

Dative-Shift : Discourse Approaches vs. Semantic Approaches

Nam Sun SONG (宋 南先)

Introduction

A lot of works have been devoted to the syntactic description of Dative-shift in English. However, comparatively little attention has been paid to why English has such a syntactic alternation. This paper reviews discourse approaches and semantic approaches to Dative-shift. On the basis of a comparison of English and Korean it argues that Dative-shift in these two languages is clearly a semantic process rather than pragmatically motivated. Moreover, Dative-shift is shown to be a reflection of the ambivalence of verbs expressing a change in possession.

1. Discourse Approaches to Dative-shift

1.1 Givón's Approach

Givón (1979), examining data from a variety of languages, proposed an analysis of Dative-shift in terms of the following two features, each of which is familiar from earlier analyses:

1. The erstwhile indirect object loses its case-marking morpheme.
2. The order of two objects is reversed.

Givón says that the 'demoted' accusative object may remain unmarked when the prepositional object is DATIVE or BENEFACTIVE as in (3), while it may otherwise acquire a preposition, as in (4).

3. a) John gave a book to Mary.
b) John gave Mary a book.

4. a) John sprayed paint on the wall.

b) John sprayed the wall with paint.

The type of alternation in (4) may also be thought of as Dative-shift from a functional viewpoint. Of the two features of Dative-shift, Givón takes (2) as the essential feature while regarding (1) as a feature specific to SVO languages like English. He argues that the most common function of the Dative-shift is changing the 'relative topicality' of the accusative *vis-à-vis* the prepositional object.

This involves the universal work-order principle that the left-most constituent is the "more topical" one, that is, the one more likely to not constitute new information.

(Givón 1979: 161.)

He claims that his assumption is compatible with the following data.

5. a) When he found it, John gave the book to Mary.

b)? When he found it, John gave Mary the book.

6. a) When he found her, John gave Mary the book.

b)? When he found her, John gave the book to Mary.

In (5), the accusative object is established as topical via previous mention in a preposed-topical adverbial clause and, therefore, ACC-DAT is more natural. DAT-ACC is more natural in (6) since the dative object is established as topical.

Givón holds that the type of Dative-shift which involves both (1) and (2) is restricted to SVO languages. However, he claims that from a functional viewpoint Dative-shift exists in SOV languages too.

One can also show that the same rule of dative-shift, in functional terms, may also exist in an SOV language where no morphological changes in the case marking are associated with it, but only the relative order change. (Givón 1979: 153.)

He adduces the following examples from Sherpa, a Tibeto-Burmese

language.

7. tiki kitabi coxts-i-kha-la zax-sung
 he-ERG book table-GEN-on-DAT put-AUX
 'He put the book on the table.'

8. tiki coxts-i-kha-la kitabi zax-sung
 he-ERG table-GEN-on-DAT book put-AUX
 'He put on the table a book.'

When the previous context topicalizes the accusative object, as in *I asked him what he did with book, so he said that...*, the order ACC-DAT is preferred while if the dative is topicalized, the order DAT-ACC is preferred. Thus, Givón assumes that Dative-shift in SVO languages and the relative word-order change in SOV languages perform an identical function.

1.2 Dominance and Dative Movement

Erteschik-Shir (1979) claims that Dative Movement in English is best accounted for not in syntax but in terms of discourse constraints. A notion of 'dominance', which is somewhat similar to 'focus', 'new information', or 'communicative dynamism', is posited to explain the discourse functions of Dative Movement. The definition of 'dominance' is as follows:

9. 'Dominance: A constituent C of a sentence S is dominant in S if and only if the speaker intends to direct the attention of his hearers to the intension of C by uttering S.' (443)

A dominant constituent therefore is the natural candidate for the topic of further conversation as in (10).

10. Speaker A: I saw Picasso's picture of the blue angel yesterday.
 Speaker B: Oh, yes, I know which one it is.

The pronoun *it* in (10) can only refer to *Picasso's picture of the blue angel* and not to *the blue angel*. It indicates that only the larger NP is dominant in A's utterance.

The dominance relation is related to various determiners and to degree of specificity, as tested in (11–16).

11. Speaker A: John killep a cop.
Speaker B: Oh, yes, I know which one it is.
12. Speaker A: John killed the cop who was a criminal himself.
Speaker B: Oh, yes, I know which one it is.
13. Speaker A: John killed the cop.
Speaker B:?? Oh, yes, I know which one it is.
14. Speaker A: John killed the president.
Speaker B:?? Oh, yes, I know which one it is.
15. Speaker A: John killed Howie.
Speaker B: *Oh, yes, I know which Howie it is.
16. Speaker A: John killed him.
Speaker B: **Oh, yes, I know who he is.

There is a hierarchy according to which indefinites are generally used to indicate that an NP is dominant, while definites generally indicate that an NP is nondominant, and pronouns cannot possibly be used dominantly. It is pointed out, however, that there are instances of a definite NP being interpreted dominantly. Such pronouns as *him* or *her* can also receive a dominant interpretation, providing they are said with stress. However, this is not normal. It is claimed that these facts make the notion of dominance distinct from the well-known notion of focus or new information. The notion of dominance is assumed also to be distinct from communicative dynamism since the latter is a relative notion while the former is an absolute property. There is only one NP that cannot be used dominantly, that is *it*. Thus, *it* is thought of as the archetype of the nondominant NP. Erteschik-Shir proposed a rule for Dative Movement as shown in (17).

17. In the structure ... V NP1 NP2 (derived from ... V NP2 $\left\{ \begin{smallmatrix} \text{to} \\ \text{for} \end{smallmatrix} \right\}$ NP1)

NP1 is nondominant and NP2 is dominant.

The following data are adduced to support the hypothesis in (17). The preferred order is marked by ‘-’.

18. a) John gave a book to Mary.

b) -John gave Mary a book.

19. a) John gave a book to the girl.

b) -John gave the girl a book.

20. a) John gave a book to her.

b) -John gave her a book.

21. a) -John gave the book to Mary.

b) John gave Mary the book.

