The Double Object Construction (Larson 1988, Aoun & Li 1989)

MIT, 24.951, Fr 14 Nov 2003

A familiar puzzle

The Dative Alternation

(1) a. *I gave the candy to the children*

b. *I gave the children the candy*

How to handle (1) given X′-theory (2), the Case Fitler (3) and the UTAH (4)?

(2) **X′-Theory (see survey in Fukui 2001):**

"Specifier": Z″ dominated by X″ and sister to X′

"Adjunct": Z″ dominated by X″ and sister to X″; or Y″ dominated by X′ and sister to X′

"Complement": Y″ sister to X^0 — $X' \rightarrow X^0$ ZP* (?)

[Cf. *Aspects*-style subcategorization entries:
put: [$_{VP}$ − NP PP] ; *give*: [$_{VP}$ − NP PP] / [$_{VP}$ − NP NP]]

(3) a. **Case Filter:**

*DP if DP has a phonetic matrix but no (abstract) Case.

b. **Case assignment rules (Chomsky 1981:170):**

i. NP is nominative if governed by AGR
ii. NP is objective if governed by transitive V
iii. NP oblique if governed by P
iv. NP is genitive in [$_{NP}$ − $\overline{X}$]
v. NP is inherently Case-marked as determined by properties of its [−N] governor

(4) **Uniformity of Theta-Assignment Hypothesis** (UTAH; see, e.g., Baker 1997, Idan's 10/1/03 handout): Identical thematic relationships between items are represented by identical structural relationships between those items at the level of D-structure (i.e. θ-roles are uniformly projected in the syntax).

(5) Given (2), what is the structure of the VPs in (1)?

(6) Given (3), how is the second DP in (1b) assigned Case?

(7) A UTAH-compatible solution to (1): The thematic roles in the pair (1a)/(1b) are identical; one member of the pair is derived—which? how can we tell? why does it matter? (Larson 1988 vs. Aoun & Li 1989 vs. Jackendoff 1990 vs. . . .)

One hint from secondary predication (from Baker 1997

(8) A secondary predicate cannot take the goal argument as subject of predication, whether or not the goal is a realized as a PP.

a. *I gave **the meat** to Mary **raw***
b. * *I gave the meat to **Mary hungry***
c. *I gave Mary **the meat raw***
d. * *I gave **Mary** the meat **hungry***

An Incorporation-style solution (P-to-V incorporation), with V- and NP-movement (Baker 1997:91[24])

(9) $[_{\text{VP}}\ [_{\text{V}'}\ gave_i\ [_{\text{V}^i}\ gave{+}\text{P}_j\ ]\ [_{\text{AspP}}\ Mary_k\ [_{\text{Asp}'}\ t_i\ [_{\text{VP}}\ [the\ meat]_n\ [_{\text{V}'}\ [_{\text{V}'}\ t_i\ [_{\text{PP}}\ t_j\ t_k\ ]\ ]\ raw_n/{*}hungry_k$

Problems with the Incorporation-style story?
(Larson 1988:373f; data from Bahasa Indonesia; Chung 1976)

(10) a. *Saja mem-bawa surat itu **kepada** Ali*
I Trans-bring letter the **to** Ali
I brought the letter to Ali

b. *Saja mem-bawa-**kan** Ali surat itu*
I TRANS-bring-**APP** Ali letter the
I brought to Ali the letter

(11) a. No morphological relatedness between P (e.g., *kepada* 'to' in (10a) and Applicative morpheme (e.g., *kan* APP in (10b)).

b. No diachronic relation either—the etyma of applicative morphemes are not prepositional.

c. Applicative morphemes can co-occur with their prepositional counterparts (e.g., the applied affix *kan* BEN and the benefactive preposition *kepada* in (12)).

(12) a. *Laki2 itu meng-irim(**-kan**) surat **kepada** wanit itu*
man the TRANS-send-**BEN** letter **to** woman the
'The man set a letter to the woman'

b. *Anak laki2 itu men-bajar(**-kan**) lima dolar **kepada** polisi itu*
chld man the TRANS-pay-**BEN** five dollar **to** police the
'The boy pay five dollars to the policeman

Discovering *structure*—further hints

(13) a. $[_{\text{VP}}$ V Goal Theme]

b. ... or $[_{\text{VP}}$ V Goal $[_{x\text{P}}\ x^0$ Theme]]

c. ... or $[_{\text{VP}}$ V $[_{x\text{P}}$ Goal [x^0 Theme]]]

d. ... or $[_{\text{VP}}$ V Theme Goal]

e. ... or $[_{\text{VP}}$ V Theme $[_{x\text{P}}\ x^0$ Goal]]

f. ... or $[_{\text{VP}}$ V $[_{x\text{P}}$ Theme [x^0 Goal]]]

g. ... or ...

