

Title: A derivational approach to the dative alternation in English

Author: Jonathan E. MacDonald

Abstract: I discuss three sets of facts on a debate regarding two approaches to the relation between the two variants of the dative alternation: inner aspect, the existence of non-alternating double object constructions and the distinct interpretations of the indirect object in the two variants. On one approach, the alternative projection approach, the two variants are not transformationally related; on the second, the transform approach, the two variants are transformationally related. I suggest that by adopting the copy theory of movement (and incorporating the role of prosody) and by abandoning the Theta Criterion, in line with minimalist thinking, these facts can easily be explained on a transform approach.

Key words: Inner aspect, double object construction, copy theory of movement, prosody

1. Introduction: The debate

Consider two representative examples of the English dative alternation in (1) and (2).

- (1) a. John gave a ball to Mary. (2) a. John threw a ball to Mary.
 b. John gave Mary a ball. b. John threw Mary a ball.

I will refer to the a. sentences as *Prepositional Dative Constructions* (PDCs) and the b. sentences as *Double Object Constructions* (DOCs).¹ Broadly speaking, two classes of

¹ I will use *indirect object* (IO) to refer to the DP interpreted as a goal/recipient/(intended) possessor in the PDC and the DOC. The IO in (1) and (2) is *Mary*. I will use *direct object* (DO) to refer to the DP interpreted as the theme/patient in

syntactic approaches to the dative alternation characterize a debate that has persisted for over the last forty years concerning the relation between PDCs and DOCs. The first class of approaches claims that PDCs are not transformationally related to DOCs; PDCs have one underlying syntactic configuration, and DOCs have an independent and distinct underlying syntactic configuration. Following Harley (2002), I will refer to this first class as *Alternate Projection* (AP) approaches. Representatives of this class, although not exhaustive, are Oerhle (1976), Marantz (1993), Pesetsky (1995), Harley (1995, 2002), Bruening (2001, 2010), and Pylkkänen (2002, 2008).²

The second class of approaches claims that PDCs and DOCs are transformationally related; while it has been argued that the DOC is basic (see, for instance, Dryer 1985), accounts which take the PDC as basic to which a transformational operation applies deriving the DOC (Larson (1988, 1990); Baker (1988, 1997); den Dikken (1995), Ormazabal & Romero (2010, 2012) among others) are more widely assumed.³ Again, following Harley (2002), I will refer to this class of approaches as *Transform* (T) approaches.

the PDC and the DOC. The DO in (1) and (2) is *a ball*. I adopt this terminology for ease of exposition and is not intended to carry any theoretical implications.

² Rappaport-Hovav & Levin (2008) state that AP approaches are currently widely assumed, although Emonds & Whitney (2006) argue that the evidence weighs in favor of T approaches.

³ I will only be concerned with the T approaches that take the PDC as basic from which the DOC is derived.

The main focus of this remark is to discuss the following three sets of facts and how they bear on the AP-T debate introduced above: 1. The role of the DO in the (a)telicity of the VP in the PDC and the DOC; 2. The existence of non-alternating DOCs; and 3. The distinct interpretations of the IO in the DOC and in the PDC. We will see that the aspectual facts help distinguish between two distinct subtypes of AP approaches. The second two sets of facts have figured prominently within the AP-T debate and both have been put forth as support for AP approaches in general.⁴ Nevertheless, as we will see, there are prosodic conditions that allow the so called non-alternating DOCs to surface as PDCs (Wasow 1997), a fact that turns out to be a serious challenge for AP approaches, but which, as I suggest, can be accounted for on a T approach by adopting the copy theory of movement (Chomsky 1993) and incorporating the P(ronounce) L(ower) C(opy) of Bošković (2001 et seq.). Moreover, I point out that if we follow recent minimalist assumptions (Hornstein 1999 et seq.) and drop the Theta Criterion, specifically allowing a single DP to receive more than one theta-role, then a T approach can easily account for the different interpretations of the IO in the DOC and in the PDC, undermining an important AP argument against T approaches. In this respect, in this remark, I endeavor to show that a closer look at non-alternating DOCs and an adoption of certain widely assumed minimalist assumptions not only produces serious challenges for AP approaches, but also re-opens the way for T approaches to the dative alternation.

⁴ Another set of facts surrounds the existence of non-alternating DOC idioms and non-alternating PDC idioms. I do not discuss idioms here, but see Larson (forthcoming) who argues that the idiom facts do not constitute evidence in favor or against either approach.

The structure of this remark is the following. In section 2, I first discuss how the aspectual role of the DO can help us distinguish between two subtypes of AP approaches, one exemplified by Harley (2002) and one exemplified by Bruening (2010); the aspectual facts favor a Bruening-style AP approach. In section 3, I discuss non-alternating DOCs. We see that, as has been noted previously in the literature, these non-alternating DOCs can alternate when the IO is *heavy* enough. The existence of PDC variants of non-alternating DOCs is mysterious under AP approaches. As we will see, even more mysterious under AP approaches is the presence of the preposition when a non-alternating DOC surfaces in the PDC, a mystery highlighted by Bruening's (2010) R-dative shift account, as pointed out in Ormazabal & Romero's (2012) reply to Bruening (2010). In section 4, I suggest that on a derivational approach that derives the DOC from the PDC in combination with the copy theory of movement which takes into account when a low copy is pronounced can handle these facts rather straightforwardly: when the IO is heavy, it is pronounced low, as the complement of P. I also remark explicitly on Bruening's (2010) three suggestions for the presence of the preposition in his attempt to maintain his AP approach; we see that none of them can be maintained. I suggest that the preposition must be pronounced to satisfy a PF constraint, one specifically proposed in Anttila (2008). One consequence of this suggestion is a reframing of one anomaly of heavy NP shift noted in the literature: there is no heavy IO shift in the DOC. On the present approach, heavy IO shift in the DOC is possible; it is the pronunciation of the low copy of the IO, as the complement of the preposition in the PDC with the additional requirement that the P must be pronounced. I suggest that the P must be pronounced to

satisfy a PF constraint. Finally, in section 5, I turn to the interpretation of the IO in the DOC. Regardless of whether the interpretation is one of a possessor (Harley 2002 a.o.) or of an affected object (Bruening 2010 a.o.), by dropping the Theta Criterion, a T approach can easily accommodate these facts, since the IO can move into a theta position.