In (18–20), the rule places the NP in the final position, which is more easily interpreted as being dominant. Therefore, the version in which the rule is applied is preferred. In (21), the underlying order is preferred since the more dominant NP already follows the less dominant in it. Erteschik-Shir claims that the validity of the rule is clearer on the basis of the above-mentioned dominance test.

22. Speaker A: John gave a book to someone yesterday.

Speaker B: Oh, yes, I know who it was.

23. Speaker A: John gave someone a book yesterday.

Speaker B: *Oh, yes, I know who it was.

Oh, yes, I know which one it was.

In (22) the response can refer either to the ‘someone’ or the ‘book’, while in (23) the response can only refer to the ‘book’; that is, ‘someone’ cannot be interpreted as being dominant after Dative Movement has applied.

The test thus strengthens the analysis of Dative Movement as a rule that functions to force a dominant interpretation on the NP that ends up in final position (and a nondominant interpretation on the other NP). (451)

The following exceptions have been problematic for syntactic approaches to Dative-shift.

24. a) John gave it to Mary.
b)* John gave Mary it.
25. a) Who did John give the book to?
b)* Who did John give the book?

Erteschik-Shir argues that the discourse approach can solve these problems. *It* cannot occur in the right-most position in double object constructions as in (26–29).

26. a) John gave it to a girl.
b)* John gave a girl it.
27. a) John gave it to the girl.
b)* John gave the girl it.
28. a) John gave it to Mary.
b)* John gave Mary it.
29. a) John gave it to her.
b)* John gave her it.

As already pointed out, *it* can never be interpreted as being dominant. It is maintained that the (b) sentences are ill-formed since dominance is assigned by the rule to an NP that cannot be interpreted as being dominant.

The discourse rule also provides an account of the unacceptability of (30) and (31).

- 30.* Who did John give the book?
31.* The girl that John gave the book is very nice.

What causes the unacceptability of these sentences is that in each case an NP is highlighted by means of questioning and relativization and given dominance, while the function of Dative Movement forces nondominant interpretations on the NPs in question.

The following data are also given an explanation in terms of the discourse rule.

32.* John told that he liked ice cream to Mary.

33. John told Mary that he liked ice cream.

Erteschik-Shir says that sentential complements and 'heavy NPs', due to their length, must be interpreted as being dominant and are, therefore, preferred in sentence-final position.

Thus, Erteschik-Shir concludes that a discourse analysis of Dative Movement predicts various kinds of data that other analyses find it difficult to account for.

2. Inadequacy of the Discourse Approaches to Dative-shift

The discourse approaches to Dative-shift proposed by Givón and Erteschik-Shir are considerable improvements on simply writing a syntactic transformation and not bothering to ask about the circumstances under which non-dative-shifted and dative-shifted sentences are used. In this section, however, the claim that Dative-shift is a process which primarily serves discourse functions is refuted, referring to two points: (i) it cannot explain the problem of exceptions, (ii) change in topicality or change in 'dominance' by a word-order change is not inherent in Dative-shift.

2.1 English Dative-shift

Three properties have been pointed out by many linguists with regard to the Dative-shift in English. First, it is a highly lexically-conditioned process. For instance, *teach* and *explain* are somewhat similar to each other, but only the former allows Dative-shift.

34. a) John taught the story to Bill.

b) John taught Bill the story.

35. a) John explained the story to Bill.
b)* John explained Bill the story.
36. a) John told the story to Bill.
b) John told Bill the story.
37. a) John said these words to Bill.
b)* John said Bill these words.
38. a) John sent some stock to Bill.
b) John sent Bill some stock.
39. a) John transferred some stock to Bill.
b)* John transferred Bill some stock.

Secondly, the 'shifted' indirect object has to be normally animate.

40. a) John brought the piano to New York.
b)* John brought New York the piano.
41. a) John brought the piano to Bill.
b) John brought Bill the piano.

Thirdly, the structure with a preposition is not allowed when the direct object NPs denote 'diseases' or certain other abstract entities.

42. a)* Mary gave the measles to John.
b) Mary gave John the measles.
43. a)* Mary gave an inferiority complex to John.
b) Mary gave John an inferiority complex.
44. a)* Mary gave a broken arm to John.
b) Mary gave John a broken arm.
45. a)* Mary gave a pain in the neck to John.
b) Mary gave John a pain in the neck.

Dative-shift is optional in (34), (36), (38), etc., while it is blocked in (35), (37), (39), and (40), and it is obligatory in (42–45). None of these three restrictions seem to have a clear discourse motivation. The Dative Movement rule (17) proposed by Erteschik-Shir does not provide any account

of these restrictions. Note that the notion of dominance is defined in terms of the speaker's intention. A constituent is dominant if the speaker intends to direct the attention of his hearers to an entity denoted by the constituent. In other words, dominance is a relation which holds between the speaker's intention and the entity denoted by an NP. The notion of dominance and the rule based on it, therefore, can say nothing about why Dative-shift is allowed with *teach* and not with *explain*. The rule (17) also cannot explain the animacy constraint on the indirect object NPs as in (40) and (41) since there is no reason why the speaker could not intend to direct the attention of his hearers to 'New York'. Erteschik-Shir says that there is no condition on Dative Movement that makes the transformation obligatory with 'diseases', adducing the following examples.

46. a) John gave Mary pneumonia and he gave it to Ted too.
 b)* John gave Mary pneumonia and he gave Ted it too.

In the second parts on these sentences *pneumonia* is not interpreted as being dominant, since it has been mentioned already in the first part. It is claimed that (46b) is unacceptable since the structure of the second part of (46b) forces a dominant interpretation on *it*. However, the question why such constructions as (47) are not allowed remains unexplained.

- 47.* John gave pneumonia to Mary.

Furthermore, the examples in (48) raised by Green (1974) seem to be serious counter-examples for Erteschik-Shir.

48. a)* Martha gave a piece of her mind to John.

- b)* Martha gave John a piece of her mind, and then she gave one to Richard.

