

First Objects and Datives: Two of a Kind?

Beth Levin
Stanford University
(beth.levin@stanford.edu)

1 The big question

There are two options for expressing recipients in English with dative verbs—verbs taking agent, recipient, and theme arguments, such as *give* and other verbs of causation of possession.

- (1) a. Terry gave Sam an apple. (double object construction)
b. Terry gave an apple to Sam. (*to* construction)

Many languages which lack a double object construction still have a core (i.e., nonadjunct) grammatical relation, distinct from subject and object, used to express recipient. Specifically, many languages have a dative case and use the dative (case marked) NP as the basic realization of possessors, including recipients of verbs of causation of possession.

- (2) Ja dal Ivanu knigu.
I.NOM give.PST Ivan.DAT book.ACC
'I gave Ivan a book.' (RUSSIAN; dative construction)

A PERENNIAL QUESTION: What is the status of the first object in the double object construction?

— Is it comparable to the object of a transitive verb?

AN ANSWER: YES is implicit in the label “first/primary/inner object” and is supported by its passivizability and postverbal position; cf. Dryer’s (1986) “primary object languages”.

- (3) Sam was given an apple.

— Is it comparable to the dative NP of languages with a dative case?

AN ANSWER: In the context of the answer to the previous question, NO is the usual answer given; it is the NP in the *to* phrase in the *to* construction that is equated with the dative NP.

THE COMPLICATION: Repeated observations that despite surface similarities with direct objects, recipients in the double object construction do not show all direct object properties (e.g., Baker 1997; Hudson 1992; Maling 2001; Marantz 1993; Polinsky 1996; Ziv & Sheintuch 1979).

GETTING TO THE ROOT OF THE COMPLICATION: As in discussions of subjecthood, it is necessary to distinguish between coding, behavioral, semantic, and discourse properties of the first object.

THE PROPOSAL: The “first object” in the English double object construction is not like the direct object of an English transitive verb, but rather like a dative NP in languages with such NPs.

There are, then, two dedicated modes of expressing recipients:

- the first object in a double object frame
- a dative NP

CONSEQUENCE: The *to* NP in the English *to* construction is not comparable to a dative NP.

Rather *to* is an allative preposition, primarily indicating spatial goals, but also extended in some languages to other argument types, including recipients, since by the Localist Hypothesis (Gruber 1965; Jackendoff 1972, 1983) they may be seen as a kind of goal.

The *to* construction is an instance of an “allative” construction.

As expected if the first object is the analogue of a dative NP, it does not show all object properties.

However, the distribution of object properties in the double object construction is principled:

- properties involving “theta-role assignment” always choose the theme and never the recipient
- coding properties to the extent that they encode information structure may choose the recipient

The parallels between the first object and the dative NP have two sources:

- Some arise because both can express a common semantic role: recipient.
- Others arise because typically recipients are animate and themes inanimate, making recipients information structurally more prominent than themes; this property, however, plays out differently because of their different coding.

2 Properties that the first object shares with the dative NP

2.1 The morphosyntactic encoding of recipients across languages

SIEWIERSKA’S (1998) GENERALIZATION: Based on a study of approximately 260 languages, Siewierska finds that no language which has a “true” dative case (i.e., use of a marker which is distinct from allative or locative markers) has a double object construction or a construction in which the recipient and theme receive the same encoding.

If the double object construction really involved “objecthood”, as its name “double object” suggests, Siewierska’s generalization would be unexpected.

Rather, this observation suggests that crosslinguistically dative NPs and first objects—and thus the dative construction and double object construction—are in complementary distribution. Given this, they might be considered two sides of the same coin.

Crosslinguistically, then, three constructions are associated with the expression of recipients:

- DOUBLE OBJECT CONSTRUCTION (recipient as possessor):
theme–second object, recipient–first object
- DATIVE CONSTRUCTION (recipient as possessor): theme–object, recipient–dative NP
- ALLATIVE CONSTRUCTION (recipient as goal): theme–object, recipient–allative/locative NP/PP

A given language’s mode of realizing recipients depends on its morphosyntactic resources, but a given language will have only one of the first two syntactic constructions.

2.2 Evidence from the crosslinguistic distribution of various phenomena

Gerds (1993) differentiates between direct object-centered languages, i.e., languages with a double object construction, and indirect object-centered languages, i.e., languages with a dative case.