Moreover, by bringing in Rappaport-Hovav & Levin's (2008) observations regarding the consistent interpretation of the IO in both the DOC and the PDC in their *give*-class of verbs, a T approach that incorporates the copy theory of movement has a way to explain these patterns straightforwardly, while AP approaches are faced with a challenging obstacle. Section 6 concludes with a brief recap of this remark.

2. AP approaches and inner aspect.

First, it is important to note that AP approaches can be subdivided along two lines: 1. The position of the IO in the DOC; and 2. The interpretation of the IO in the DOC. In this section, I discuss the position of the IO in the DOC and how the affect of the DO on the (a)telicity of the VP can distinguish these two approaches. In section 5, I discuss the interpretations of the IO in the DOC.

As representative of the first class of AP approaches, consider Bruening (2001, 2010), who builds on Marantz (1993). The PDC is illustrated in (3a) and the DOC in (3b), from Bruening (2010:289).⁵

(3) a. [_{voiceP} voice [_{VP} V [_{PP} DO [P IO]]]] b. [_{voiceP} voice [_{AppIP} IO Appl [_{VP} V DO]]]

⁵ One motivation for the Appl head in Marantz (1993) is the corresponding overt verbal morphology that surfaces in Bantu languages. Marantz (1993) assumes that this morpheme can be overt or null. It is null in English.

As representative of the second class, consider Harley (2002), who builds on Pesetsky (1995).⁶ She proposes the following two structures for the PDC and DOC respectively:⁷

- (4) a. $[_{VP} v [_{PP} DO P_{LOC} [_{PP} to IO]]]$ b. $[_{VP} v [_{PP} IO P_{HAVE} [_{DP} DO]]]$

Now observe in (5) that the DO in the PDC affects the (a)telicity of the VP, indicated by the (un)grammaticality patterns of the *in/for*-adverbials. In contrast, the IO does not affect the (a)telicity of the VP.

- (5) a. John gave a bucket of water to livestock/to the cow *for/in 10 minutes.
 b. John gave water to livestock/to the cow for/*in 10 minutes.

Assuming AspP is located between *v* and VP (Travis 1991, 2010 MacDonald 2008), and the closest DP to Asp affects the (a)telicity of the VP (Borer 2005, MacDonald 2008, Travis 2010), by incorporating AspP into (3a) and (4a), respectively as in (6a) and (6b), we see that both AP approaches can handle these facts straightforwardly, given that the DO is the closest DP to Asp.

- (6) a. $[_{voiceP} voice [_{AspP} Asp [_{VP} V [_{PP} DO [P IO]]]]]$
 b. $[_{VP} v [_{AspP} Asp [_{PP} DO P_{LOC} [_{PP} to IO]]]]$

The facts that distinguish these two accounts arise in the DOC. As Baker (1997) observes, in the DOC the DO affects the (a)telicity of the VP, not the IO. The relevant data—not from Baker 1997—are illustrated in (7).

⁶ Others in this class are Beck & Johnson (2004), Pylkkänen (2002, 2008), Cuervo (2003).

⁷ *v* in (4) is *v*-CAUSE. See footnotes 20 and 27.

- (7) a. John gave livestock/the cow water for/*in 10 minutes.
b. John gave livestock/the cow a bucket of water *for/in 10 minutes.

Assuming that AspP cannot split Harley's (2002) PP_{HAVE}, we must assume that AspP is above it, as illustrated in (8).

- (8) [VP V [AspP Asp [PP IO P_{HAVE} [DP DO]]]]

A structure like this, however, makes the incorrect prediction that the IO should affect the (a)telicity of the VP. In contrast, in Bruening's (2010) structures there appears to be nothing to prevent AspP from being located between Appl and VP in the DOC, as illustrated in (9), in which case, the DO is closest to Asp in the DOC.

- (9) [voiceP voice [AppIP IO Appl [AspP Asp [VP V DO]]]]

These aspectual facts suggest that, structurally, Bruening's AP approach is more adequate.⁸ Thus, in what follows, I adopt Bruening's (2010) structures as representative of AP approaches. Importantly, however, the remainder of the facts discussed in this remark bear on both subtypes of AP approaches.

3. "Non-alternating" DOCs

One set of facts that has been central to the AP-T debate is related to the existence of widely noted non-alternating DOCs, examples of which are in (10) to (12).

- (10) a. Mary gave John a black eye. [Larson 1988:376]
b. *Mary gave a black eye to John.

- (11) a. The Count gives Mary the creeps. [Richards 2001:187]

⁸ Below in section 4 I illustrate that a T approach can account for these aspectual facts in the same way that Bruening's account can.

b. *The Count gives the creeps to Mary.

(12)a. The lightening here gives me a headache. [Bruening 2010:]

b. *The lightening here gives a headache to me.

AP approaches argue that the fact there is no PDC that corresponds to these DOCs is not expected on the T approach, since the DOC is transformationally derived from the PDC. On the other had, if the PDC and the DOC are not transformationally related, then it is not at all surprising that there should exist non-alternating DOCs.⁹

The logic of the argument is sound. Nevertheless, it has also been observed that non-alternating DOCs can appear in the PDC when the IO is heavy enough (Wasow 1997, Richards 2001). First, consider the verb *begrudge*, which Levin (1993) cites as non-alternating, illustrated by the following examples from Stowell (1981: 308).

(13)a. You shouldn't begrudge John his wealth.

b. *You shouldn't begrudge his wealth to John.