In the second part of (48b), 'a piece of her mind' referred to by the indefinite pronoun *one*, is most likely to be interpreted nondominantly since it has already been mentioned in the first part. Given the rule (17),

(48b) should be well-formed.

As already mentioned, Dative-shift in English has two criterial features: one is the change in order of two objects and the other is the change in prepositionality. What is common to Erteschik-Shir and Givón is that they take the former as the essential feature of Dative-shift, paying no serious attention to the fact that prepositional indirect object loses its preposition. Quite an opposite position is taken by Green (1974). She argues that the two features are independent of each other and that the crucial feature is the prepositionlessness of the immediately post-verbal indirect object, not its position. In support of this view she compares examples such as (32) and (33) with (49) and (50) by way of demonstrating that the order of constituents is independent of whether or not the verb allows Dative-shift, and points out that discourse structure cannot account for the fact that the prepositional indirect object loses its preposition in (33) but retains it in (49b) and (50b).

49. a)? John demonstrated the sixteen proofs for the existence of God which he found in a medieval manuscript over the weekend to me.

b) John demonstrated to me the sixteen proofs for the existence of God which he found in a medieval manuscript over the weekend.

50. a)?* Arthur will try to obtain the recommendations which you say I need for me.

b) Arthur will try to obtain for me the recommendations which you say I need.

Examples (26–29) also cannot be strong evidence for the hypothesis that the primary function of Dative-shift is a discourse function since occurrence of *it* in the left-most position is not inherent in Dative-shift, as shown in (51).

51. a) John said these words to Bill.
b) John said to Bill these words.
c) John said to Bill the words he had just learned.
d) John said it to Bill.
e)* John said to Bill it.

There is another problem that the discourse analysis of Dative-shift cannot deal with. The NPs to be dative-shifted are restricted to Goal; Source NPs cannot be shifted.

52. a) John took away a book from Mary.
b)* John took away Mary a book.
c)* John took Mary away a book.
53. a) John stole a book from Mary.
b)* John stole Mary a book.

We have so far argued that the assumption that the function of Dative-shift is merely a discourse function cannot account for its semantically-conditioned nature and exceptions.

2.2 Word-order Variation in Japanese and Dative-shift

Givón argues that the main and most common function of Dative-shift is that it makes a promoted NP more topical and a demoted NP a focus. This change in topicality is shown in the following test.

54. a) When he found it, John gave the book to Mary. (5a)
b)? When he found it, John gave Mary the book.
55. What did you do the wall?
a) I sprayed it with paint.
b)? I sprayed paint on it.
56. What did you do with the paint?
a) I sprayed it on the wall.
b)? I sprayed the wall with it.

He treats the change in case marking concomitant with Dative-shift as

a language-specific feature, not an essential one. He therefore claims that the Dative-shift in English has the same function as the word order-variation in SOV languages exemplified in (7) and (8). This kind of word-order variation is also found in Japanese, an SOV language.

57. a) *watashi-ga John-ni hon-o age-ta*

I-nom John-dat book-acc give-past

'I gave John a book.'

b) *watashi-ga hon-o John-ni age-ta*

I-nom book-acc John-dat give-past

'I gave a book to John.'

This word-order variation is exploited to change the relative topicality of the constituents and focus assignment as shown below.

58. a) *watashi-ga kaban-kara issatsuno hon-o*

I-nom bag-abl one book-acc

toridashi sono hon-o John-ni age-ta

take-out-and, the book-acc John-dat give-past

'I took a book out of my bag, and gave the book to John.'

b)? *watashi-ga kaban-kara issatsuno hon-o*

I-nom bag-abl one book-acc

toridashi, John-ni sono hon-o age-ta

take-out-and, John-dat the book-acc give-past

'I took a book out of my bag, and gave to John the book.'

Clearer evidence that word-order variation such as in (57) functions to change the relative topicality of the two NPs comes from the manner in which the two NPs combine with the particle *wa*. Kuno (1973) and Inoue (1983) point out that the particle *wa* indicates either the topic of a sentence when it is assigned to an NP conveying given information, or 'contrast' when it is attached to an NP conveying new information.

59. *gakusei-ga suunin kega-o shita. karera-wa*

student-nom several injury-acc did they-top
gakko-ni tsuita-bakari-datta.

school-dat arrive perf-past

'Several students were injured. They had just arrived at school.'

60. mise-wa manindeshita-ga, *rojin-wa* amari-inakkata.

shop-top crowded-though old-people-cont few-were

'The shop was crowded, but old people were few (though there were many young people.'

Karera 'they', which has been mentioned in the preceding sentence, is interpreted as the topic while *rojin* 'the old', which has not been mentioned, is interpreted as being a contrastive expression. Compare now the following expressions.

61. John-ni ringo-o age-ta

John-dat apple-acc give-past

'[I] gave to John an apple.'

a) John-ni-*wa* ringo-o age-ta

John-dat apple-acc give-past

b) John-ni ringo-*wa* age-ta

John-dat apple (acc) give-past

62. ringo-o John-ni age-ta

apple-acc John-dat give-past

'[I] gave an/the apple to John.'

a) ringo-*wa* John-ni age-ta

apple (acc) John-dat give-past

b) ringo-o John-ni-*wa* age-ta

apple-acc John-dat give-past

John in (61a) can be interpreted either as a topic or as contrastive as in (63).

63. a) A: John-ni nani-o age-mashi-ta-ka

John-dat what-acc give-honorific-past-interrogative
 'What did you give to John?'

B: John-ni-wa ringo-o age-mashi-ta

John-dat apple-acc give-honorific-past
 '[I] gave to John an apple.'

b) John-ni-wa ringo-o age, Mary-ni-wa nashi-o age-ta

John-dat apple-acc give Mary-dat pear-acc give-past

'To John, I gave an apple, and to Mary, I gave a pear.'

