGTj	INSTRj	PATj	Vi-ta.
	c.	(11f)	AGTi	LOC(in)i	PATi	Vi-te,	AGTj	LOC(in)j	PATj	Vi-ta.
	d.	(11g)	AGTi	LOC(at)i	PATi	Vi-te,	AGTj	LOC(at)j	PATj	Vi-ta.
	e.	(11h)	AGTi	ASSi	PATi	Vi-te,	AGTj	ASSj	PATj	Vi-ta.
	f.	(11i)	AGTi	TMPi	PATi	Vi-te,	AGTj	TMPj	PATj	Vi-ta.
	g.	(11j)	SUBi	ASSi	LOC(to)i	Vi-te,	SUBj	ASSj	LOC(to)j	Vi-ta.
	h.	(11k)	SUBi	TMPi	LOC(in)i	Vi-te,	SUBj	TMPj	LOC(in)j	Vi-ta.

(where i and j indicate the different lexical items)

See the Appendix for a list of actual test sentences used in the present study.

#### RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4. The results of the grammaticality judgments for the test sentences showed the following overall patterns in terms of which argument is MARKED (cannot be deleted).

- (12) — for 11a–11i (AGT X PAT): PAT  
 (except 11e, which does not have a marked argument; i.e., all arguments can be deleted)  
 — for 11j and 11k (SUB X LOC): LOC  
 (where X denotes any type of argument)

Thus we see that PAT is marked for those sentences with PAT (i.e. with a transitive verb), and LOC is marked for those intransitive construction with LOC.

In all cases, AGT or SUB is the argument which can always be deleted. After all, SUB/AGT (or in a traditional term, SUBJECT) in Japanese is not necessary even in non-coordinate sentences. Noda 1992 states that it is wasteful to say the subject all the time if some other devices can specify it. Indeed, in Japanese, it is possible to know what the subject is with the help of other devices. Noda (1992:182–3) points out that correspondence of subjects between main and subordinate clauses can be one of the factors for identification of a referent by a subject.<sup>8</sup>

As Kac (1985:6) says, about non-overt subjects,

'... to assure that for every predication in a sentence, a subject slot will be reserved for the predicate and filled in some rule-sanctioned way. How this is done in cases where the Subject is non-overt varies depending on the nature of the construction involved.'

Hence non-overt subject is not a phenomenon specific to Japanese.

The pattern which emerged from the grammaticality test and was reported in 13, suggests that those arguments which are PHYSICALLY CLOSE TO THE VERB cannot be deleted. However, it seems that so strong a suggestion would need further verification. Therefore, I reexamined the sentence in 10a (with *ageru* 'give'; AGT DAT PAT order), scrambling the order of the arguments (e.g. DAT PAT AGT, PAT AGT DAT etc.) As Japanese does not observe rigid constituent order, scrambling does not generate ungrammatical sentences as long as the arguments maintain proper postpositions. Then, I performed the same test of grammatical judgment as described in §3. The results showed a different pattern of deletable arguments. The results are as follows:

(13)	Clause-initial argument	Marked (undeletable) argument
	AGT	PAT (as in 12)
	DAT	PAT (and AGT to some extent)
	PAT	DAT

This pattern suggests that PAT can be deleted when PAT is in the initial position of the first clause of the coordinate conjunction construction. This may be because the clause-initial PAT becomes a topic of the first clause and its status as a topic is carried on to the second clause. Thus, even PAT is marked in the second clause, it can be recoverable from the context (the topic).

<sup>8</sup> Other factors include: type of a sentence (question, volition, command); expression of speaker's feeling or speaker's perception of the outside world, such as *want* for speaker's feeling; expression with directionality; honorific expression; and correspondence of subjects for two sentences adjacent to each other.

With respect to my original hypothesis, i.e. the verbs mark some arguments as more central to conveying their meaning than others, it was not strongly supported. The emergence of pattern independent of individual verb subcategorization frames but dependent on argument placement undermines the original hypothesis. However, there is evidence that some verbs may behave differently from others. In the present study, ex. 10e (with *tataku* 'to tap') allowed all of the arguments to be deleted individually. This may be because of idiosyncrasy of the verb; although the argument which the agent taps is expressed by the postposition *o* (PAT), it may not be perceived as TRUE PAT. It is the LOCATION of the tapping that the argument shows. Therefore, this kind of study may need finer distinctions in grammatical relations in terms of semantic aspects of use of language.