Wasow (1997:84), however, observes that when the IO is *heavy*, the PDC is licensed, as his example from the Hector Corpus illustrates in (14).

(14) But no one could begrudge its splendid facilities to a city which lost 16,000 of Armenia's 25,000 dead on December 7,1988, and was half-ruined by the earthquake.

⁹ It would also not be surprising that there exist non-alternating PDCs. The existence of non-alternating PDCs can be accommodated within a derivational approach, for instance by appeal to the semantics of the preposition, as in Larson (1988) or den Dikken (1995).

In fact, for all of the examples of non-alternating DOCs in (10) to (12), examples of PDC variants with Heavy IOs have been attested, as illustrated in (15a) to (15d) respectively.¹⁰

(15) a. One of the Jewish children is a spunky girl, who gave a black eye to the kid with the German roots before the start of the war.

[Rappaport-Hovav & Levin 2008: 139]

c. The Count gives the creeps to [anyone who talks with him for five minutes].

[Richards 2001:187 fn.4]

d. ...a stench or smell is diffused over the ship that would give a headache to the most athletic constitution.

[Bresnan & Nikitina 2007:4]

On an AP approach to the DOC, these data are simply mysterious. How is it that a non-alternating verb can appear in the PDC when the PDC is an independent construction from the DOC? Bruening (2010) offers one possible answer to this question. Based mainly on scope freezing effects, he claims that the sentences in (15) are disguised DOCs. That is, the IO is still in Spec,Appl, however, in these cases, the heavy IO licenses a rightward specifier, which accounts for the word order. These are instances of what he calls R-dative shift. Bruening (2010:292) states that “The most important point of this analysis is that, although R-dative shift looks identical on the surface to the prepositional dative construction, it is really a double object construction.” Ormazabal & Romero (2012) provide a detailed reply to Bruening’s proposal, so I will not do that here. I will, however, discuss one mysterious aspect of Bruening’s proposal, which although pointed out, is not discussed in detail by Ormazabal & Romero, namely, the source of the

¹⁰ See Bresnan & Nikitina (2008) for more examples.

preposition. If the IO is still in Spec,Appl, the appearance of the preposition is a mystery. That discussion will come in section 4.2. For now, I focus on how a T approach can handle the facts in (15). Concretely, in the next section, I suggest that if we assume a copy theory of movement and that the DOC is derived from the PDC we can begin to understand both why a PDC variant of non-alternating DOCs is available when the IO is heavy as well as what the source of the preposition is.

4. The copy theory of movement

Chomsky (1993) proposes the copy theory of movement, one result of which is the elimination of Trace Theory from the grammar. This simplification of the grammar is minimalist in nature. (See Nunes & Bošković (2007) for numerous other conceptual benefits). Adopting the copy theory of movement, then, I propose the structures in (16a) and (16b) as the structures for the non-alternating DOCs and their PDCs respectively.¹¹

- (16) a. [_{VP} v [_{AppIP} IO Appl [_{VP} DO V [_{PP} ~~P IO~~]]]]
 ▲──┘
 b. [_{VP} v [_{AppIP} ~~IO~~ Appl [_{VP} DO V [_{PP} P IO]]]]
 ▲──┘

The IO merges initially as the complement of P, then moves to Spec,Appl (à la Marantz 1993 and Bruening 2001, 2010). Strikethrough represents lack of pronunciation, to which I return below.¹² Given the position of AppIP, the aspectual facts discussed in section 2

¹¹ The expectation is that for each of these non-alternating DOCs, whether in the DOC or in the PDC, the IO should have the same interpretation, since it always moves to Spec,Appl. This seems to be correct, as I discuss below in section 5.

¹² On this derivational approach, I assume that ultimately the IO moves so that its Case can be checked. Case is not the main focus of this remark. One possibility, however,

fall out in the same way that they do for Bruening (2001, 2010), since DO will always be closer to Asp than IO.¹³

Two questions arise under the proposal in (16): 1. When do we pronounce the IO high in Spec,Appl and when do we pronounce the IO low as the complement of P? And 2. Why do we need to pronounce the preposition when the IO is pronounced low? The answer to the first question has two parts. Following Nunes (1995, 1999, 2004), Nunes & Bošković (2007), I assume that there is a general preference to pronounce the highest copy of a chain, for economy reasons. I assume this is fundamentally correct and have

following Baker (1988) and more recently Ormazabal & Romero (2010), is that P incorporates into the verb and as a result the IO cannot check its case on P. In Spec,Appl, I assume that the IO checks structural accusative on *v*. With respect to DO, two options are available: 1. DO gets inherent case; or 2. Appl itself has a Case feature on which DO can check its Case. On this second option, Appl would function with regards to Case like Baker & Collins's (2006) linker, or Deal's (2013a) μ . See also footnote 15.

¹³ On some syntactic accounts of the affect of the DP on the (a)telicity of the VP, the effects arise from a Spec,Head relation between a DP that moves to Spec,Asp and Asp. As Husband (2010:79,n.10) observes, however, if movement were the relevant syntactic relation, then the DP that affects (a)telicity should not allow extraction, on the assumption that moved constituents are islands. This is contrary to the facts, however: *What did John eat a bag of in 10 minutes?* I follow MacDonald (2008) and assume Agree is the relevant syntactic relation.

nothing further to add to it here.¹⁴ Given this preference, the more important question then is: When do we pronounce the IO low? Here, I follow Bošković (2001) and Nunes & Bošković (2007), who develop Franks's (1998) idea that a low copy can be pronounced in order to avoid a violation of a PF constraint. Bošković (2001) refers to this as P(ronounce) L(ower) C(opy).

With respect to the data in (15), this PF constraint is clearly directly related to the weight of the IO. When a heavy IO is pronounced low it avoids violation of some PF constraint. Anttila (2008) offers just such a constraint within an OT framework:

(17) The stress-to-stress principle: Word stress implies phrasal stress (gradient).