Ringo 'apple' in (61b) however, can only be interpreted as contrastive. Sentence (61b) is most likely to be interpreted as '[I] gave John an apple but nothing else'. The same difference exists between (62a) and (62b). Our argument so far shows that the word-order difference in (57) is employed to change the relative topicality and focus assignment between two arguments, i.e., the left-most constituent is topical and the right-most constituent is focus. It follows that, according to the assumption suggested by Givón, the Dative-shift in English and Japanese word-order variation as in (57) have the same function, although there is some 'trivial' difference in that the former has a change in case-marking while the latter does not. The word-order variation in Japanese, however, drastically differs from Dative-shift in English in that it has no exception. The word-order variation in Japanese is neither lexically nor semantically conditioned, i.e., it is allowed whatever the verb is or whatever the semantic contents of the NPs to be permuted are. For instance, there is no animacy constraint on word-order variation in Japanese, as is seen from (64).

64. a) watshi-ga London-ni tegami-o okutta.

I-nom London-dat letter-acc send-past

'I sent to London a letter.'

b) watashi-ga tegami-o London-ni okutta

I-nom letter-acc London-dat send-past

'I sent a letter to London.'

From the argument above, one can plausibly assume that the word-order variation, unlike the Dative-shift in English, is a process motivated purely in discourse.

Givón treats as Dative-shift not only the alternation between 'give X to Y' and 'give Y X', but also the alternation between 'spray X on Y' and 'spray Y with X'. As pointed out in relation to (54–56), it is claimed that their function is to change the relative topicality and focus assignment. Japanese also has oppositions comparable with that between 'spray X on Y' and 'spray Y with X'.

65. a) watashi-ga mizu-o baketsu-ni mitashi-ta

I-nom water-acc bucket-dat fill-past

'I filled water into a bucket' (literally).

b) watashi-ga mizu-de baketsu-o mitashi-ta

I-nom water-instr bucket-acc fill-past

'I filled a bucket with water.'

There are changes in case-marking in (65). Recall that the word-order variation in Japanese is exceptionless. The combination of the differentiation in case-marking and the word-order variation produces the following four possibilities, and they are all quite acceptable.

66. a) watashi-ga mizu-o baketsu-ni mitashita

I-nom water-acc bucket-dat filled

'I filled water into a bucket.'

b) watashi-ga baketsu-ni mizu-o mitashita

I-nom bucket-dat water-acc filled

'I filled into a bucket water.'

c) watashi-ga baketsu-o mizu-de mitashita

I-nom bucket-acc water-instr filled

'I filled a bucket with water.'

d) *watashi-ga mizu-de baketsu-o mitashita*

I-nom water-instr bucket-acc filled

'I filled with water a bucket.'

The word-order variation in (66) is purely pragmatic. The more topical constituent takes the left-most position while the focus takes the right-most position, as tested in (67).

67. a) *watashi-ga ido-kara mizu-o kumi*

I-nom well-from water-acc draw

sore-o baketsu-ni mitashita

(and) it-acc-bucket-dat filled

'I drew water from the well, and filled it into a bucket.'

b)? *watashi-ga ido-kara mizu-o kumi*

I-nom well-from water-acc draw

baketsu-ni sore-o mitashita

(and) bucket-dat it-acc filled

'I drew water from the well, and filled it into a bucket.'

c)? *watashi-ga ido-kara mizu-o kumi,*

I-nom well-from water-acc draw

baketsu-o sore-de mitashita

(and) bucket-acc it-instr filled

'I drew water from the well, and filled a bucket with it.'

d) *watashi-ga ido-kara mizu-o kumi,*

I-nom well-from water-acc draw

sore-de baketsu-o mitashita

(and) it-instr bucket-acc filled

Sentences (67b) and (67c) are a little unnatural since the topical NP, which has already been mentioned in the first part of the sentence, is placed to the right of the focus NP. It seems very plausible intuitively

that sentences (66a) and (66b) which have the same case-marking are logically about *mizu* 'water' or its change of location. Similarly, (66c) and (66d) are both about *baketsu* 'bucket', in spite of the difference in word-order and focus assignment. These observations show that the word-order variation and the case-marking variation in (66) are independent of each other, and the former is a purely pragmatic operation while the latter is a semantic one. Now compare the English sentences in (68) and Japanese ones in (66). It will be noticeable that the possibilities in (66b) and (66d) are blocked in English. The reason for this seems to me quite straightforward. The direct object, which is marked by the accusative postposition in Japanese, is marked in English by the immediately post-verbal position without a preposition. This language-specific property in case-marking blocks the possibilities (68b) and (68d).

68. a) I sprayed the paint on the wall.
 b)* I sprayed on the wall the paint.
 c) I sprayed the wall with the paint.
 d)* I sprayed with the paint the wall.

In a language in which possibilities like (68b) and (68d) are blocked, the functions which were otherwise performed by the blocked word-orders are performed by the existing word-orders, producing pragmatic ambiguity.

69. a) I bought some paint, and sprayed it on the wall.
 b) I cleared the wall of pictures, and sprayed paint on it.
 c) I bought some paint, and sprayed the wall with it.
 d) I cleared the wall of pictures, and sprayed it with paint.

The examples in (69) indicate that in the word-orders 'spray X on Y' and 'spray Y with X', either 'X' or 'Y' can be topical.

The discussion so far clearly demonstrates that the *spray* type syntactic opposition as in (68a) and (68c) is not pragmatically motivated but seman-

tically motivated. In fact, the *spray* type opposition seen both in English and Japanese is, like the *give* type Dative-shift in English and unlike Japanese word-order variation, lexically-conditioned. SONG (1987, 1989) points out that (68a) is, in a logical sense, about the change in location 'the paint' underwent while (68c) is about the conditional change 'the wall' underwent. Therefore, verbs which express only a change in location cannot have the *spray* type opposition. The English verb *put* and the Japanese verb *sosogu* 'pour' are typical examples.

70. a) I put the paint on the wall.

b)* I put the wall with paint.

71. a) watashi-wa baketsu-ni misu-o sosoida

I-top bucket-dat water-acc poured

'I poured water into a bucket.'

b)* watashi-wa baketsu-o mizu-de sosoida

I-top bucket-acc water-instr poured

'I poured a bucket with water.'

