

If you (P)*have* you can *give to* [somebody]*

Javier Ormazabal^{1 2} & Juan Romero^{2 3}

October, 2016

1. Introduction

In their response to Pylkkänen (2008) and Bruening (2010a), Harley & Jung (2015) [H&J] argue that DOCs parallel the behavior of *HAVE* in a systematic way with respect to a broad battery of phenomena, supporting a decompositional approach to double object *GIVE* constructions. This battery includes several parallelisms between *HAVE* and *GIVE*+DOC previously observed in the literature (see especially Harley, 1995; 2002; Beck & Johnson, 2004), as well as the discussion of the objections raised by Pylkkänen (2008) and Bruening (2010a), arguing that in fact, with minor changes, they reinforce the original hypothesis.

In this squib we show that *GIVE*+*to* passes all tests discussed by H&J for DOC. Applying their logic, this fact supports an analysis where *HAVE*, *GIVE*+DOC and *GIVE*+*to* share a key subconstituent. We also argue that this parallelism has been obscured by the polysemic nature of *SEND*- and *THROW*-type verbs (Rappaport Hovav & Levin, 2008) [RH&L].

2. The parallelism extends to *to*-constructions

In this section we consider H&J arguments one by one, as well as Beck & Johnson's argument involving *again*. For most of them, we show that the behavior of *GIVE*+DOC and *GIVE*+*to* is completely parallel, and when they differ we argue that it is due to reasons independent of the *HAVE-GIVE* connection.⁴

* Acknowledgements

¹ University of the Basque Country (UPV/EHU); javier.ormazabal@ehu.eus

² Basque Group of Theoretical Linguistics (HiTT)

³ University of Extremadura (UNEX); juantxo.romero@gmail.com

⁴ As for locative-inversion in DOC idioms as well as for the lack of *to*-constructions with *denial* verbs, see Ormazabal & Romero (2012).

2.1. *Result state adverbial modification*. Adverbs such as *for a week* in GIVE+DOC do not modify the entire event of *giving*, but they pick out a resulting state of having (1a,b). Example (1c) shows that exactly the same holds for GIVE+*to*.

- (1) a. John had the car for a week.
b. Brenda gave John the car for a week. (*having* lasts a week, not *giving*)
c. Brenda gave the car to John for a week (idem)

2.2. *Alienable possession*. H&J show that the animacy constraint (Green 1974) appears both with GIVE+DOC (2) and with HAVE (3). As shown in (4), the same restriction applies to GIVE+*to*.

- (2) a. Brenda gave John a book
b. # Brenda gave London a book. (only possible if interpreted as London office)
- (3) a. John has a book.
b. # London has the book. (idem)
- (4) a. Brenda gave a book to John
b. # Brenda gave a book to London (idem)

These facts are not new; RH&L observe that the animacy constraint, presented as an argument for polysemic analyses of DOC/*to*-construction alternations, involves only *SEND*- and *THROW*-type predicates (5), but never *GIVE*/*TELL*-type ones (2b)-(4b), a distinction often ignored in the literature.

- (5) a. # Brenda sent London a book. (OK London office reading only)
b. Brenda sent a book to London. (Either regular or office reading OK)

RH&L extensively argue that the contrast between (4b) and (5b) is due to their different lexical meaning. *GIVE* only allows a **cause-possession** (available in both DOC and *to*-construction) interpretation, while *SEND* is ambiguous between a cause-possession and a **cause-motion** reading, which is only available in the *to*-construction. In consequence, this restriction is not a constraint on DOCs, as assumed by H&J, but on cause possession predicates: possessors must be animate. Thus,

GIVE- and *TELL*-type verbs uniformly yield the same animacy effects both in the DOC and in the *to*-construction, exactly as *SEND* predicates in their cause possession interpretation.⁵

On the other hand, *SEND* predicates in their cause motion interpretation are restricted to the prepositional frame. In English this ambiguity arises because the same preposition, *to*, is used in both readings. However, in languages that resort to two different prepositions (Russian, North-Eastern Basque), animacy effects are observed by *SEND*.possession (6a-b), but do not show up in the *SEND*.motion reading (6c) [Basque examples from Ormazabal & Romero [O&R] 2016b; for Russian see RH&L; also see O&R 2010 and Harley & Miyagawa 2016 for discussion]

- (6) a. Ogia igorri dut ama-**ri**
bread(_{ABS}) send AUX[(3_{ABS})-1_{ERG}] mother-DAT
'I sent (the) bread to the mother'
- b. * Ogia igorri dut merkatua-**ri**
bread(_{ABS}) send AUX[(3_{ABS})-1_{ERG}] market-DAT
'I sent (the) bread to the market'
- c. Ogia igorri dut merkatu-ra
bread(_{abs}) send aux[(3_{abs})-1_{erg}] market-ALL
'I sent (the) bread to the market'

2.3. '*Light*' verb *GIVE* does not require animate possessors. In contrast to the context discussed above, there are cases where the animacy restriction does not hold (7):

- (7) a. The house has a new coat of paint.
b. The painter gave the house a new coat of paint.