The essence of (17) is that if the IO has more word stresses than the DO it must come after the DO, otherwise it incurs a greater number of violations of (17).¹⁵ A heavy enough IO will be pronounced low, in order to avoid violation of a PF constraint, in line with the PLC.¹⁶

¹⁴ This does suggest an explanation for why these non-alternating DOCs tend not to alternate; because there is a preference to pronounce the IO high, in Spec,Appl.

¹⁵ The IO must come after the DO when heavy in order to satisfy Selkirk's (1995) nuclear stress rule, stated in OT constraint form in Anttila (2008) as: The most prominent syllable of the rightmost constituent in a phrase P is the most prominent syllable in P.

¹⁶ A question arises regarding Case in these instances. Although I do not have an explicit proposal, an appeal to the distinction between abstract Case and morphological case might provide leverage. That is, when the IO is in Spec,Appl abstract Case and morphological case coincide, but when the IO is pronounced low, it spells out

In fact, Anttila (2008) offers an OT account of the role of several prosodic factors that affect whether the DOC or the PDC surfaces in the dative alternation, including the role of lexically unstressed pronouns, the foot structure of the verb, prosodic weight, binary vs. ternary prosodic phrases, among others. I do not go through his entire OT account in detail here. However, in the next section, I will discuss the role of foot structure for two reasons. First, it serves to illustrate another instance of PLC within the dative alternation, which will become relevant in section 5 below when we discuss observations by Rappaort-Hovav & Levin (2008). Second, Anttila (2008) offers one specific constraint that can help us provide an answer to our second question from above: Why do we need to pronounce the preposition when the IO is pronounced low?

4.1. Pronouncing the preposition

Anttila (2008) builds on Grimshaw's (2005) observation that the core class of verbs that alternate between the DOC and the PDC have exactly one foot. Those verbs that are non-alternating verbs have two or more feet. Parentheses in (18) indicate foot structure.

- (18)a. They (gave) the church money.
b. *They (do)(nated) the church money.

Anttila (2008) carries out a corpus search (www.blogspot.com) which revealed that with one-foot verbs like *give*, the DOC and PDC are about equally common, whereas with two-foot verbs like *donate*, the PDC is strongly favored. To account for the role of morphological case as the complement of P, but checks abstract Case in Spec,Appl. Since Case is not the main focus of this remark, I leave a detailed exploration of this question for future research.

foot structure in determining the dative alternation, Anttila assumes, following Inkelas & Zec (1995), that a verb forms a prosodic phrase with an argument immediately on its right and that prosodic constituents are preferably binary. In order to explain why a two-foot verb does not alternate, Anttila makes the following crucial assumption: The DOC and the PDC have different phonological phrasings, which he captures with the following undominated OT constraint:

- (19) PARSE(Goal): The goal NP must be prosodically parsed together with its syntactic head.¹⁷

The result of this assumption is that the goal (or the IO in my terms) will form a prosodic phrase with the verb in the DOC, while it will form a prosodic phrase with P in the PDC. This is illustrated in (20).

- (20) a. *((do)(nate) (my sister)) (the money) a ternary constituent
 b. ((do)(nate)) (the money) (to my sister) no ternary constituents

Since *donate* has two feet, once *my sister* is parsed with it in the DOC (20a), a ternary constituent arises, violating the preference for binary constituents. This is not the case in the PDC, since *my sister* is parsed with *to* (20b). This illustrates another instance where the IO (i.e. *my sister*) is pronounced low to avoid violation of a prosodic constraint (i.e. to avoid a ternary constituent) in line with the PLC. Additionally, it suggests a way to

¹⁷ A question arises about what is meant by syntactic head, especially within the derivational approach espoused here. I suggest that one possibility is that the head that is relevant for the *prosodic* constraint is the head that is responsible for IO's morphological case.

answer our question of why the preposition is pronounced when the IO is pronounced low. Concretely, I suggest that Anttila's (2008) PARSE(Goal) is directly responsible for the pronunciation of the preposition. Since PARSE(Goal) is undominated on Anttila's (2008) account, if the preposition is not pronounced, the constraint cannot be satisfied. Thus, when the IO surfaces as the complement of P, P must be pronounced. In fact, this is exactly how Anttila (2008) accounts for the pairs of sentences in (21).

- (21) a. *John gave the book my sister.
b. John gave the book to my sister.

Thus, the IO will be pronounced low as the complement of P to avoid violation of some PF constraint, in line with the PLC, and P itself will be pronounced to satisfy PARSE (Goal). If this PF approach to the pronunciation of P is viable, it allows us to explain one anomalous fact regarding heavy NP shift that has been noted in the literature for some time, but which has yet to receive satisfactory explanation: the lack of heavy IO shift in the DOC. It has been repeatedly observed that a heavy IO in the DOC cannot undergo heavy NP shift (Stowell 1981, Baker 1988, 1997, Larson 1988, Marantz 1993 and references therein). Consider the data below in (22) to (25), which illustrate this.