An eclectic position is adopted by Foley and Van Valin (1985). They claim that the *give* type alternation represents 'pragmatic dative shift' which involves only a rearrangement of constituents for purely pragmatic reasons while the *spray* type alternation represents semantic dative-shift which involved an important semantic differentiation. However, this position cannot answer the question why the *give* type Dative-shift, unlike the purely pragmatic word-order variation in SOV languages, is so much lexically and semantically conditioned. Stronger evidence against the view that the *give* type Dative-shift in English is purely pragmatic comes from the study of Korean data in the following section.

2.3 Double-accusative Constructions in Korean

Korean, another SOV language, has the purely pragmatically motivated word-order variation.

72. a) nae-ga John-ege chaeg-il ju-össda
 I-nom John-dat book-acc give-past
 'I gave to John a book.'
- b) nae-ga chaeg-il John-ege ju-össda
 I-nom book-acc John-dat give-past
 'I gave a book to John.'
73. a) nae-ga Seoul-e don-il bone-össda
 I-nom Seoul-dat money-acc send-past
 'I sent to Seoul the money.'
- b) nae-ga don-il Seoul-e bone-össda
 I-nom money-acc Seoul-dat send-past
 'I sent the money to Seoul.'

These word-order variations in Korean perform the same function as the word-order variation in Japanese, as is seen from (74).

74. a) gi-ga gaban-esö hangwön-il chaeg-il
 he-nom bag-from one-gen book-acc
 kkönae-daga, gi chaeg-il John-ege ju-össda
 take-out-after the book-acc John-dat give-past
 'He took a book out of his bag, and then gave the book to John.'
- b)? gi-ga gaban-esö hangwön-ti chaeg-il
 he-nom bag-from one-gen book-acc
 kkönae-daga, John-ege gi chaeg-il ju-össda
 take-out-after John-dat the book-acc give-past
 'He took a book out of his bag, and then gave to John the book.'

The Korean particle (*n*) *in* has almost the same function as Japanese *wa*. It indicates either the topic of a sentence or 'contrast' if it is attached to an NP with given information while it only expresses contrast if it is

attached to an NP with new information. We get exactly the same result from the test in (75) as we got in (61) and (62).

75. John-ege chaeg-il ju-össda
 John-dat book-acc give-past
 ‘[I] gave to John a book.’
- a) John-ege-*nin* chaeg-il ju-össda
 John-dat book-acc give-past
- b) John-ege chaeg-*in* ju-össda
 John-dat book (acc) give-past
- c) chaeg-*in* John-ege ju-össda
 book(acc) John-dat give-past
- d) chaeg-il John-ege-*nin* ju-össda
 book-acc John-dat give-past

The particle (*n*) *in* in (75a) and (75c) indicates that the NPs to which it is assigned are either ‘topical’ or ‘contrastive’, while (*n*) *in* in (75b) and (75d) is interpreted only as expressing contrast. Furthermore, there are no lexical or semantic constraints on this word-order variation. Thus, we can say that the word-order variation in Korean is purely pragmatically motivated like that in Japanese. Korean, in addition to the word-order variation, has so-called ‘double-accusativization’. Some dative and genitive NPs are accusativized, resulting in double-accusative constructions.

76. a) nae-ga John-ege chaeg-il ju-össda
 I-nom John-dat book-acc give-past
 ‘I gave a book to John.’
- b) nae-ga John-il chaeg-il ju-össda
 I-nom John-acc book-acc give-past
 ‘I gave John a book.’
77. a) nae-ga John-ege don-il ponaessda

Dative-Shift : Discourse Approaches vs. Semantic Approaches (SONG)

- I-nom John-dat money-acc sent
 'I sent money to John.'
- b) nae-ga John-il don-il ponaessda
 I-nom John-acc money-acc sent
 'I sent John money.'
- a)' nae-ga Seoul-e don-il bonaessda
 I-nom Seoul-dat money-acc sent
 'I sent money to Seoul.'
- b)* nae-ga Seoul-il don-il bonaessda
 I-nom Seoul-acc money-acc sent
 'I sent Seoul money.'
78. a) nae-ga John-il son-il jab-assda
 I-nom John-gen hand-acc grasp-past
 'I grasped John's hand.'
- b) nae-ga John-il son-il jab-assda
 I-nom John-acc hand-acc grasp-past
 'I grasped John by the hand.'
79. a) nae-ga John-ii/egeso don-il ppaeas-assda
 I-nom John-gen/abl money-acc take-away-past
 'I took away money from John.'
- b)* nae-ga John-il don-il ppaeas-assda
 I-nom John-acc money-acc take-away-past
 'I took away John money.'

Dative-shift in English and double-accusativization in Korean are similar in that in both a non-core or non-accusative NP is promoted to be a core or accusative NP. Furthermore, Korean double-accusativization manifests the characteristics common to Dative-shift in English. First, it is constrained by animacy. The NP to be accusativized has to be, in general, animate, typically human, as shown in (77). Second, NPs with

the semantic role 'Source' cannot be accusativized, as in (79). Third, double-accusativization, like English Dative-shift, is lexically conditioned. The verbs like *sölmýönggha* 'explain' and *malha* 'say' cannot have the double-accusative construction, while *karichi* 'teach' can.

80. a) nae-ga yöngö munjang-il John-ege karichi-össda
 I-nom English sentence-acc John-dat teach-past
 'I taught an English sentence to John.'

b) nae-ga yöngö munjang-il John-il karichi-össda
 I-nom English sentence-acc John-acc teach-past
 'I taught John an English sentence.'

81. a) nae-ga yöngö munjang-il John-ege sölmýönggha-össda
 I-nom English sentence-acc John-dat explain-past
 'I explained an English sentence to John.'

b)* nae-ga yöngö munjang-il John-il sölmýönggha-össda
 I-nom English sentence-acc John-acc explain-past
 'I explained John an English sentence.'