Gerds compares direct object-centered languages and indirect object-centered languages, showing that a range of constructions attested in one language type is not attested in the other.

There is a reason for the complementary distribution: certain phenomena are instantiated in distinct ways in the two language types. Essentially, they involve a first object (a '2' in Relational Grammar terms) in the direct object-centered languages and a dative NP (a '3') in the indirect object-centered languages. Gerds takes these patterns to be signatures of the two language types.

| HALKOMELEM (Direct object-centered) | GEORGIAN (Indirect object-centered) |
|--|--|
| 3-to-2 advancement (i.e., dative shift) | initial 3 as final 3 |
| benefactive-to-2 advancement | benefactive-to-3 advancement |
| other advancements to 2 | other advancements to 3 |
| possessor revalued to 2 | possessor revalued to 3 |
| causee-to-2 revaluation (transitives) | causee-to-3 revaluation (transitives) |

NOTE: '1' = subject, '2' = direct object, '3' = dative NP.

The complementary distribution of these pairs of phenomena further supports Siewierska's proposal that first objects and dative NPs are in complementary distribution and suggests both realize the same set of semantic notions (recipient, inalienable possessor, "low" benefactive à la Pyłkkänen (2000), causee).

2.3 Evidence from syntactic domain asymmetries

In both the double object and dative constructions, the same structural relation holds between the recipient and theme: with respect to Barss/Lasnik (1986) asymmetries, the theme may be in the domain of the recipient, independent of its expression as a first object or a dative NP.

- (4) a. Susan sent every owner_i his_i dog. (Harley 2003)
 b. *Susan sent his_i owner every dog_i.
- (5) a. Agimi ia ktheu librin e tij_i [secilit autor]_i
 Agim-NOM 3sD3sA return book-ACC his_i [each-DAT author]_i
 'Agim returned to each author his book.'
 (ALBANIAN; Marantz 1993:118, (7b); from Massey 1990, 1991)
- b. John Salax le-kol ima_i et ha-ben Sela_i.
 John sent to-every mother ACC the-son her
 'John sent every mother her son.' (HEBREW; Landau 1994:22, (28b))
- c. La profesora le pasó a limpio su_i dibujo a cada niño_i.
 the teacher.F CL.3SG gave back-cleared his drawing to each child
 'The teacher gave each child back his/her cleared drawing.'
 (SPANISH; Demonte 1995:11, (10a'))

In contrast, in the *to* construction the recipient is in the domain of the theme.

- (6) Susan sent every dog_i to his_i owner.

3 Reexamining the distribution of object properties across recipient and theme in English

If the first object in some languages is the analogue of a dative NP in others, the first object in the double object construction isn't expected to show all direct object properties, despite its name.

This prediction is unsurprising as not all "object" properties have the same status (cf. Keenan 1976 on subjects):

- Some properties are semantic role-related, i.e., event-based properties of arguments.
- Others are sensitive to the nature of the NP that fills that a semantic role.

L&RH (2005a) suggest that event-based properties of arguments determine their basic grammatical relation, but filler-based properties of arguments are relevant to the morphosyntactic realization of these grammatical relations; see also Evans (1998) and Haspelmath (2004).

3.1 Object properties associated with theme rather than recipient

With respect to nominalization, compound formation and secondary predication, the theme—and never the recipient—of dative verbs patterns like the object of a transitive verb (Baker 1996, 1997; Marantz 1997; Maling 2001).

- (7) a. Nominalization:
 the giving of gifts to the homeless
 * the giving of the homeless (of) gifts. (Fraser 1970:92)
- b. Compound formation:
 secret-telling (to spies), book-reading (to children)
 * spy-telling (of secrets), *child-reading (of books)
- c. Secondary predication:
 I gave Mary the meat raw.
 * I gave Mary the meat hungry.
 I gave the meat to Mary raw.

(based on Baker (1997:90–94))

Mohawk only has the equivalent of the English double object construction for dative verbs, as in (8a), and has nothing comparable to the English *to* construction, as shown in (8b); yet, even in Mohawk only the theme can incorporate, as in (9), again like a transitive object.

- (8) a. O'neróhkwa' y-a-hiy-at^nyéht-^-' ne Shawátis.
 box TRANS-FACT-1sS/MsO-send-BEN-PUNC NE John
 'I sent John a box.'
- b. *O'neróhkwa' y-a-k-at^yeht-e' Shawátis-hne.
 box TRANS-FACT-1sS/NsO-send-PUNC Shawatis-LOC
 'I sent a box to John.'