- (22)a. Wayne sent [a guy who we met last week] a telegram.
b. *Wayne sent a telegram [a guy who we met last week]. [Stowell 1981: 321]
- (23)a. Debbie gave [the girl whose bicycle is outside] a record.
b. *Debbie gave a record [the girl whose bicycle is outside]. [Stowell 1981: 321]
- (24)a. Max gave [a tall man in the garden] a book about roses.
b. *Max gave a book about roses [a tall man in the garden]. [Larson 1988: 354]

(25)a. I gave [every child that came to the door] candy.

b. *I gave candy [every child that came to the door]. [Baker 1997]

It is an anomaly of heavy NP shift that heavy IOs in the DOC cannot shift to the right, since there is a variety of syntactic constituents that can shift to the right when heavy (see, for instance, Wasow 1997). This anomaly, moreover, has resisted explanation for some time.¹⁸ I suggest here that, in fact, heavy IO shift in the DOC does exist in English: it is simply a low pronunciation of IO, as the complement of P. In fact, the non-alternating DOCs that surface in the PDC from (15) are precisely instances of heavy IO shift in the DOC. There is, however, an additional phonological constraint that must be satisfied: PARSE (Goal). If the preposition is not pronounced when the IO is pronounced low, then a fatal violation of the undominated PARSE (Goal) arises, and the sentence is ungrammatical. This is why the b. sentences in (22) to (25) are ungrammatical. As

¹⁸ It is often assumed that the lack of heavy IO shift is related to the general difficulty in A'-moving the IO in the DOC. However, as Larson (1988) illustrates through a discussion of Norwegian, heavy IO shift in the DOC and A'-movement should be kept separate. Specifically, he observes that Norwegian disallows heavy IO shift in the DOC, but allows *wh*-movement of the IO in the DOC. The present approach is consistent with Larson's (1988) conclusions. To explain that lack of heavy IO shift, Larson (1988) assumes "light predicate raising" where the verb and preposition move to the left around the DO. As Emonds & Whitney (2006:135, n. 28) observe, however, this account does not explain the ungrammaticality of **John gave to Mary it*. It is not clear what the role of heaviness is on a light predicate raising account.

expected then, when the preposition is added to the b. sentences in (22) to (25), the sentences become grammatical, as illustrated in (26).

- (26) a. Wayne sent a telegram [to a guy who we met last week].
b. Debbie gave a record [to the girl whose bicycle is outside].
c. Max gave a book about roses [to a tall man in the garden].
c. I gave candy [to every child that came to the door].

The approach just outlined suggests that when an IO is heavy it can be pronounced low, as the complement of P, and the P itself must be pronounced for phonological reasons. Importantly, for the cases of the non-alternating DOCs, which can surface in the PDCs, as in (15), a T approach is able to provide a source for the preposition, since the DOC is derived transformationally from the PDC; the preposition is the same preposition in the PDC from which the DOC is derived. This is not the case for AP approaches. They must rely on add hoc strategies to explain the presence of the preposition. This is obvious on Bruening's (2010) R-dative shift, where the IO is still in Spec,Appl, but the specifier is shifted to the right. Bruening (2010:291,n.5) offers three suggestions for the presence of the preposition: "(a) the two NPs must be distinguished when their canonical order is reversed; (b) the null dative case marker corresponding to *to* is only licensed adjacent to the verb; (c) *to* obligatorily deletes when adjacent to the verb."

Suggestion (a) cannot be correct. Baker (1988b:370) illustrates that in Chichewa, two adjacent unmarked DPs in the instrumental construction can appear in virtually free variation, as illustrated in (27).

- (27) a. Anyani a- na- kwapul –ir –a agalu ndodo.

Baboons SP PAST whip APPL ASP dogs sticks.

“The baboons whipped the dogs with sticks.”

b. Anyani a- na- kwapul –ir –a ndodo agalu.

Baboons SP PAST whip APPL ASP sticks dogs.

“The baboons whipped the dogs with sticks.”

It is not clear that these two unmarked NPs need to be distinguished.¹⁹ Moreover, given that the suggested possibility is stated in terms of adjacency, it does not matter if ultimately these instrumental alternations are structurally distinct from the dative alternation.

Regarding (b), given that the IO in the DOC passivizes, and on standard assumptions the DP that undergoes movement to Spec,T in the passive is the DP that receives structural case from the verb, it is not at all clear that IO has dative case.

Suggestion (c) has no grounds. If it were the case, then, why wouldn't the preposition obligatorily delete under heavy NP shift, as in (28), where *to* is clearly adjacent to the verb?

(28) John gave to his neighbor a case of homebrewed Rye Pale Ale.

In the same footnote, on the other hand, Bruening notes “that the *to* that appears as a result of R-dative shift acts in numerous ways like a regular preposition...”. On the present account, *to* acts like a regular preposition, because it arguably is a regular preposition, the source of which is the PDC from which the DOC is derived.

¹⁹ Baker (1997:16,n.19) makes this same point.

Recapping briefly, with respect to the aspectual effect of the DO in the VP, it appears that either a Bruening-style AP approach or a T approach can handle the facts equally well. With respect to the “non-alternating” DOCs that surface as PDCs when the IO is heavy, AP approaches simply have no way to explain how they can surface in the PDC, nor where the preposition comes from. In contrast, a T approach that incorporates a copy theory of movement and the PLC can accommodate these facts rather well. Moreover, it offers a reframing of an old question of why heavy IOs cannot undergo heavy NP shift; they can, but the preposition must be pronounced to satisfy a PF constraint. This state of affairs leaves AP approaches with only one set of facts that support a non-derivational relation between the DOC and the PDC: the distinct interpretations of the IO in the DOC and in the PDC. In the next section, I discuss how a T approach can accommodate these distinct interpretations as well.

5. The interpretation of the IO

Since at least Oerhle (1976) and Green (1974), it is known that the IO has distinct interpretations in the PDC and in the DOC. Two distinct interpretations of the IO in the DOC have been proposed: *possessor* and *affectee*. In the PDC, an additional interpretation of *location* is available. Consider the possessor interpretation first, illustrated in (29).

- (29) a. The editor sent the article to Sue/Philadelphia. [Harley 2002:35]
b. The editor sent Sue/^{??}Philadelphia the article.

The IO in the PDC can have either a location interpretation or a possessor interpretation. In contrast, in the DOC, the IO must be interpreted as a possessor.²⁰ Thus, in (29a) there is a location interpretation where *the article* ends up at Sue/Philadelphia, both perfectly fine locations. Additionally, a possessor interpretation of Sue is available. In contrast, in (29b), *Philadelphia* is not a good possessor, thus its presence as an IO in the DOC gives rise to infelicity.²¹

Now consider the contrast in (30) from Bruening (2001: 261).