The above-mentioned evidence shows that the English *give* type Dative-shift is comparable to double-accusativization in Korean but not to the word-order variation. Givón and Van Valin's claim that the change in case-marking involved in the *give* type Dative-shift is restricted to SVO languages is obviously wrong.

Double-accusativization can combine with the pragmatic word-order variation, resulting in the following four possibilities.

82. a) nae-ga John-ege chaeg-il ju-össda
 I-nom John-dat book-acc give-past
 'I gave to John a book.'

b) nae-ga chaeg-il John-ege ju-össda
 I-nom book-acc John-dat give-past
 'I gave a book to John.'

- c) nae-ga John-il chaeg-il ju-össda
 I-nom John-acc book-acc give-past
 'I gave John a book.'
- d) nae-ga chaeg-il John-il ju-össda
 I-nom book-acc John-acc give-past
 'I gave a book John.'

Again, these four sentences are all acceptable. If the function of double-accusativization were purely pragmatic, i.e., to change the relative topicality between the two constituents and the focus assignment, then it would be a totally unnecessary device, since the same effect is already achieved by word-order variation. Korean also has alternation of the *spray* type. This alternation, combined with the word-order variation, allows the following four possibilities.

83. a) nae-ga ppenkki-lil byög-e chilha-össda
 I-nom paint-acc wall-dat paint-past
 'I painted paint on the wall.'
- b) nae-ga byög-e ppenkki-lil chilha-össda
 I-nom wall-dat paint-acc paint-past
 'I painted on the wall paint.'
- c) nae-ga byög-il ppenkki-ro chilha-össda
 I-nom wall-acc paint-instr paint-past
 'I painted the wall with paint.'
- d) nae-ga ppenkki-ro byög-il chilha-össda
 I-nom paint-instr wall acc paint-past
 'I painted with paint the wall.'

Compare (82) and (83) with (84) and (85).

84. a) I gave a book to John.
 b)* I gave to John a book.
 c) I gave John a book.

- d)* I gave a book John.
85. a) I painted white paint on the wall.
b)* I painted on the wall white paint.
c) I painted the wall with white paint.
d)* I painted with white paint the wall.

The reason why the possibilities (84b) and (84d) are blocked seems straightforward again. It should be attributed to the property of English that the direct object is marked by putting the constituent in question in the immediately post-verbal position without a preposition. It seems that the fact that possibilities (84b) and (84d) are blocked in English has made it difficult to understand that the purely pragmatically-motivated word-order change and the change in case-marking which seems to me semantically motivated are independent of each other. The two mechanisms, which are kept quite separate in Korean, are conflated in English.

3. The Semantics of Dative-shift

In this section, I argue that the Dative-shifts in English and Korean are best explained in semantics.

Three kinds of change are differentiated by three restrictive modifiers: 'Positional', 'Possessional' and 'Conditional'.

86. a) GO posit (x, y, z)
b) GO poss (x, y, z)
c) GO con (x, y, z)

Now that the assumption that the *spray* type syntactic alternation is pragmatically motivated has been refuted, it should be semantics, in the absence of any other plausible candidate, that motivates the alternation. In SONG (1987, 1989), verbs are classified into two types: one is univalent verbs which have only one set of thematic relations and the other

is ambivalent verbs which have more than one set of thematic relations. It is assumed that only ambivalent verbs allow the *spray* type syntactic alternation. For instance, *drain*, being an ambivalent verb, entails that, in addition to a positional change of some entity, the entity denoted by the Source NP undergoes a specific conditional change. The syntactic variants shown by *drain* are assigned semantic representations as follows:

- (1) 87. a) John drained water from the pool.
 CAUSE (JOHN, GO posit (WATER, THE POOL, z))
 b) John drained the pool of water.
 CAUSE (JOHN, GO con (THE POOL, u, EMPTY OF WATER))

The syntactic form (87a) focalizes the positional change of 'water' and (87b) focalizes the conditional change of 'the pool'. These two changes are the two aspects of an integrated whole denoted by the ambivalent verb *drain*. In (87a), the semantic subject is 'water', while in (87b) it is 'the pool'. In either case, the semantic subject is assigned the semantic role Theme by the rest of the sentence.

The analysis proposed above is applicable to Korean and Japanese. Compare the following Korean sentences.

88. a) John-i bakkejju-e mul-il chaeu-össda
 John-nom bucket-dat water-acc fill-past
 'John filled water in a bucket' (literal translation).
 b) John-i bakkejju-lil mul-ro chaeu-össda
 John-nom bucket-acc water-instr fill-past
 'John filled a bucket with water.'
 89. a) John-i bakkejju-e mul-il bu-össda
 John-nom bucket-dat water-acc pour-past
 'John poured water into a bucket.'
 b)* John-i bakkejju-lil mul-ro bu-össda

John-nom bucket-acc water-instr pour-past

*‘John poured a bucket with water.’

The verb *chaeu* ‘fill’ is an ambivalent verb which refers to a positional change of an entity and also a concomitant conditional change of the Goal of the positional change. The ambivalence of the verb *chaeu* is represented as follows:

90. a) CAUSE (w, GO posit (x, y, z)) (Factitive 1)

b) CAUSE (w, GO con (z, u, FILLED WITH x))

(Factitive 2)

The syntactic form (88a) focalizes the positional change (90a), while (88b) focalizes the conditional change (90b). The verb *bus* ‘pour’ is a univalent verb which expresses only a positional change of an entity and does not refer to a conditional change of the Goal. Thus the semantic nature of the verb *bus* ‘pour’ blocks the syntactic form (89b). The semantic representations for (88a) and (88b) are as follows:

91. a) CAUSE (JOHN, GO poist (WATER, y, BUCKET))

b) CAUSE (JOHN, GO con (BUCKET, u, FILLED WITH WATER))

The semantic representations in (91) indicate that in (88a) the semantic subject is ‘mul’ (‘water’) while in (88b) it is ‘bakkejju’ (‘bucket’). In other words, sentence (88a) is logically about the change of ‘mul’ (‘water’) while (88b) is about the change that ‘bakkejju’ (‘bucket’) underwent. This logical topicality should be kept distinct from the pragmatic topicality mentioned in Sections 1 and 2. The pragmatic topicality may be changed by word-order variation, but not the logical topicality. Sentence (88a’) is still logically about the change the ‘water’ underwent, while (88b’) is about the change the ‘bucket’ underwent.