H&J characterize these contexts as involving *inalienable possession*. It is not clear to us that there is a transfer of possession, but rather it seems that it is the "light verb" nature of *GIVE* what makes

⁵ Pesetsky's (1995) initial treatment of *to*-constructions captures this parallelism. His proposal included DOC basic structure as part of the complex internal structure of *to*-PPs in *GIVE* contexts, in order to capture the superset/subset relation he observed in the semantics of the Goals. In an attempt to drift apart from derivational analyses, other proposals put the emphasis on the alleged differences and eliminate all connections between the two constructions.

these structures especial.⁶ Be it as it may, exactly the same example has been discussed in different places by Langaker [e.g. 1987: 40], who scores the *to*-construction in (8b) differently, from a star in the first writings to a question mark in the last ones. However, he always makes the same observation: that the example is "a bit less natural" than the DOC in (8b):

- (8) a. I gave the house a new coat of paint.
b. ? I gave a new coat of paint to the house

Native speakers we have consulted agree with Langaker that (8b) is "a bit less natural" but, given the right context, acceptable. In the same vein, it is true that examples are much less common than the DOC construction, but they may be found now and then, as the ones in (9) illustrate:

- (9) a. I gave a new coat of paint to the *Arrow of Norwich* [Arthur Ransome. 1932. *Peter Duck*]
b. [...] and I gave a new coat of paint to our carved work, which was very bare and parched
[A. Dalrimple: 1775. *A collection of voyages*].

This discussion again supports the idea that GIVE+*to* and GIVE+DOC, pattern together.⁷

2.4. *Existence presupposition*. Another property attributed to DOCs in the literature and shared with *HAVE* is that they presuppose the existence of the recipient. Thus, both (10a-b) are deviant if we do not know whether there are actual aliens in the cosmos:

- (10) a. # The aliens have a disk
b. # I gave the aliens a disk

To compare this pair with *to*-constructions, consider the examples in (11).

- (11) a. We have been sending tapes to the Aliens (for the last 2 months)...
b. # We have been giving tapes to the Aliens (for the last 2 months)...

⁶ "Giving X a (new) coat of paint" looks semantically equivalent to "(re-)painting X". In other words, *give* becomes a light creation verb (RH&L). In fact giving away or receiving something that is possessed inalienably, that is, a transfer of inalienable possession, is an oxymoron at best. As will also be observed in 2.12 below, light verb *GIVE* presents special properties across the board.

⁷ Traditionally, the argument against derivational analyses has been that DOCs show animacy restrictions, a claim proved by HR&L not to be correct (see §2.2). It is worth noticing that, if the "unnaturalness" of (7b) is attributed to structural reasons—as suggested by H&J—the *to*-construction would paradoxically end up showing stronger animacy effects than the DOC.

SEND, in its cause motion reading, may be interpreted as prospective in space or time, and, consequently, the construction shows no actual existence presupposition associated, yielding the felicitous continuation in (11a). It is clear that this interpretation is not available in (10). Again, the recipient in the *GIVE+to* construction (11b) is subject to the same existence presupposition as the subject of *HAVE* in (10a) and the recipient of *DOC* in (10b).

2.5. *The two readings of 'again'*. Beck & Johnson (2004) observe that *DOCs* modified with *again* present a repetitive reading (12a), as well as a restitutive one (12b). They argue that the restitutive reading is obtained by modification of a small clause resulting state that is present as a sub-structure of *DOCs*.

(12) Thilo gave Satoshi the map again. [B&J's exxx. (48)-(49)]

- a. Thilo gave Satoshi the map, and that had happened before.
- b. Thilo gave Satoshi the map, and Satoshi had had the map before.

These authors also attribute exactly the same two interpretations to *GIVE+to* (13). Following their logic, the restitutive reading must be attributed to the same structural relation between the adverb and the small clause found in (12).