(30) a. The lighting here gives me a headache.

b. *The lighting here gives a headache to me.

Bruening (2001) states that the IO only gets an *affected* interpretation in the DOC, and since headaches cannot be transferred, (30b) is anomalous.

Independent of the exact interpretation of the IO in the DOC, the logic of the AP approach argument is that given UTAH (Baker 1988)—or Relativized UTAH (Larson

²⁰ In fact, there is a difference in interpretation of the entire construction; in the DOC, there is a *caused possession* interpretation, while in the PDC, there is *caused location/motion* interpretation (Harley 2002; Krifka 2004; Rappaport-Hovav & Levin 2008). My focus is only on the interpretation of the IO in this remark.

²¹ Inanimates tend not to be good possessors. However, as has been widely noted, *Philadelphia* could be interpreted anthropomorphically and therefore be interpreted as a possessor. In this instance, it can be the IO in the DOC. Additionally, if there is an inanimate IO, the DO must form a part-whole relation with the IO, an example of which is provided below in (35a) and (35c).

1990)—and given the distinct interpretations of the IO in the PDC and the DOC, there must be distinct configurations underlying the PDC and the DOC. Thus, the set of data in (29) and (30) has been taken as an argument in favor of AP approaches over T approaches.

I will not discuss whether the correct interpretation of the IO in the DOC is one of a possessor or of an affectee.²² The discussion in this section holds independently of the

²² Consider two sets of data, the first from Harley (2002:40) in (i), and the second from Green (1974:108) in (ii), that might be taken to favor an affectee role in Spec,Appl, over a possessor role:

- (i) a. John gave Mary a child.
- b. John gave a child to Mary.

Harley notes that “[ia] can express the notion that Mary was merely impregnated by John, while [(ib)] seems to entail that there is an existing child who was physically transferred.” With respect to each sentence it is clear that Mary stands in a possession relation with a child, in the widest sense. Thus, it is possible that the different interpretations that Harley (2002) notes is related to affectedness. Being pregnant, Mary is affected by the event of having received a child; she has undergone a change of state. Green (1974:108) observes a contrast in (ii).

- (ii) a. ?I expect to give my wealth to the grandchildren of your great-grand children.
- b. *I expect to give the grandchildren of your great-grand children my wealth.

A possession interpretation is available in both sentences. It appears that in order to be affected, an individual must be alive, which does not hold for a possession relation: *The*

exact nature of the role the IO receives in the DOC. There are two main points that I want to make. The first is to argue that if we drop the Theta Criterion, a T approach to the DOC, which takes the PDC as basic becomes available and can accommodate the distinct interpretations of the IO in the DOC in a very straightforward way. The second is to claim that, in fact, T approaches find greater support if we take seriously Rappaport-Hovav & Levin's (2008) observations that there are two classes of verbs that enter the dative alternation.

First, consider the Theta Criterion from Chomsky (1981: 36) in (31)

(31) The Theta Criterion

Each argument bears one and only one θ -role, and each θ -role is assigned to one and only one argument.

Hornstein (1999 et seq.) provides a range of conceptual arguments for why the Theta Criterion should be dropped highlighting a minimalist approach to the architecture of the grammar. Just to mention one, by doing so, we eliminate a module from the grammar and thereby simplify it. I refer the reader to Hornstein (1999 et seq.) and related work for further discussion.²³ The specific aspect of the Theta Criterion that is of concern here is

grandchildren of my great-grand children will have my last name. See footnote 22 on possessor raising and the affectee role.

²³ Dropping the theta-role in possessor raising constructions has also been recently adopted, as in Lee-Schoenfeld (2006) and Rodrigues (2010); see Deal (2013b) for a general discussion of possessor raising that incorporates an abandonment of the Theta Criterion. What is assumed on these movement to theta-position accounts of possessor

that a single DP can only receive one theta-role. I will drop this assumption, in line with minimalist thinking. Consequently, while the PDC in (32a) can be represented as in (33a), the DOC in (32b) can be represented as in (33b), which is derived from (33a).

- (32) a. The editor sent the article to Sue/Philadelphia.
 b. The editor sent Sue/??Philadelphia the article.

- (33) a. [_{VP} V [_{VP} DO V [_{PP} P IO]]]]
 b. [_{VP} V [_{AppIP} ~~IO~~ Appl [_{VP} DO V [_{PP} P IO]]]]
-

The IO receives a goal/location theta-role as the complement of P in both (33a) and (33b). In the DOC, in (33b), the IO also moves to Spec,Appl where it receives an affectee/possessor theta-role.²⁴ This is only possible under the assumption that a single

raising is that the possessor DP moves to a structurally analogous position proposed in Marantz (1993) where it receives an *affectee* role. Deal (2013b) notes that a possessor in these constructions must meet certain criteria, such as being construed as a “living, animate being”, and when not animate, there must be “a part-whole relationship” between the possessor and the possessum. There is an obvious parallel with the relation between the IO and the DO in the DOC. See footnote 20.

²⁴ This is fundamentally what Stowell (1981:310) claims as well, albeit within a different model, where an empty category is left in stead of a copy: “In a sense then, we might say that the incorporated NP is associated with two theta-roles simultaneously: goal and possessor.”

DP can receive more than one theta-role.²⁵ By dropping the Theta Criterion, and thereby allowing a single DP to receive more than one theta-role, a key argument in favor of AP approaches over T approaches dissolves. T approaches can accommodate these facts straightforwardly on this minimalist approach.