(MOHAWK; Baker 1997:97, (44))

- (9) a. Se'wáhr-a-nut ne érhár.
 2sS/MsO-meat-0-feed NE dog
 'Feed the (male) dog some meat!' (theme incorporated)
- b. *O-'wáhr-u se-náhskw-a-nut.
 NsO-meat-nsf 2sS-pet-0-feed
 'Feed the pet some meat!' (recipient incorporated)
- (MOHAWK; Baker 1997:100, (48))

This data presents a particularly striking contrast with the comparable locative alternation data: both the material and location arguments show the comparable “object” properties.

- (10) a. Smith loaded hay on the truck. (locative variant)
 Smith loaded the truck with hay. (*with*-variant)
- b. Nominalization:
 the loading of the hay onto the truck
 the loading of the truck with hay
- c. Compound formation:
 hay-loading
 truck-loading
- d. Secondary predication:
 John loaded the hay into the wagon green.
 John loaded the wagon full with hay. (Williams 1984:204, (2a,b))
- (based on Baker (1997:90–94))

Maling (2001) proposes that the object properties that the recipient lacks have a semantic basis.

If she is correct, these properties always stick with the theme of a dative verb because in contrast to the locative alternation, the recipient is never eligible to be analyzed as a “theme” (RH&L 2005), some analyses of the dative alternation notwithstanding.

Furthermore, in languages with a dative NP, the recipient still does not show these properties (e.g., Maling (2001) on German), consistent with the proposal that they might have a semantic basis and consistent with the proposed first object/dative NP parallels.

Thus, the data in (7) and (9) shows that in the double object construction the recipient is an object in a rather superficial sense, supporting the proposed parallels between the English first object and the dative NP of other languages.

3.2 Object properties associated with the recipient in the double object construction

In languages with the double object construction the recipient often “usurps” from the theme — coding properties of objects, i.e., word order, case marking, agreement (Dryer 1986), — the ability to passivize, a coding property in an extended sense (cf. Aissen 1999).

An example: The English double object construction.

The recipient is adjacent to the verb and is the subject of the corresponding passive.

- (11) a. Sandy sent Terry the package.
 b. * Sandy sent the package Terry.
- (12) a. Terry was sent the package.
 b. ?? The package was sent Terry.
- (13) a. Sandy sent the package yesterday.
 b. The package was sent yesterday.

The surface coding of an argument in a language depends on the interaction of its semantic role—an event-based property of an argument—with properties of the NPs filling that argument position. Specifically, coding is often sensitive to animacy, with animate NPs more likely to receive explicit coding or with animates and inanimates having distinct treatment (e.g., differential object marking).

In some languages there is clear evidence that coding is particularly sensitive to animacy:
 with dative verbs, not only recipients but also animate themes are singled out for coding.
 Sesotho is such a language (Morolong and Hyman 1977).

Properties of the Sesotho double object construction:

- when the verb has two animate or two inanimate nonagent arguments,
 either can be the subject of a passive or can trigger object agreement
- when the verb takes an inanimate beneficiary and an animate theme,
 the animate theme is the subject of a passive and triggers object agreement

It is not surprising, then, that more generally in double object constructions coding properties choose the recipient, which is typically animate, over the theme, which is typically inanimate.

4 The English *to* construction is not a dative construction

- The English *to* construction is sometimes taken to be the analogue of the dative construction, yet:
- there are distributional restrictions on both verbs and their arguments in the
 double object construction that are mirrored in the dative construction.
 - distributional restrictions on the *to* construction are not mirrored in the dative construction.

The shared semantic restrictions arise as the dative NP and the first object both express recipients; in contrast, English *to* is an allative marker, expressing a different set of semantic notions, and showing a different distribution.

NOTE: These parallels are obscured in certain languages, including Hebrew and French, where there is a partial overlap in certain forms of the allative and dative markers. Once this overlap is teased apart, the distributional parallels are observed.

4.1 The parallel distribution of verbs in the double object and dative constructions

Across languages, there is a core semantic class of verbs found in the double object and dative NP constructions; other classes show varying propensities for being found in these constructions, with those classes that are most likely to be found in the double object construction being the ones most likely to be found in the dative construction.