(13) Thilo gave the map to Satoshi again. [B&J's ex. (67)]

- a. Thilo gave the map to Satoshi, and that had happened before.
- b. Thilo gave the map to Satoshi, and Satoshi had had the map before.

They also observe that not all *to*-constructions have a uniform interpretation in the restitutive reading. Thus, verbs of motion may have a locative resulting state (14).

(14) Thilo sent the plane to Yubara again. [B&J (69)]

- a. Thilo sent the plane to Yubara, and that had happened before.
- b. Thilo sent the plane to Yubara, and the plane had been in Yubara before.

Even in these cases, B&J do not argue that the restitutive reading is not available in the *to*-construction, but that in that resulting state “an object is restored to a location”, and not to a previous possessor. This is what we expect if, as discussed above, RH&L are correct and

predicates like *SEND* are ambiguous. In fact, when the recipient is animate the change of possession is predicted to be available also with these verbs, a fulfilled expectation:

(15) Thilo sent the plane to Satoshi again.

a. Thilo sent the plane to Satoshi, and that had happened before.

b. Thilo sent the plane to Satoshi, and Satoshi had had the map before.

Extending their argumentation, this test not only shows that DOC and *to*-construction pattern together, but it also that a small clause structure is involved in both “caused possession” and “caused motion” *to*-constructions: different verbs, different prepositions, the same underlying structure.

2.6. *Subextraction*. Bruening (2010a) and H&P claim that the following contrast supports a different analysis for DOCs and *to*-constructions :

(16) a. Who_i did you send pictures of *t_i* to all the season ticket holders?

b. * Who_i did you send relatives of *t_i* invitations to the wedding?

Example (16) shows that extraction out of the recipient in DOCs is more restricted than from the theme, but it does not say anything about the DOC/*to*-construction relation. To complete the paradigm, a missing third case must be considered where subextraction takes place from the *to*-PP, as in (17):

(17) * Who did you send invitations (to the wedding) to relatives of *t_i*?

Once again, the ungrammaticality of (17) parallels (16b), suggesting that *GIVE* + *to* does not behave differently from DOC-*GIVE* also in that respect.

2.7. *Non-opaque domains for anaphora*. Pesetsky (1995:159-160) and Bruening (2010a) mention the contrast in (18) to argue against a small clause analysis of DOCs. According to them, while small clauses are opaque domains for anaphor-binding (18a), the anaphor is allowed in the structurally lower object of the DOC (18b).

(18) a. * John considered her angry at himself.

b. John showed her himself.

The first relevant observation is that binding of the theme in the *to*-construction is also possible:

(19) John showed/presented himself to the two disciples

The second observation is that Pesetsky's argument against a small clause configuration only holds if the recipient (*her* in (18b)) is base-generated higher than the theme (*himself*), as in the P_{HAVE} hypothesis, but not if the base position is the opposite, as in many derivational analyses since Larson (1988) and Baker (1988). From that perspective, the structure parallel to (18b) is the grammatical (20) rather than (18a):

(20) John has always considered himself close to her

2.8. *Scope freezing*. It is generally assumed (Aoun & Li 1989; Bruening 2010a, among others) that DOCs and *to*-constructions differ in their scope properties: while *to*-constructions show scope ambiguity between universal and existential quantifiers, DOCs have fixed scope, with the existential always taking wide scope:

- (21) a. Maria gave a bottle to every baby. $\exists > \forall$, $\forall > \exists$
 b. Maria gave a baby every bottle. $\exists > \forall$, * $\forall > \exists$

H&J argue that $HAVE$ is also subject to this restriction. In contrast to regular transitive verbs (22b), $HAVE$ -construction show fixed scope, again with the existential taking scope over the universal (22a) [Satoshi Tomioka's observation, mentioned by Bruening 2010a:547 and H&J, ex. (27)]:

- (22) a. Someone has every book. $\exists > \forall$, ??/* $\forall > \exists$
 b. Someone read every book $\exists > \forall$, $\forall > \exists$

Contrary to the general assumption, (21a-b) does not constitute a true paradigm: in (21a) the existential quantifier is in the theme and the universal one in the goal, while in (21b) the quantifiers are lined up in the opposite way. In order to check the alleged DOC/*to*-construction divergence, the minimal pair must keep the quantified expressions constant in the goal and in the theme, as schematized in (23a-b) and (24a-b), below:

- (23) a. Subject GIVE [THEME \exists NP] [RECIPIENT to \forall NP]
 b. Subject GIVE [RECIPIENT \forall NP] [THEME \exists NP]
 (24) a. Subject GIVE [THEME \forall NP] [RECIPIENT to \exists NP]
 b. Subject GIVE [RECIPIENT \exists NP] [THEME \forall NP]