More needs to be said about the interpretation of the IO, however. Consider observations from Rappaport-Hovav & Levin (2008), regarding classes of verbs that undergo the dative alternation and the corresponding interpretations of the IO. They make a first distinction between the *give*-class and the *throw*-class of verbs.²⁶ I focus the

²⁵ The IO in DOC is compatible with a subset of interpretations of the IO in PDC (Pesetsky 1995: 141; Rappaport-Hovav & Levin 2008). Harley (2002) argues against this superset-subset relation based on the existence of non-alternating DOCs. As we saw above, however, many—if not all—of the non-alternating DOCs do, in fact, alternate. Moreover, the present account might be taken as a syntactic underpinning of Beavers's (2010) observation that for many shifted DPs there tends to be *monotonically stronger truth conditions* associated with it than when the same DP is not shifted.

²⁶ *Give*-class verbs (a.k.a *Dative verbs having only a caused possession meaning*) include (a) Verbs that inherently signify acts of giving: give, hand, lend, loan, pass, rent, sell... (b) Verbs of future having: allocate, allow, bequeath, grant, offer, owe, promise... (c) Verbs of communication: tell, show, ask, teach, read, write, quote, cite. *Throw*-class verbs (a.k.a *Dative verbs having both caused motion and possession meanings*) include (a) Verbs of sending (*send*-type verbs): forward, mail, send, ship,... (b) Verbs of instantaneous causation of ballistic motion (*throw*-type verbs): fling, flip, kick, lob, slap, shoot, throw,

discussion on the *give*-class here. They observe that in both the PDC and the DOC with the *give*-class the IO is interpreted as a possessor.²⁷ They note that the same restriction regarding inanimate IOs in the DOC, noted in (30) above holds for the IO in the PDC for *give*-class verbs, as illustrated in (34).

(34) I gave the package to Maria/*London.

Rappaport-Hovav & Levin (2008:139) observe many instances of a possession relation in the PDC with *give*, as illustrated in (35), examples they take from the Internet.

- (35) a. Give a fresh coat of paint to the front door.
- b. One of the Jewish children is a spunky girl, who gave a black eye to the kid with the German roots before the start of the war.
- c. Cultural commissioner Megan Whilden said that the five ‘Artscape’ pieces would ‘give a festive air to Park Square, they’re fun and interesting.’

toss... (c) Verbs of causation of accompanied motion in a deictically specified direction: bring, take. (d) Verbs of instrument of communication: e-mail, fax, radio, wire, telegraph, telephone.

²⁷ They frame the discussion in terms of *caused possession* and *caused motion*, where the *give*-class of verbs always have a *caused possession* interpretation in either the DOC or the PDC, while the *throw*-class of verbs have either a caused possession or a caused motion interpretation in the PDC, but only a caused possession interpretation in the DOC. I refocus the discussion in terms of the interpretation of the IO. See also footnote 19. The structures in (33) illustrate how the *throw*-class of verbs can be handled on the present approach.

It appears then that the possessor role is not limited to the DOC with this class of verbs. We find the same situation with the affectee role as well. Specifically, in as much as the IO *me* in the DOC is an affected object in (30) above, the IO *the most athletic constitution* in the PDC from (15d) above is also an affected object. So, again, independently of whether the concrete theta-role is possessor or affectee, we find that said role is not limited alone to the IO in the DOC. As Rappaport-Hovav & Levin (2008) correctly observe, these facts are rather problematic for AP approaches; if the possessor/affectee interpretation of the IO arises only when in the DOC on AP approaches, it is not at all clear how they can accommodate the same interpretation of the IO in the PDC since the PDC is structurally unrelated to the DOC. On the present T approach, these facts can be handled straightforwardly. The IO in the PDC can receive a possessor/affectee role if we assume that the IO has moved from the complement of P to Spec,Appl to receive the role, yet is pronounced low. Whether or not it is pronounced low or high depends on, at least, prosodic properties, such as foot structure and IO weight, as discussed above in section 4.²⁸

Consequently, the argument for AP approaches based on the well-known differences in interpretation of the IO in the DOC and the PDC no longer hold if we drop the Theta Criterion. Moreover, given the observations that there is a class of verbs where the same

²⁸ Information structure related properties might also play a role. See, for instance, Wasow (1997, 2002), Rappaport-Hovav & Levin (2008), Bresnan & Nikitina (2008) and references therein.

possessor/affectee interpretation is available for the IO in both the PDC and the DOC, an argument based on the interpretation of the IO turns out, in fact, to favor T approaches.

6. Brief recap

In this remark, I have discussed how the affect of the direct object on the (a)telicity of the VP can help distinguish between two subtypes of AP approaches to the dative alternation. I have also discussed two sets of facts that have been taken as support for AP approaches over T approaches. What we have seen is that by adopting the copy theory of movement and abandoning the Theta Criterion, in line with minimalist thinking, not only can these two sets of facts easily be explained on a T approach, they can also be taken as support in favor of the T approach over the AP approach.

References

- Anttila, Arto. 2008. "Phonological constraints on constituent ordering." Proceedings of the 26th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics, ed. Charles B. Chang and Hannah J. Haynie, 51-59. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
- Baker, Mark. 1988. *Incorporation: a theory of grammatical function changing*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Baker, Mark. 1997. Thematic Roles and Syntactic Structure. In L. Haegeman (ed.) *Elements of Grammar*. Kluwer, Dordrecht, 73-137.
- Beavers, John. 2010. The structure of lexical meaning: Why semantics really matters". *Language*, 86: 821-864.

- Beck, Sigrid, and Kyle Johnson. 2004. Double objects again. *Linguistic Inquiry* 35:97–123.
- Borer, Hagit. 2005. *Structuring Sense Volume II: The normal course of events*. Oxford: OUP.
- Bošković, Željko. 2001. *On the nature of the syntax-phonology interface: Cliticization and related phenomena*. Amsterdam: Elsevier Science.
- Bowers, John (1988) *Grammatical relations*. New York: Garland.
- Bresnan, Joan, and Tatiana Nikitina. 2009. The gradience of the dative alternation. In *Reality exploration and discovery: Pattern interaction in language and life*, ed. by Linda Ann Uyechi and Lian-Hee Wee, 161–184. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Bruening, Benjamin. 2001. QR obeys Superiority: Frozen Scope and ACD. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32: 233-273.
- Bruening, Benjamin. 2010. Double object constructions disguised as prepositional datives. *Linguistic Inquiry* 41:287-305.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1981. *Government and Binding*
- Chomsky, Noam. 1993. A minimalist program for linguistic theory. In *The view from Building 20*, K. Hale & S.J. Keyser, 1-52. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Corver, Norbert & Jairo Nunes (eds.). 2007. *The copy theory of movement*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Cuervo, María Cristina. 2003. *Datives at large*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.
- Deal, Amy Rose. 2013a. Possessor raising. *Linguistic Inquiry* 37:391-432.