#### DELETION OF TWO ARGUMENTS

**5.1. GENERAL DESCRIPTION.** So far, the present study has dealt with deletion of only one argument. However, it is plausible that two (or more) arguments can be deleted from the second clause. Compare the following examples from English and Japanese (taken from Shibatani et al. 1992:303–4; partly modified). Notice that argument gapping is accompanied by the backward gapping of a verb.

- (14) a. \*John lent  $\emptyset$   $\emptyset$ , and Bill gave Mary a bicycle.  
 b. *Taroo wa Amerika ni  $\emptyset$   $\emptyset$ , Hanako wa Huransu ni*  
     AGT America to AGT France to  
     *kaado o okut-ta.*  
     card PAT send-PAST  
     'Taro sent a card to America, and Hanako to France.'  
 c. *Taroo wa Amerika ni  $\emptyset$   $\emptyset$   $\emptyset$ , Hanako wa*  
     AGT America to AGT  
     *Huransu ni kookuu-bin de kaado o okut-ta.*  
     France to airmail by card PAT send-PAST  
     'Taro sent a card to America by airmail, and Hanako to France.'

**5.2. RESULT IN CASES OF TWO-ARGUMENT DELETION.** I examined the test sentences (see the appendix) for which arguments can optionally be deleted and for which arguments cannot be deleted. Although most of the test sentences became borderline when two arguments were deleted, generally the pattern of argument deletion is as stated in 12; that is, for transitive verbs 10a through 10i, PAT must remain in a sentence, and for intransitive verbs 10j and 10k, LOC must. This supports the contention that PAT and LOC are marked. Moreover, when PAT was deleted together with another argument (either SUB, AGT, or DAT), the resulting sentences evoked a question asking for the PAT argument. This also supports the fact that PAT is necessary in the second clause.

**5.3. CASES IN WHICH TWO ARGUMENTS CAN BE DELETED.** In the previous section, I asserted that it is impossible to delete PAT from those sentences I examined. However, I found two cases (or devices) in which it is indeed possible to delete ANY two arguments (including PAT) from the sentences, and still leave the sentences grammatical.

**5.3.1. NEGATION/TOPICALIZATION.** The first device is a combination of negation of the second clause of the coordinate conjunction construction with topicalization of the entire construction. Consider the following examples:

- (15) a. ?*Taroo ga Hanako ni tyoko o age-te,*  
           AGT DAT chocolate PAT give-CONJ  
           *Zi-roo ga Masako ni kyandee o age-nakat-ta.*  
           AGT DAT candy PAT give-NEG-PAST  
           (for 'Taro gave chocolate to Hanako, but Jiro did not give candy to Masako.')
- b. *Taroo ga Hanako ni tyoko o age-te,*  
     AGT DAT chocolate PAT give-CONJ  
     *Zi-roo ga Masako ni kyandee o age-nakat-ta*  
     AGT DAT candy PAT give-NEG-PAST  
     *no wa hen da.*  
     COMP TOP strange COP  
     'It is strange that Taro gave chocolate to Hanako, but Jiro did not give candy to Masako.'



(undeletable) argument was not strongly supported, but loosely so. In the sentences examined, most transitive verbs must have a PAT argument (which roughly corresponds to the traditional DIRECT OBJECT) and intransitive verbs should have a LOC (locative) argument. The present study also showed that there are some cases in which only one argument (out of three, in the case of the test sentences here) is obligatory in certain constructions (i.e. combination of negative and topicalization in §5.3.1, and use of the postposition *mo* in §5.3.2).

The present study needs some refinement in terms of the variety of arguments and verbs. Further studies may include finer distinctions in arguments based on differences in cognitive aspects (as mentioned in §4 with respect to the verb *tataku* 'to tap'). Nonetheless, I hope that the present study can serve as a preliminary to the understanding of ARGUMENT GAPPING in Japanese.