In fact, addressing a previous objection we raised in O&R (2012), Bruening (2014, (47)-(49)) provides all the judgments, and, his examples clearly show that DOCs and *to*-constructions behave uniformly with respect to scope. Thus, when the existential is in the theme, and the universal in the recipient (structures 23a-b), either scope is possible, no matter whether the recipient is in a DOC (25) or in a *to*-construction (26):

(25) This lighting gives everyone a different kind of headache. [=B's (49a)]

(26) This lighting gives a different kind of headache to everyone who enters the room [=B's (49d)]

In contrast, if the existential is in the recipient (structures (24a-b), it always has wide scope, independently of whether it is in a DOC (27) or in a *to*-construction (28):

(27) This lighting gives a different person every kind of headache [=B's (49b)]

(28) a. This lighting gives every kind of headache to a different (type of) person. [=B's(47a)/(49c)]

b. Let's spare every ordeal to someone or other (who comes before us today). [=B's 47b]

c. The bosses denied every position to some applicant or other from within the bureau

[=B's (47c)]

In other words, descriptively speaking, the universal quantifier may scope over existential one if and only if the former is in the recipient and the later in the theme, regardless of whether we are dealing with a DOC or a *to*-construction. Therefore, scope freezing not only does not constitute an argument against a derivational analysis but, quite to the contrary, it strongly favors a structural connection between DOCs and *to*-constructions.

2.9. Idioms. Bruening (2010a) and H&J state that idioms in ditransitive constructions follow the paradigm in (29). This split between idioms in DOCs and in *to*-constructions has been used as a primary argument against a derivational analysis.

(29) a. Class 1: fixed V+Theme, double object construction [V X NP]: *GIVE X the creeps*

b. Class 2: fixed V+Theme, *to*-dative construction [V NP *to* X]: *GIVE rise to X*

c. Class 3: fixed V+Goal, *to*-dative construction [V X *to* NP]: *SEND X to the showers*

d. Class 4: fixed V+Goal, double object construction [V NP X]: **unattested**

However, the description is incomplete and somehow misleading. First, Bresnan & Nikitina (2008) and RH&L show that fixed theme idioms in Class 1, contrary to what was traditionally assumed, can also appear in the Class 2 frame. Thus, for instance, the examples in (30) correspond to the *to*-version of "give X a headache" and "give X a punch" respectively:

- (30) a. ... a stench or smell is diffused over the ship that would give a headache to the most athletic constitution.
- b. ... she gave a punch to the evil reporter that had asked the dumb ass question.

Since the same idiomatic meaning is present in both constructions, the relation between classes 1 and 2 constitutes strong evidence for a derivational analysis⁸ Second, concerning class 3, all the examples discussed are idioms with verbs of the *SEND* and *THROW* type. There is no reported idiom with a *GIVE* type verb, a gap that correlates with the lack of Class 4 idioms. And in all the massive "V X [*to* DP]" reported in the literature, the *to*-phrase has a clear locative meaning, as supported by the fact that, with a few exceptions (31b), they all are inanimate goals:

- (31) a. send X to the showers, send X to Coventry, carry X to the extremes,...
- b. send X to the devil, take X to the cleaners, throw X to the wolves.

Even animate *to*-PPs in (31b) have a locative flavour, and they often coexist—in English as well as in other languages—with clear locative idioms with exactly the same meaning:

- (32) send X to hell, mandar a X la mierda ('send X to the shit'), etc.

Given the distribution of "change of possession"/"change of place" frames, this suggests, once again, that the restriction is a general ban on fixed recipient idioms in "change of possession" contexts, independently of whether they are framed as DOCs or *to*-construction.

2.10. Nominalizations. A context where DOCs and *to*-constructions do contrast sharply is in nominalizations, where DOCs are banned, as originally shown by Kayne (1984) and discussed in several places in the literature (e.g. Beck & Johnson 2004, Bruening 2010a, H&J):

⁸ In order to save their analysis, H&J rely on the R-dative shift analysis proposed by Bruening (2010b). However, O&R (2012) show that that proposal is neither theoretically nor empirically tenable; and Larson (2013) goes even further, denying any idiomatic import in these examples.