The distribution of verbs in the English double object construction:

(14) Verbs found in the double object construction:

- a. Verbs that inherently signify acts of giving: *give, pass, hand, sell, pay, trade, lend, loan, serve, feed*
- b. Verbs of sending: *send, mail, ship*
- c. Verbs of instantaneous causation of ballistic motion (Verbs of throwing): *throw, toss, flip, slap, kick, poke, fling, shoot, blast*
- d. Verbs of continuous causation of accompanied motion in a deictically specified direction: *bring, take*
- e. Verbs of future having: *offer, promise, bequeath, leave, refer, forward, allocate, guarantee, allot, assign, allow, advance, award, reserve, grant*

(Gropen et al. 1989:243-244)

(15) Verbs not found in the double object construction:

- a. Verbs of fulfilling: *credit, present, entrust, supply, trust*
- b. Verbs of continuous causation of accompanied motion in some manner: *carry, pull, push, schlep, lift, lower, haul*

(Gropen et al. 1989:244)

(NOTE: “benefactive” and manner of speaking/communication examples are ignored.)

BEYOND ENGLISH: A HIERARCHY OF VERB CLASSES (Levin 2004)

Croft proposes a hierarchy based on three verbs in English, Icelandic, German, Dutch:

(16) Ditransitivity Hierarchy: ‘give’ < ‘send’ < ‘throw’

(i) If there are constraints on the distribution of a ditransitive [=double object or dative] construction the construction will be associated with the higher end of the Ditransitivity Hierarchy;

(ii) If there are constraints on the distribution of an oblique [=allative] construction, especially a spatial oblique construction, the construction will be associated with the lower end of a Ditransitivity Hierarchy.

(Croft et. al. 2001:2)

The verbs in this hierarchy are representative of major classes figuring in lists of dative verbs:

‘give’ — Verbs that inherently signify acts of giving

‘send’ — Verbs of sending

‘throw’ — Verbs of instantaneous causation of ballistic motion

A survey of some other languages fill out this picture, while showing patterns of data that are consistent with (16).

NOTE: The languages surveyed have double object constructions, as in English, or other syntactically comparable constructions: usually, involving a dative NP (Siewierska 1998), but also a clitic doubled dative, as in Spanish (Bleam 2003; Demonte 1995), or a genitive NP, as in Greek (Anagnostopoulou 2003).

| | Greek | English | Warlpiri | Dutch | Mandarin | Fongbe | Yaqui |
|----------------------|-------|---------|----------|-------|----------|--------|-------|
| GIVING | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Future having | Yes | Yes | ND | Yes | Yes | ND | ND |
| SENDING | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | ND | No |
| Bring/Take | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | ND | ND |
| THROWING | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No |
| Fulfilling | Yes | No | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND |
| Continuous causation | No? | No? | No | No | ND | ND | ND |

(ND = no data available; data sources: Dutch — Colleman (n.d.); Fongbe — Lefebvre (1994:117-118), Lefebvre and Brousseau (2002:472-473); Greek — Anagnostopoulou (2003:12-13); Mandarin Chinese — Chung & Gordon (1998:113), Grano (p.c.); Warlpiri (Legate 2003); Yaqui — Guerrero Valenzuela (2002, p.c.)

The parallel distributional restrictions on the verbs found in the two constructions extend to a very fine-grained level of detail: e.g., controversy about whether verbs of continuous causation of accompanied motion in some manner occur in the double object/dative construction.

INTERPRETING THE PATTERNS

The convergence in distribution of semantic verb classes across the double object and dative constructions arises because both provide a dedicated expression for recipients and the classes most often found are those that necessarily have a recipient or are most easily construed as having one.

The classes of verbs found in the two constructions are of two types:

- (17) Verbs that lexically select recipients—i.e., possessional goals;
- a. Verbs that inherently signify acts of giving: *give, hand, lend, loan, rent, sell, ...*
 - b. Verbs of future having: *allocate, allow, bequeath, forward, grant, offer, promise, ...*
- (18) Verbs that lexically select spatial goals
- a. Verbs of sending: *mail, send, ship, ...*
 - b. Verbs of instantaneous causation of ballistic motion (Verbs of throwing): *fling, flip, kick, lob, slap, shoot, throw, toss, ...*
 - c. Verbs of causing accompanied motion in a deictically specific direction: *bring, take*

A more detailed view:

- VERBS OF GIVING: Their event structure has the form of an externally caused change of state, with the state represented by a primitive predicate HAVE (Tham 2004).