88. a’) John-i mul-il bakkejju-e chaeu-össda

John-nom water-acc bucket-dat fill-past

'John filled water in a bucket.'

b') John-i mul-ro bakkejju-lil chaeu-össda

John-nom water-instr bucket-acc fill-past

'John filled a bucket with water.'

3.1 Ambiguity of Change in Possession

In this section, I propose a semantic account of the *give* type of Dative-shift in English and Korean. Our semantics has to be capable of explaining the following problems.

- i) The lexically-conditioned property of Dative-shifts in English and Korean.
- ii) The semantic constraints on Dative-shifts in English and Korean: the animacy constraint and the constraint that blocks the NP with Source role from being dative-shifted.
- iii) The exceptions to English Dative-shift pointed out in (41-45).

Ikegami (1975) points out that a sentence expressing a 'change in possession' like (92) allows two interpretations: (92a) and (92b).

92. John got first prize.

a) John (Y) ← first prize (X)

b) John (X) → first prize (Y)

(X='what changes'
Y='Goal of change')

In the first interpretation, 'what changes' is 'first prize' and the change is concerned with 'who is its possessor'. In the second interpretation, 'what undergoes change' is 'John' and the change is about 'whether he possesses the prize or not'. He says that the former interpretation is related to a 'change in locus' and the latter to a 'change in condition'. I adopt this dual interpretation of a 'change in possession' suggested by Ikegami.

Let us suppose a prototypical situation in which a change in possession takes place, i.e., a situation denoted by a proposition like *John brought Mary a book*. This situation is analysable into three kinds of changes

integrated by the proposition: a positional change of 'a book' to 'Mary', a possessional change of 'a book' from 'John' to 'Mary' and a conditional change of 'Mary'. The change in possession presupposes the positional change and the conditional change presupposes the possessional change in this case. These three kinds of changes are represented as follows:

93. a) GO posit (x, y, z)
 b) GO poss (x, y, z)
 c) GO con (z, u, WITH x)

Logically, a positional change (93a) does not necessarily entail a possessional change (93b). This is clear from the fact that (94) does not express any change in possession.

94. John went to the classroom.

Moreover, a change in possession need not entail a change in position, as is clear from (95).

95. John's property went to his eldest son.

However, a change in possession as represented in (93b) always entails a change in condition (93c). When some entity goes into the possession of some person, the person necessarily goes into the condition of possessing it. On the other hand, a conditional change (93c) does not necessarily presuppose a change in possession (93b). One can make somebody possess something without giving it to him, as in (96).

96. John made Mary make a toy for herself.

In other words, (93b) is a subset of (93c).

97. $GO\ poss\ (x, y, z) \subset GO\ con\ (z, u, WITH\ x)$

Our assumption is that a language may reflect this 'logical inclusion relation' and that Dative-shift is a reflection of the ambiguity of a change in possession. We consider that the alternative syntactic forms shown by the Dative-shift verbs correspond to the thematic role structures (93b) and (93c) as exemplified in (98).

98. a) John gave a book to Mary.
 a') CAUSE (JOHN, GO poss (A BOOK, JOHN, MARY))
 b) John gave Mary a book.
 b') CAUSE (JOHN, GO con (MARY, u, WITH A BOOK))
99. a) John-i Chölsu-ege chaeg-il ju-össda
 John-nom Chölsu-dat book-acc give-past
 'John gave a book to Chölsu.'
 a') CAUSE (JOHN, GO poss (BOOK, JOHN, CHÖLSU))
 b) John-i Chölsu-lil chaeg-il ju-össda
 John-nom Chölsu-acc book-acc give-past
 'John gave Chölsu a book.'
 b') CAUSE (JOHN, GO con (CHÖLSU, u, WITH BOOK))

First, our assumption that the thematic role structures of the Dative-shift in English and Korean alternate between a possessional one and a conditional one, is compatible with the animacy constraint on the Dative-shift.

100. a) John brought the piano to New York.
 b)* John brought New York the piano.
101. a) John brought the piano to Bill.
 b) John brought Bill the piano.
102. a) John-i Seoul-e pyönji-lil bonae-össda
 John-nom Seoul-dat letter-acc send-past
 'John sent a letter to Seoul.'
 b)* John-i Seoul-lil pyönji-lil bonae-össda
 John-nom Seoul-acc letter-acc send-past
 'John sent Seoul a letter.'
103. a) John-i Chölsu-ege pyönji-lil bonae-össda
 John-nom Chölsu-dat letter-acc send-past
 'John sent a letter to Chölsu.'
 b) John-i Chölsu-lil pyönji-lil bonae-össda

John-nom Chölsu-acc letter-acc send-past

'John sent Chölsu a letter.'

As already pointed out, a positional change does not necessarily entail a possessional change. In order for a positional change to entail a possessional change, the Goal has to be an entity which is capable of 'possessing', i.e., it has to be animate, typically human. This is why (100b) and (102b) are ungrammatical. Sentence (101a) allows two interpretations as represented in (104).

104. a) CAUSE (JOHN, GO posit (THE PIANO, y, BILL))

b) CAUSE (JOHN, GO poss (THE PIANO, JOHN, BILL))

The first representation means that John brought the piano to the presence of Bill. In this interpretation 'Bill' is only a locative Goal. Dative-shift is possible only in the interpretation (104b).

The second set of data our semantics can account for is sentences in which Dative-shift is 'obligatory'.

105. a)* Mary gave an inferiority complex to John.

b) Mary gave John an inferiority complex.

106. a)* Mary gave a broken arm to John.

b) Mary gave John a broken arm.

107. a)* Mary gave a pain in the neck to John.

b) Mary gave John a pain in the neck.