- (33) a. The gift of a statue to Mary
 b. * The gift of Mary (of) a statue

Virtually every derivational analysis of DOCs since Larson (1988) assumes some type of V- or P-incorporation process in the DOC that does not occur in *to*-constructions, as P_{HAVE}- and *Appl*P analyses also do. Consequently, the contrast in nominalizations is equally relevant for most competing proposals and any analysis that postulates an asymmetry with respect to the presence of an empty head in the DOC (be it an *Appl* head, a P_{HAVE}, an incorporated V or P, or any other mechanism) has different options to derive it.

2.11. *Failure of the entailment (result possessive state)*. One of Pylkkänen's (2008) objection to the P_{HAVE} analysis is the well known fact that the result possessive state expected is not always entailed in DOCs:

- (34) a. I threw John the ball but he didn't catch it
 b. I sent John a letter but he never got it

However, and regardless of H&J's answer to this objection, R-H&L show that transfer inferences are determined solely by the choice of verbs, not by the syntactic structure the verb appears in (see also Jackendoff 1989). Thus, verbs that inherently signify acts of giving (*GIVE*, *hand*, *lend*, *loan*, etc.) entail successful transfer in either variant (35). On the other hand, verbs of future having (*owe*, *offer*, *promise*, etc) fail to entail it in both DOC and *to*-construction (36). In other words, with some predicates successful transfer is lexically encoded, independently of the event schema associated to each syntactic variant; and with others, it is not an entailment but an implicature governed by pragmatic factors.

- (35) a. # His aunt gave/lent/loaned my brother some money for a new car, but he never got it.
 b. # His aunt gave/lent/loaned some money to my younger brother, but he never got it.
- (36) a. Max offered help to the victims, but they refused his offer.
 b. Max offered the victims help, but they refused his offer.

2.12. *Depictive secondary predicates*. Finally, Pylkkänen (2008) argues against a P_{HAVE} analysis on the basis of secondary predication. Depictive predication is generally allowed in small clauses,

but disallowed in DOCs (37). Again, this fact does not make any difference with respect to the *to*-construction (38).

- (37) a. *I gave John_i a book drunk_i
b. *I gave the baby_i the bottle crying_i

- (38) a. *I gave a book to John_i drunk_i
b. *I gave the bottle to the baby_i crying_i

There are, however, some instances where secondary predication is grammatical (41). Pylkkänen and H&J have different interpretations of the facts: for Pylkkänen the relevant context is when *GIVE* is a light verb, and according to H&J, when the theme is eventive (Ritter & Rosen 1993).

Independently of which approach proves to be the right explanation, what is relevant for us is that, once again, when secondary predication is available for DOCs (39a), it is also available for the *to*-construction (40a).

- (39) a. The nurse gave the patient_i the medication half-asleep_i.
b. * Mary gave John_i the book half-asleep_i

- (40) a. The nurse gave the medication to the patient_i half-asleep_i
b. * Mary gave the book to John_i half-asleep_i

3. Conclusions

To summarize, all the tests discussed in the literature support the conclusion that change-of-possession *to*-PPs and DOCs behave the same way. Thus, it does not seem to be an option to maintain the logic of the *HAVE*/*P_{HAVE}* parallelism and, at the same time, to leave the *to*-construction aside. Either we ignore the basic *HAVE*/*P_{have}* altogether or we extend the logic of the *HAVE*/*P_{have}* connection to the *GIVE+to* construction and, obviously, to the *HAVE*/*P_{have}* reading of *to*-constructions with other alternating verbs (*THROW*, *SEND*-types, etc.). The second option looks more promising. If that is correct, it does not seem that the ApplP analysis or the "mixed" *P_{HAVE}* analysis are the best suited options to capture the relationship between DOCs and *to*-constructions. More generally, as far as we can see, this leaves us with three logical options:

- (i) either we propose parallel structures, encoding the syntax of *HAVE/P_{HAVE}* as part of a more complex PP structure in *GIVE +to* constructions as well (that is, Pesetsky's (1995, sect. 6.3.2) original solution to the superset/subset problem and, at least partially, RH&L's "compatible frames" approach);
- (ii) we derive *HAVE/P_{HAVE}* from some kind of *to_{HAVE}* construction, provided that RH&L's results are incorporated (e.g., O&R 2010, 2016a, in the spirit of Baker's 1988 P-incorporation analysis, or Larson 2013, Gonçalves, Duarte & Tjerk 2016, in the spirit of Larson 1988);
- (iii) or we derive the *to_{HAVE}* construction from the *HAVE/P_{HAVE}* -type one (e.g., Aoun & Li 1989, and recent proposals by MacDonnald 2015 or Hallman 2015, among others).