- (19) [[x ACT] CAUSE [BECOME [y HAVE<POSS-TYPE> z]]]

Why can this event structure give rise to two argument realization options?

Recipients may be realized in two ways in English, as they meet the semantic characterizations associated with two distinct syntactic realizations (cf. Goldsmith 1980):

— THE FIRST OBJECT IN THE DOUBLE OBJECT CONSTRUCTION: It is dedicated to the expression of a “projected possessor” (Goldsmith 1980:429; see also Goldberg 1995; Green 1974; Oehrle 1976; Pinker 1989). A recipient, as a type of possessor, can be expressed as the first object.

— THE OBJECT OF *to*: It is much less semantically restricted than the first object and indicates a wide range of argument types, broadly falling under semantic categories covered by the dative and allative cases in other languages, including recipients, spatial goals, and some arguments that are less clearly goals (e.g., *yield to*, *submit to*, *surrender to*, *subject to*).

• VERBS WHICH SELECT SPATIAL GOALS: These verbs have two distinct event structures.

— They have “roots” that are naturally associated with a caused motion event structure:

(20) [[x ACT_{<THROW>}] CAUSE [y GO [PATH z]]]

— Such roots also may be associated with a causative change of possession event structure (Croft et al. 2001; Levin 2004), and, hence, may be found in the double object construction or its equivalent in other languages.

(21) [[x ACT_{<THROW>}] CAUSE [y HAVE z]]

This option is available because, as Goldberg (1997) proposes, verbs may be integrated into constructions via a force-dynamic relation—in this instance, a means or instrument relation. However, it may not be exploited in all languages, explaining Croft et al.’s Ditransitivity Hierarchy.

A FURTHER NOTE ON VERBS OF GIVING AND THE DATIVE ALTERNATION:

The dative alternation arises “because there are many cases in which the meaning of the dative [first object] position roughly coincides with the meaning of the preposition *to*” (Goldsmith 1980:424).

The dative alternation does not reflect polysemy on the part of verbs of giving, as argued extensively in RH&L (2005). That is, verbs of giving, unlike verbs such as *throw*, are not associated with two event structures, a causation of possession structure and a caused motion event structure.

There is no evidence that English verbs of giving select for a spatial goal argument, even when found in the *to* construction. As shown by RH&L (2005), in this construction, they lack certain basic properties of verbs like *throw*, which select spatial goals.

(22) The *to*-phrase cannot be questioned by locative *where* (Levinson 2005):

- a. To whom/*where did you give the ball?
- b. To whom/where did you throw the ball?

4.2 The verb *send* and its counterparts

The English verb *send* and its translation equivalents make a strong case that the double object construction and the dative construction are analogous semantically, differing from the *to* construction.

This verb may show two event structures, which are distributed as follows:

- a caused motion event structure: only the *to* construction or its counterparts
- a causation of possession event structure: double object/dative construction (primarily)

Furthermore, there is an interaction between argument choice and sense choice:

- With an inanimate theme and a possessional goal, both event structures are available in principle, though the causation of possession sense—the strongest possible meaning—is preferred.
- With an inanimate theme and a purely spatial goal, only the caused motion option is available.

- (23) a. We sent the package to the border.
b. * We sent the border the package.

- With an animate theme, there is no possessive relation and only the caused motion option is available.

AN EXAMPLE: If a teacher sends some children to the principal, the principal does not, as a result, have the children, while if someone sends the principal a letter, he does, as a result, have the letter.

- (24) a. * The principal got the children.
b. The principal got the letter.
- (25) a. The teacher sent the children to the principal.
b. * The teacher sent the principal the children.

THE RUSSIAN VERB *poslat* 'SEND'

In languages with a dative case, such as Russian, the argument choices that preclude the double object construction also preclude the dative construction.

- In Russian, the dative construction is never found when *poslat* 'send' takes an inanimate theme and a purely spatial goal.

- (26) * Ja poslal knigu Moskve.
I.NOM send book.ACC Moscow.DAT
'I sent the book to Moscow.'

- Nor is the dative construction found when *poslat* takes an animate theme.

- (27) * Ja poslal učenikov direktoru.
I.NOM send students.ACC director.DAT
'I sent the children to the director.'

In such examples the allative preposition *k* is used, suggesting that no recipient is involved.

- (28) Ja poslal učenikov k direktoru.
I.NOM send students.ACC K director.DAT
'I sent the children to the director.'