- Deal, Amy Rose. 2013b. External Possession and Possessor Raising. To appear in M. Everaert & H. van Riemsdijk (eds), *The Companion to Syntax*, 2nd Edition, Wiley-Blackwell.
- Dikken, Marcel den. 1995. *Particles: On the syntax of verb-particle, triadic, and causative constructions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dryer, Matthew (1987) “On primary objects, secondary objects, and antitativity,” *Language* 62: 808-845.
- Emonds, Joseph, and Rosemary Whitney. 2006. Thirty years of double object debates. In *The Blackwell companion to syntax, vol. 2*, ed. by Martin Everaert and Henk van Riemsdijk, 16–59. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Franks, Steven. 1998. Clitics in Slavic. Paper presented at the Comparative Slavic Morphosyntax Workshop, Spencer, Ind., June 1998.
- Green, Georgia .1974. *Semantics and syntactic irregularity*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Grimshaw, Jane. 2005. *Words and Structure*. CSLI Publications, Stanford, California, and University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Harley, Heidi. 1995. Subjects, Events and Licensing. Doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.
- Harley, Heidi. 2002. Possession and the double object construction. *Yearbook of Linguistic Variation* 2: 29–68.
- Hornstein, Norbert. 1999. Movement and control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30:69-96.

- Husband, Matthew. 2010. *On the compositional nature of states*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins
- Inkelas, Sharon, and Draga Zec. 1995. 'Syntax-phonology interface.' In John A. Goldsmith (ed.), *The Handbook of Phonological Theory*. Blackwell, Oxford, pp. 535-549.
- Krifka, Manfred. 2004. Semantic and pragmatic conditions for the dative alternation. *Korean Journal of English Language and Linguistics* 4:1–32.
- Larson, Richard K. 1988. On the double object construction. *Linguistic Inquiry* 19, 335–391.
- Larson, Richard K. 1990. Double objects revisited: Reply to Jackendoff. *Linguistic Inquiry* 21:589–632
- Larson, Richard K. forthcoming. On 'Dative idioms' in English. *Linguistic Inquiry*.
- Lee-Schoenfeld, Vera. 2006. German possessor datives: raised *and* affected. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 9:101-142.
- Levin, Beth. 1993. *English verb classes and alternations: A preliminary investigation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- MacDonald, Jonathan E. 2008. Domain of aspectual interpretation. *Linguistic Inquiry*
- Marantz, Alec. 1993. Implications of asymmetries in double object constructions. In *Theoretical aspects of Bantu grammar, vol. 1*, ed. by Sam A. Mchombo, 113–150. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

- Nunes, Jairo. 1995. The copy theory of movement and linearization of chains in the Minimalist Program. Doctoral Dissertation. University of Maryland.
- Nunes, Jairo. 1999. Linearization of chains and phonetic realization of chain links. In *Working Minimalism*, Samuel D. Epstein & Norbert Horstein (eds), 217-249. Cambridge MA: The MIT Press.
- Nunes, Jairo. 2004. *Linearization of chains and sideward movement*. Cambridge MA: The MIT Press.
- Nunes, Jairo & Željko Bošković. 2007. The copy theory of movement: A view from PF. In *The copy theory of movement*. Norbert Corver & Jairo Nunes (eds), 13-74. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Oehrle, Richard T. 1976. *The grammatical status of the English dative alternation*. Ph.D., Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge
- Ormazabal, Javier & Juan Romero. 2010. The derivation of dative alternations. In *Argument structure and syntactic relations: A cross-linguistic perspective*, ed. by Maia Duguine, Susana Huidobro, and Nerea Madariaga, 203–232. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Ormazabal, Javier & Juan Romero. 2012. PPs without Disguises: Reply to Bruening. *Linguistic Inquiry* 43.2:455-474.
- Pesetsky, David. 1995. *Zero Syntax: Experiencers and Cascades*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Pylkkänen, Liina. 2002. Introducing arguments. Doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.

- Pylkkänen, Liina. 2008. *Introducing arguments*. MIT Press: Cambridge, MA.
- Rappaport Hovav, Malka and Beth Levin (2008) The English dative alternation: the case for verb sensitivity. *Journal of linguistics* 44:129–167.
- Richards, Norvin (2001) “An idiomatic argument for lexical decomposition.” *Linguistic inquiry* 32: 183–192.
- Rodrigues, Celine. 2010. Possessor raising through thematic positions. In *Movement theory of Control*, ed. Norbert Horstein & Maria Polinsky, 119-146. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Selkirk, Elisabeth. 1995. ‘Sentence prosody: Intonation, stress, and phrasing.’ In John A. Goldsmith (ed.), *The Handbook of Phonological Theory*. Blackwell, Oxford, pp. 550-569.
- Stowell, Timothy. 1981. Origins of phrase structure. Doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.
- Travis, Lisa deMena. 1991. Derived Objects, Inner Aspect, and the Structure of VP. University of Delaware: NELS 22.
- Travis, Lisa deMena. 2010. *Inner Aspect: the articulation of VP*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Wasow, Thomas. 1997. Remarks on grammatical weight. *Language Variation and Change* 9:81-105.
- Wasow, Thomas. 2002. *Postverbal Behavior*. CSLI Publications, Stanford, California.