Coordination facts (but see Jackendoff vs. Larson debate; 11/19/03 presentations)

(14) a. *Sue gave John the book and Mary the record*

b. *Sue sent neither John the letter nor Mary the postcard*

Barss & Lasnik's (1986) observations *possibly* re c-command domains in (1)

(15) a. *I showed Mary herself*
* *I showed herself Mary*

b. *I showed each man the other's socks*
* *I showed the other's friend each man*

c. *I gave* [*every worker*]$_i$ *his*$_i$ paycheck
* *I gave its*$_i$ *owner* [*every paycheck*]$_i$

d. *I showed no one anything*
* *I showed anyone nothing*

(16) a. *I presented Mary to herself*
* *I presented herself to Mary*

b. *I sent each boy to the other's parent*
* *I showed the other's check to each employee*

c. *I sent* [*every check*]$_i$ to *its*$_i$ owner
?? *I sent his*$_i$ *paycheck* to [*every employee*]$_i$

d. *I sent nothing to anyone*

e. * *I sent anything to no one*

(17) a. *I talked to John and Bill about each other*
* *I talked to each other about John and Bill*

b. *I talked to* [*every girl*]$_i$ *about her*$_i$ *mother*

* *I talked to her$_i$ mother about* [*every girl*]$_i$

c. *I talked about none of the boys to any of the girls*
* *I talked about any of the boys to none of the girls*

A Kaynian small-clause solution

(18) a. In (13c), x is a predicate meaning HAVE and V is CAUSE.

b. *Mary* CAUSE [*John* HAVE *the book*] → ...
→ *Mary* CAUSE+HAVE$_i$ [*John* t_i *the book*] → ...
→ *Mary gave John the book*

c. How are CAUSE and HAVE to be pronounced? If CAUSE is a constant in double-object constructions, then x is $\sqrt{give}$ and *give* = CAUSE+$\sqrt{give}$.

What about other double-object verbs like *hand*, *send*, *fax*, *show*, etc.

d. [*John* HAVE *the book*] is a small clause (a CFC in binding terms).

e. The indirect object is actually a subject (i.e., *John* is a subject of the small clause [*John* HAVE *the book*]

Prediction? (Fill in grammaticality judgements

(19) a. *Who$_i$ do you like a picture of t_i?*

b. *Who$_i$ do you consider a picture of t_i worth a prize?*

c. *Who$_i$ did you give friends of t_i that picture?*

A problem?

(20) a. * *Bill made Mary have a picture of himself*

b. *Bill gave Mary a picture of himself*

Larson's Kaynian solution *sans* the generative-semantics component

(21) a. In (13f), x is where the verb is generated and V is a vacant head to which the verb moves—for INFL-, *theta*- and/or Case-related reasons (V must be governed by INFL, θ-assignment happens under locality, and Case-assingment is righward.

[$_{VP}$ Agent − [$_{VP}$ Theme *give* Goal]]

b. xP is not strictly a small-clause; xP is 'merely' a VP-shell—one layer of an exploded VP (the predicate assigns each of its θ-role to its 'complement' or 'specifier').

Evidence?

Recall Barss-Lasnik facts in (16) (=(22)):

(22) a. *I presented Mary to herself*

* *I presented herself to Mary*

b. *I sent each boy to the other's parent*
* *I showed the other's check to each employee*

c. *I sent* [*every check*]$_i$ to *its*$_i$ owner
?? *I sent his*$_i$ *paycheck* to [*every employee*]$_i$

d. *I sent nothing to anyone*

(23) * *I sent anything to no one*

More coordination facts (cf. (14)

(24) a. *Sue gave the book to John and the record to Mary*

b. *Sue sent neither the letter to John nor the postcard to Mary*

An argument from idioms suggesting a [V Goal] unit? (Larson 1998:340)

(25) a. ***send** y **to the showers***

b. ***take** y **to task**/**to the cleaners**/**into consideration***

c. *throw y* ***to the wolves***

What to do with the double-object variant given the UTAH? Advancement+Demotion as in the run-of-the-mill passive ...

(26) a. *I gave* [$_{x\mathrm{P}}$ *the candy* [$_{x'}$ *x to the children*]]

b. *I gave* [$_{x\mathrm{P}}$ [*the children*]$_i$ [$_{x'}$ [$_{x'}$ *x* t_i] [$_{\mathrm{Adjunct}}$ *the candy*]]]

Aoun & Li's (1989) Larsonian solution, but with Goal generated higher than Theme

(27) a. [$_{\mathrm{VP}_1}$ Agent *give*$_i$ [$_{\mathrm{SmCl}}$ Goal [$_{\mathrm{VP}_2}$ t_i Theme]]]

b. [$_{\mathrm{VP}_1}$ Agent *give*$_i$ [$_{\mathrm{SmCl}}$ Theme$_j$ [$_{\mathrm{VP}_2}$ [$_{\mathrm{VP}_2}$ t_i t_j] [$_{\mathrm{Adjunct}}$ *to* Goal]]]]

Prediction

"Scope freezing" effects (see Bruening 2002 for alternative proposal)

(28) a. *Mary gave someone every book* (unambiguous)

b. *Mary gave some book to everyone* (ambiguous)

(29) a. **Minimal Binding Requirement:** Variables must be bound by the most local potential $\overline{\mathrm{A}}$-binder (i.e., raise quantifier to adjoin to nearest clausal projection).

b. **The Scope Principle:** A quantifier A has scope over a quantifier B in case A c-commands a member of the chain containing B (i.e., quantifier scope reflects c-command of chain members).

Backward binding

(30) a. * *Sue showed each other's friends John and Bill*

b. *Sue showed each other's friends to John and Bill*

Recursive VP-shells

[Kayne's rightward-is-downward, Pesetsky's cascades, Collins's parser-as-grammar-and-viceversa, . . .]

(31) *Sue gave the children candy on each other's birthdays*

Problems?

(32) a. Lexical θ-roles, D-structure and the Projection Principle?

b. Argument-vs.-adjunct distinctins?

c. The scope of adverbs (syntax-semantics mismatches? see Larson's recent work)