## REFERENCES

- FRAJZYNGIER, ZYGMUNT. 1985. Propositional characterization of categories. Proceedings of the First Annual Meeting of the Pacific Linguistic Conference, Eugene, OR, 108–19.
- GOODALL, GRANT. 1992. Coordination. International encyclopedia of linguistics, ed. by William Bright, 1.311–13. New York: Oxford University Press.
- HANKAMER, JORGE. 1979. Deletion in coordinate structures. New York: Garland.
- KAC, MICHAEL B. 1985. Constraints on predicate coordination. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Linguistics Club.
- KUDO, HIROSHI; KENJI KOBAYASHI; SHINJI SANADA; TAI SUZUKI; HOZUMI TANAKA; HIROSHI TOKI; YOSHIO NITA; HIROMI HATA; FUMINORI HAYASHI; SHINJIRO MURAKI; and MASAOKI YAMANASHI. 1993. Nihongo yoosetu [Outline of the Japanese language]. Saitama, Japan: Hituzi Syoboo.
- MALING, JOAN M. 1972. On 'Gapping and the order of constituents.' Linguistic Inquiry 3.101–8.
- NODA, HISASI. 1992. Hazimete no hito no nihongo bunpoo [Japanese grammar for beginners]. Tokyo: Kurosio Syuppan.
- SCHACHTER, PAUL. 1977. Constraints on coordination. Language 53.86–103.
- SHIBATANI, MASAYOSHI. 1990. The languages of Japan. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- ; TARO KAGEYAMA; and IKUHIRO TAMORI. 1992. Gengo no koozoo: Imitoogo hen [Structure of language: Volume on semantics and syntax]. Tokyo: Kurosio Syuppan.

## APPENDIX: LIST OF TEST SENTENCES

- 10a. *ageru* 'to give'
- |              |           |               |           |                |          |                |
|--------------|-----------|---------------|-----------|----------------|----------|----------------|
| <i>Taroo</i> | <i>ga</i> | <i>Hanako</i> | <i>ni</i> | <i>tyoko</i>   | <i>o</i> | <i>age-te,</i> |
|              | AGT       |               | DAT       | chocolate      | PAT      | give-CONJ      |
| <i>Ziroo</i> | <i>ga</i> | <i>Masako</i> | <i>ni</i> | <i>kyandee</i> | <i>o</i> | <i>age-ta.</i> |
|              | AGT       |               | DAT       | candy          | PAT      | give-PAST      |
- 'Taro gave chocolate to Hanako, and Jiro gave candy to Masako.'
- 10b. *okuru* 'to send'
- |              |           |               |           |               |          |                 |
|--------------|-----------|---------------|-----------|---------------|----------|-----------------|
| <i>Taroo</i> | <i>ga</i> | <i>Hanako</i> | <i>ni</i> | <i>tegami</i> | <i>o</i> | <i>okut-te,</i> |
|              | AGT       |               | DAT       | letter        | PAT      | send-CONJ       |
| <i>Ziroo</i> | <i>ga</i> | <i>Masako</i> | <i>ni</i> | <i>kaado</i>  | <i>o</i> | <i>okut-ta.</i> |
|              | AGT       |               | DAT       | card          | PAT      | send-PAST       |
- 'Taro sent a letter to Hanako, and Jiro sent a card to Masako.'
- 10c. *tugeru* 'to tell'
- |              |           |               |           |             |          |                 |
|--------------|-----------|---------------|-----------|-------------|----------|-----------------|
| <i>Taroo</i> | <i>ga</i> | <i>Hanako</i> | <i>ni</i> | <i>ai</i>   | <i>o</i> | <i>tuge-te,</i> |
|              | AGT       |               | DAT       | love        | PAT      | tell-CONJ       |
| <i>Ziroo</i> | <i>ga</i> | <i>Masako</i> | <i>ni</i> | <i>toki</i> | <i>o</i> | <i>tuge-ta.</i> |
|              | AGT       |               | DAT       | time        | PAT      | tell-PAST       |
- 'Taro told his love to Hanako, and Jiro told the time to Masako.'
- 10d. *kakeru* 'to "put"'
- |              |           |               |           |              |          |                 |
|--------------|-----------|---------------|-----------|--------------|----------|-----------------|
| <i>Taroo</i> | <i>ga</i> | <i>Hanako</i> | <i>ni</i> | <i>denwa</i> | <i>o</i> | <i>kake-te,</i> |
|              | AGT       |               | DAT       | telephone    | PAT      | 'put'-CONJ      |
| <i>Ziroo</i> | <i>ga</i> | <i>Masako</i> | <i>ni</i> | <i>koe</i>   | <i>o</i> | <i>kake-ta.</i> |
|              | AGT       |               | DAT       | voice        | PAT      | 'put'-PAST      |
- 'Taro called Hanako over the phone, and Jiro addressed Masako.'