- A dative NP may be found with *poslat* ‘send’, but only in describing events of causation of possession, where the dative indicates a recipient.

(29) Ja poslal emu knigu.
 I.NOM sent he.DAT book.ACC
 ‘I sent him a book.’

These distributional properties of the Russian dative construction would be unexpected if it were the analogue of the *to* construction.

Comparable facts may be found in Hebrew (Botwinik-Rotem 2003; Francez 2002, 2005) and French, once overlaps between dative and allative markers are controlled for.

5 The object properties of English recipients revisited

Why should the first object in the English double object construction show object coding?

A large part of the answer lies in recognizing the dual function of English surface word order: encoding argument realization and encoding information structure.

In English, surface word order conveys information structure, with given information preceding new information.

With dative verbs, since recipients are typically human, they are likely to be given, while themes are typically inanimates and, thus, less likely to be given.

THE CONSEQUENCE: For information structure purposes, English needs a construction where recipients linearly precede themes: The double object construction fills this need.

In the double object construction, a recipient shows object coding properties not due to its semantic role, but to satisfy information structure constraints on the typical agent-theme-recipient clause.

In fact, studies of texts show the distribution of the double object and *to* constructions is largely governed by information structure considerations, interacting with heaviness considerations (e.g., Arnold et al. 2000; Davidse 1996; Erteschik-Shir 1979; Givón 1984; Polinsky 1996; Ransom 1979; Snyder 2003; Thompson 1990, 1995; Wasow 1997, 2002).

These studies show there is an overall preference for the double object construction since recipients are typically human and, therefore, likely to be given, while themes are typically inanimates and, therefore, less likely to be given.

(30) a. Nixon’s behavior gave Mailer an idea for a book.
 b. #Nixon’s behavior gave an idea for a book to Mailer.
 (Snyder 2003:35, (47a,b), (48))

Most likely, in (30) the recipient, *Mailer*, is the topic of conversation and thus given, while the theme, *an idea for a book*, is new information.

If there is a scenario in which the notion of a book idea may be given, the *to* construction is fine.

(31) A: It is very difficult to get book ideas simply from interviews.
 B: Well, interviewing Nixon gave an idea for a book to Mailer.

MOVING BEYOND ENGLISH

- Many languages, even ones closely related to English (e.g., German), lack a dative alternation (Baker 1997; Dryer 1986)—that is, the availability of both double object and *to* constructions.
- Languages with a dative construction, such as Russian, which by definition have a dedicated dative case, usually lack a “dative alternation” in the sense of English.
- Such languages also tend to have freer word order than English, presumably due to the presence of morphological case. Rather, information structure demands on word order can be met independent of the surface coding of grammatical relations: the recipient may precede the theme, while maintaining its dative case.

(32) Ja dal Ivanu knigu.
I.NOM give.PST Ivan.DAT book.ACC
'I gave Ivan a book.' (RUSSIAN; dative construction)

(33) *Ja dal knigu k Ivanu.
I.NOM give.PST book.ACC K Ivan.DAT
'I gave a book to Ivan.' (RUSSIAN; intended meaning; allative construction)

- In such languages there is no information structure motivation for an alternate case assignment to recipients, explaining why recipients of verbs like *give* are expressed as dative NPs and not encoded as allatives, as in (33).
- If word order becomes fixed in a language which previously had free word order, the dative alternation might be expected to arise as it would provide a way to meet the demands that information structure and heaviness place on word order, while using word order to encode argument realization. Precisely this seems to have happened in English, whose dative alternation seems to have arisen as the case system deteriorated and word order became fixed.

6 Conclusions

- There is much to be gained by considering the double object construction and the dative construction to be comparable.
- Recognizing these parallels sets the stage for productively reexamining other puzzles posed by dative verbs, and by the overlapping distribution of dative and locative/allative cases/adpositions in some languages (Aristar 1996), most likely attributable to recipients being analyzed as a type of goal via the Localist Hypothesis.

References

- Aissen, J. (1999) “Markedness and Subject Choice in Optimality Theory”, *NLLT* 17, 673-711.
Anagnostopoulou, E. (2002) *The Syntax of Ditransitives: Evidence from Clitics*, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.
Aristar, A.R. (1996) “The Relationship between Dative and Locative: Kuryłowicz’s Argument from a Typological Perspective”, *Diachronica* 13, 207-224.
Arnold, J.E. et al. (2000) “Heaviness vs. Newness: The Effects of Structural Complexity and Discourse Status on Constituent Ordering”, *Language* 76, 28-55.