The decision among these three general options then will depend on how each analysis deals with the parallelisms discussed here, and at the same time how it derives the obvious structural differences--mostly Barss & Lasnik's (1986) but also newly added ones-- between the two constructions, always within standard parameters of conceptual adequacy.

References

- Aoun, J. and Li, Y.-H. A. 1989. "Scope and constituency." *Linguistic Inquiry* 20: 141–172.
- Baker, Mark. 1988. *Incorporation: a theory of grammatical function changing*. Chicago: U. Chicago Press.
- Barss, Andrew and Lasnik, Howard. 1986. "A note on anaphora and double objects." *Linguistic Inquiry* 17: 347–354.
- Beck, Sigrid, and Kyle Johnson. 2004. Double objects again. *Linguistic Inquiry* 35:97–123.
- Bleam, Tonia & Norbert Hornstein. 2010. Deriving Multiple "Object" Constructions. Manuscript, University of Maryland.
- Bresnan, Joan & T. Nikitina. 2007. The Gradience of the Dative Alternation. To appear in *Reality Exploration and Discovery: Pattern interaction in Language and Life*, L. Uyechi & L.H. Wee (eds.), Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Bruening, Benjamin. 2010a. Ditransitive asymmetries and a theory of idiom formation. *Linguistic Inquiry* 41:519–562.

- Bruening, Benjamin. 2010b. "Double object constructions as disguised prepositional datives," *Linguistic inquiry* 41: 287-305.
- Bruening, Benjamin. 2014. Double Object Constructions and Prepositional Dative Constructions are Distinct: A Reply to Ormazabal and Romero. Ms. University of Delaware [September 16, 2014 version].
- Goncalves, Rita, Ines Duarte & Tjerk Hagemeijer. 2016. *CGG 2016*.
- Hallman, Peter. 2015. Syntactic Neutralization in Double Object Constructions. *Linguistic Inquiry* 46.3, 389-424.
- Harley, Heidi. 2002. Possession and the double object construction. *Yearbook of Linguistic Variation* 2: 29–68.
- Harley, H. and H-K Jung. (2015). In support of the *P_{HAVE}* approach to the double object construction. *Linguistic Inquiry* 46.4, 703-730. 10.1162/LING_a_00198
- Harley, Heidi & Shigeru Miyagawa. 2016. Ditransitives. Ms. Univ. of Arizona & MIT. To appear, Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Linguistics
- Jackendoff, Ray. 1989. *Semantic structures*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Kayne, Richard. 1984. *Connectedness and Binary Branching*. Dordrecht: Foris Pub.
- Langaker, Ronald W. 1987. *Cognitive Foundation so f Cognitive Linguistics vol. 1: Theoretical prerequisites*, Stanford University Press.
- Larson, Richard. 1988. On the Double Object Construction. *Linguistic Inquiry* 19:335-391.
- Larson, Richard. 2013. On "Dative Idioms" in English. Ms. Stonny Brook University.
- MacDonald, Jonathan E. 2015. A derivational approach to the dative alternation in English. Ms.,
- Marantz, Alec. 1993. Implications of asymmetries in Double Object Constructions. In S. A. Mchombo, ed. *Theoretical Aspects of Bantu Grammar*, CSLI Publications, Stanford, 113-150.
- Ormazabal, Javier & Juan Romero. 2010. The Derivation of Dative Alternations. In M. Duguine et al, eds. *Argument Structure and Syntactic Relations from a Crosslinguistic Perspective*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 203-232.

- Ormazabal, Javier & Juan Romero. 2012. [PPs without disguises. Reply to Bruening](https://doi.org/10.1162/LING_a_00097). *Linguistic Inquiry* 43, 455-474. [doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1162/LING_a_00097]
- Ormazabal, Javier & Juan Romero. 2016a. Crosslinguistic Variation in Dative Alternations. Ms. University of the Basque Country (UPV/EHU) and University of Extremadura.
- Ormazabal, Javier & Juan Romero. 2016b. Historical Changes in Basque Dative Alternations: evidence for a derivational analysis. Under revision for *Glossa*.
- Pesetsky, David. 1995. *Zero Syntax: Experiencers and Cascades*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Pylkkänen, L. 2008. *Introducing Arguments*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Rappaport Hovav, M. & Levin, B. 2008. The English Dative Alternation: The Case for Verb Sensitivity'. *Journal of Linguistics* 44: 129-167.
- Ritter, Elizabeth & Sara Rosen. 1993. Deriving Causation. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 11, 519-555.