10e. *tataku* 'to tap'

<i>Taroo</i>	<i>ga</i>	<i>te</i>	<i>de</i>	<i>tukue</i>	<i>o</i>	<i>tatai-te,</i>
	AGT	hand	INSTR	desk	PAT	tap-CONJ
<i>Ziroo</i>	<i>ga</i>	<i>ashi</i>	<i>de</i>	<i>yuka</i>	<i>o</i>	<i>tatai-ta.</i>
	AGT	foot	INSTR	floor	PAT	tap-PAST

'Taro tapped a desk by hand, and Jiro tapped the floor with his foot.'

10f. *oku* 'to put (in a place)'

<i>Taroo</i>	<i>ga</i>	<i>daidokoro</i>	<i>ni</i>	<i>kabin</i>	<i>o</i>	<i>oi-te,</i>
	AGT	kitchen	LOC	vase	PAT	put-CONJ
<i>Ziroo</i>	<i>ga</i>	<i>sinsitu</i>	<i>ni</i>	<i>terebi</i>	<i>o</i>	<i>oi-ta.</i>
	AGT	bedroom	LOC	TV	PAT	put-PAST

'Taro put a vase in the kitchen, and Jiro put a TV set in the bedroom.'

10g. *suru* 'to do' with LOC

<i>Taroo</i>	<i>ga</i>	<i>gakkoo</i>	<i>de</i>	<i>sakkaa</i>	<i>o</i>	<i>si-te,</i>
	AGT	school	LOC	soccer	PAT	do-CONJ
<i>Ziroo</i>	<i>ga</i>	<i>zinzya</i>	<i>de</i>	<i>yakyuu</i>	<i>o</i>	<i>si-ta.</i>
	AGT	shrine	LOC	baseball	PAT	do-PAST

'Taro played soccer in school, and Jiro played baseball at the shrine.'

10h. *suru* 'to do' with ASSOC

<i>Taroo</i>	<i>ga</i>	<i>Hanako</i>	<i>to</i>	<i>sukii</i>	<i>o</i>	<i>si-te,</i>
	AGT		ASSOC	ski	PAT	do-CONJ
<i>Ziroo</i>	<i>ga</i>	<i>Masako</i>	<i>to</i>	<i>sukeeto</i>	<i>o</i>	<i>si-ta.</i>
	AGT		ASSOC	skate	PAT	do-PAST

'Taro skied with Hanako, and Jiro skated with Masako.'

10i. *suru* 'to do' with TMP

<i>Taroo</i>	<i>ga</i>	<i>kinoo</i>	<i>sukii</i>	<i>o</i>	<i>si-te,</i>		
	AGT	yesterday	ski	PAT	do-CONJ		
<i>Ziroo</i>	<i>ga</i>	<i>ototoi</i>			<i>sukeeto</i>	<i>o</i>	<i>si-ta.</i>
	AGT	day.before.yesterday			skate	PAT	do-PAST

'Taro skied yesterday, and Jiro skated the day before yesterday.'

10j. *iku* 'to go'

<i>Taroo</i>	<i>ga</i>	<i>Hanako</i>	<i>to</i>	<i>gakkoo</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>it-te,</i>
	SUB		ASSOC	school	LOC	go-CONJ
<i>Ziroo</i>	<i>ga</i>	<i>Masako</i>	<i>to</i>	<i>zinzya</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>it-ta.</i>
	SUB		ASSOC	shrine	LOC	go-PAST

'Taro went to school with Hanako, and Jiro went to a shrine with Masako.'

10k. *neru* 'to sleep'

<i>Taroo</i>	<i>ga</i>	<i>kinoo</i>	<i>beddo</i>	<i>de</i>	<i>ne-te,</i>	
	SUB	yesterday	bed	LOC	sleep-CONJ	
<i>Ziroo</i>	<i>ga</i>	<i>ototoi</i>		<i>sofaa</i>	<i>de</i>	<i>ne-ta.</i>
	SUB	day.before.yesterday		sofa	LOC	sleep-PAST

'Taro slept on a bed yesterday, and Jiro slept on a sofa the day before yesterday.'