- Baker, M.C. (1997) "Thematic Roles and Syntactic Structure" in L. Haegeman, ed., *Elements of Grammar. Handbook of Generative Syntax*, Kluwer, Dordrecht, 73-137.
- Barss, A. and H. Lasnik (1986) "A Note on Anaphora and Double Objects", *Linguistic Inquiry* 17, 347-354.
- Botwinik-Rotem, I. (2003) "The Thematic and Syntactic Status of Ps: The Dative, Directional, Locative Distinction", in J. Lecarme, ed., *Research in Afroasiatic Grammar II*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam, 79-104.
- Chung, T.T.R. and P. Gordon (1998) "The Acquisition of Chinese Dative Constructions", *BUCLD* 22, 109-120.
- Colleman, T. (n.d.) "The Double Object Construction and Dative Alternation in Dutch and English", unpublished ms., Ghent University.
- Croft, W., J. Barddal, W. Hollmann, M. Nielsen, V. Sotirova, and C. Taoka (2001) "Discriminating Verb Meanings: The Case of Transfer Verbs", handout, LAGB Autumn Meeting, Reading.
- Davidse, K. (1996) "Functional Dimensions of the Dative in English", in W. van Belle and W. van Langendonck, eds., *The Dative Volume 1: Descriptive Studies*, Benjamins, Amsterdam, 289-338.
- Demonte, V. (1995) "Dative Alternation in Spanish", *Probus* 7, 5-30.
- Dryer, M. (1986) "On Primary Objects, Secondary Objects and Antidative", *Language* 62, 808-845.
- Erteschik-Shir, N. (1979) "Discourse Constraints on Dative Movement", in T. Givón, ed., *Syntax and Semantics 12: Discourse and Syntax*, Academic Press, New York, 441-467.
- Evans, N. (1997) "Role or Cast", in A. Alsina, J. Bresnan, and P. Sells, eds., *Complex Predicates*, CSLI Publications, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, 397-430.
- Fraser, B. (1970) "Some Remarks on the Action Nominalization in English", in R.A. Jacobs and P.S. Rosenbaum, eds., *Readings in English Transformational Grammar*, Ginn, Waltham, MA, 83-98.
- Francez, I. (2002) "Hebrew *el* and *le* and the Pronominal Suffixes", unpublished ms., Stanford University, Stanford, CA.
- Francez, I. (2005) "Recipients between Goals and Possessors in Hebrew and Elsewhere", handout, Lexical Semantics Research Workshop, Stanford University, Stanford, CA.
- Gerds, D.B. (1993) "Mapping Halkomelem Grammatical Relations", *Linguistics* 31, 591-621.
- Givón, T. (1984) "Direct Object and Dative Shifting: Semantic and Pragmatic Case", in F. Plank, ed., *Objects*, Academic Press, London, 151-182.
- Goldberg, A.E. (1995) *Constructions*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL.
- Goldberg, A. (1997) "The Relationships between Verbs and Constructions", in M. Verspoor, K.D. Lee, and E. Sweetser, eds., *Lexical and Syntactical Constructions and the Construction of Meaning*, Benjamins, Amsterdam, 383-398.
- Goldsmith, J. (1980) "Meaning and Mechanism in Grammar", in S. Kuno, ed., *Harvard Studies in Syntax and Semantics*, 423-449.
- Green, G. (1974) *Semantics and Syntactic Regularity*, Indiana University Press.
- Gropen, J., S. Pinker, M. Hollander, R. Goldberg, and R. Wilson (1989) "The Learnability and Acquisition of the Dative Alternation in English", *Language* 65, 203-257.
- Gruber, J.S. (1965) *Studies in Lexical Relations*, Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Guerrero Valenzuela, L. (2002) "Macroroles and Double-Object Constructions in Yaqui", unpublished ms., SUNY Buffalo, Buffalo, NY.
- Harley, H. (2003) "Possession and the Double Object Construction", in P. Pica and J. Rooryck, eds., *Linguistic Variation Yearbook 2*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam, 31-70.
- Haspelmath, M. (2004) "Explaining the Ditransitive Person-Role Constraint: A Usage-based Approach", *Constructions* 2/2004. (www.constructions-online.de)
- Hudson, R. (1992) "So-Called 'Double Objects' and Grammatical Relations", *Language* 68, 251-276.
- Jackendoff, R.S. (1972) *Semantic Interpretation in Generative Grammar*, MIT Press.
- Jackendoff, R.S. (1983) *Semantics and Cognition*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Keenan, E.L. (1976) "Towards a Universal Definition of 'Subject'", in C.N. Li, ed., *Subject and Topic*, Academic Press, New York, 303-333.

- Landau, I. (1994) *Dative Shift and Extended VP-Shells*, MA thesis, Tel Aviv University.
- Legate, J.A. (2003) *Warlpiri: Theoretical Implications*, Doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge.
- Lefebvre, C. (1994) "New Facts from Fongbe on the Double Object Construction:", *Lingua* 94, 69-123.
- Lefebvre, C. and A.-M. Brousseau (2002) *A Grammar of Fongbe*, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.
- Levin, B. (2004) "Verbs and Constructions: Where Next?", handout, Western Conference on Linguistics, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA.
- Levin, B. and M. Rappaport Hovav (2005) *Argument Realization*, Cambridge University Press.
- Levinson, L. (2005) "'To' in Two Places in the Dative Alternation", *Proceedings of the 28th Annual Penn Linguistics Colloquium*, Penn Working Papers in Linguistics 11.1.
- Maling, J. (2001) "Dative: The Heterogeneity of the Mapping Among Morphological Case, Grammatical Functions, and Thematic Roles", *Lingua* 111, 419-464.
- Marantz, A. (1993) "Implications of Asymmetries in Double Object Constructions", in S.A. Mchombo, ed., *Theoretical Aspects of Bantu Grammar*, CSLI Publications, 113-150.
- Massey, V.W. (1992) *Compositionality and Constituency in Albanian*, MIT Occasional Papers in Linguistics 23, Department of Linguistics and Philosophy, MIT, Cambridge, MA.
- Morolong, M. and L.M. Hyman (1977) "Animacy, Objects and Clitics in Sesotho", *Studies in African Linguistics* 8, 119-218.
- Oehrle, R.T. (1976) *The Grammatical Status of the English Dative Alternation*, Doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, MA.
- Pinker, S. (1989) *Learnability and Cognition*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Polinsky, M. (1996) "A Non-Syntactic Account of Some Asymmetries in the Double Object Construction", in J.-P. Koenig, ed., *Discourse and Cognition*, CSLI Publications, 403-22.
- Pylkkänen, L. (2000) "What Applicative Heads Apply To", *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics* 7.1, 197-210.
- Ransom, E.N. (1979) "Definiteness and Animacy Constraints on Passive and Double-Object Constructions in English", *Glossa* 13, 215-240.
- Rappaport Hovav, M. and B. Levin (1998) "Building Verb Meanings", in M. Butt and W. Geuder, eds., *The Projection of Arguments*, CSLI Publications, Stanford, CA, 97-134.

- Rappaport Hovav, M. and B. Levin (2005) "All Dative Verbs Are Not Created Equal", unpublished ms., The Hebrew University of Jerusalem and Stanford University, Jerusalem and Stanford, CA.
- Siewierska, A. (1998) "Languages with and without Objects: The Functional Grammar Approach", *Languages in Contrast* 1, 173-190.
- Snyder, K.M. (2003) *The Relationship between Form and Function in Ditransitive Constructions*, Doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA.
- Tham, S.W. (2004) *Representing Possessive Predication: Semantic Dimensions and Pragmatic Bases*, Doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, Stanford, CA.
- Thompson, S.A. (1990) "Information Flow and Dative Shift in English Discourse", in J.A. Edmondson et al., eds., *Development and Diversity*, SIL, Dallas, TX, 239-253.
- Thompson, S.A. (1995) "The Iconicity of 'Dative Shift' in English", in M.E. Landsberg, ed., *Syntactic Iconicity and Linguistic Freezes*, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, 155-175.
- Wasow, T. (1997) "Remarks on Grammatical Weight", *Language Variation and Change* 9, 81-105.
- Wasow, T. (2002) *Postverbal Behavior*, CSLI Publications, Stanford University, Stanford, CA.
- Williams, E. (1980) "Predication", *Linguistic Inquiry* 11, 203-238.
- Ziv, Y. and G. Sheintuch (1979) "Indirect Objects — Reconsidered", *CLS* 15, 390-404.