Green (1974) points out that when *give* means 'provide with' as opposed to 'present as a gift', the indirect object is restricted to a prepositionless form, and the action in many cases can be conceived of as non-volitional. *Give* in (108) is interpreted in the 'provide with' sense and non-volitional. When *give* has this sense, it may have an abstract subject as in (109). On the other hand, *give* in (110) is interpreted only in the 'present as a gift' sense. *Give* with this meaning cannot have an abstract subject.

108. a) Mary gave John an idea.

- b) Mary gave John the clue to the Sphinx's riddle.
109. a) Mary's behaviour gave John an idea.
b) Mary's behaviour gave John the clue to the Sphinx's riddle.
110. a) Mary gave an idea to John.
b) Mary gave the clue to the Sphinx's riddle to John.
111. a)* Mary's behaviour gave an idea to John.
b)* Mary's behaviour gave the clue to the Sphinx's riddle to John.

A similar problem arises in the following sentences.

112. a) Greta showed Sam the meaning of true love.
b) Greta showed the meaning of true love to Sam.
113. a) The accident showed Sam the meaning of true love.
b)* The accident showed the meaning of true love to Sam.
114. a) Several mistakes taught John the secrets of Chinese cooking.
b)* Several mistakes taught the secrets of Chinese cooking to John.

Sentence (112a) is about the effect on Sam of some behaviour of Greta, while (112b) reports that Greta pointed out to him some linguistic or philological description for the purpose of having him take it in. Therefore, the subject of (112a) can be replaced by an abstract NP, as in (113a), while it is impossible in (112b).

We assumed that Dative-shift involves an alternation between the semantic structures (93b) and (93c). Note that (93a) and (93b) are both about the movement of 'x' to 'z' whether the movement is concrete or not, while (93c) does not express any movement of 'x'. It follows that the most essential function of Dative-shift is to defocalize, or 'abstract', the meaning of movement.

Sentences (105b), (106b) and (107b) do not express any movement, concrete or abstract, of 'x'. For instance, the situation denoted by (106b)

does not include the movement of 'a broken arm' from 'Mary' to 'John'. In (106b) 'Mary' is not the Source of a change in possession, and 'John' is not the Goal of a possessional change. What (106b) expresses is that 'Mary caused John to have a broken arm'. In such a case, the prepositional construction, like (106a), which focalizes a possessional change or movement of an entity to a Goal cannot be used. The so-called 'obligatoriness' of Dative-shift in (105–107) is a reflection of the logical inclusion relation that (93b) necessarily entails (93c) but not the other way round.

The data presented in (108–111) can be explained along the same lines. The thematic relations of (108a) and (110a) are represented as follows:

110a. Mary gave an idea to John.

CAUSE (MARY, GO poss (AN IDEA, MARY, JOHN))

108a. Mary gave John an idea.

CAUSE (MARY, GO con (JOHN, u, WITH AN IDEA))

Give in (108a) is, as Green pointed out, ambiguous between 'present as a gift' and 'provide with', while *give* in (110a) is conceived of as having only the 'present as a gift' sense. This means that the conditional change of *John* expressed in (108a) may or may not presuppose the possessional change of *an idea* from *Mary* to *John*. This again is quite compatible with our assumption. Logically, (93b) always entails (93c), while (93c) may or may not presuppose (93b). *Give* in (105b), (106b), (107b), (108) and (109) seems to be semantically almost equivalent to *give* as a 'causative verb' as in (115).

115. They gave me to understand that you would be there.

Give as a causative verb does not necessarily mean the action is volitional. Sentence (115) is most likely to be interpreted as 'they were responsible for the fact that I understood that you would be there'. Sentence (115) also does not report that any change in possession took place. The

thematic relations of (115) are represented as in (116), which is basically compatible with (39c).

116. CAUSE (THEY, GO con (I, u, UNDERSTANDING THAT YOU WOULD BE THERE))

The same explanation is applicable to (112–114). The prepositional constructions always express volitional action to cause a possessional change of an entity to a Goal while the prepositionless constructions do not necessarily do so. When it is impossible to presuppose a possessional movement of an entity to a Goal, then a prepositional construction is impossible.

Third question we have to answer is why with some verbs in English and Korean Dative-shift is impossible.

117. a) John explained the story to Bill.
 b)* John explained Bill the story.
118. a) John said these words to Bill.
 b)* John said Bill these words.
119. a) John transferred some stock to Bill.
 b)* John transferred Bill some stock.
120. a) nae-ga yǒngǒ mungang-il John-ege sölmyǒngha-össda
 I-nom English sentence-acc John-dat explain-past
 'I explained an English sentence to John.'
 b)* nae-ga yǒngǒ munjang-il John-il sölmyǒngha-össda
 I-nom English sentence-acc John-acc explain-past
 'I explained John an English sentence.'
121. a) nae-ga igös-il John-ege malha-össda
 I-nom this-acc John-dat say-past
 'I said this to John.'
 b)* nae-ga igös-il John-il malha-össda
 I-nom this-acc John-acc say-past

'I said John this.'

We have regarded Dative-shift as crucially involving a change of condition. Sentences (117a), (118a), (120a) and (121a) — because of the nature of the actions in question — cannot be conceived of (or are not normally conceived of) as changing the condition of the Goal. Gruber said as follows:

Tell indicates that what is told is subsequently heard whereas for *say* it is possible not to be understood. Thus one can say something to a wall, but one will never succeed in telling it to anything. (Gruber 1976: 127)

Transfer in (119) does not necessarily report a positional change of *some stock* to *Bill*. The change expressed in (119a) is surely possessional. Thus our semantics cannot reject (119b). However, the meanings of verbs are changing all the time and verbs formerly not used for Dative-shift may come to be so used. We can quite imagine that (119b) might become acceptable. Indeed, perhaps it already is for some speakers. The Korean verb semantically similar to *transfer* in (119) allows the double-accusative construction.

122. a) nae-ga John-ege jaesan-il nŏmgi-össda
 I-nom John-dat property-acc transfer-past
 'I transferred my property to John.'
- b) nae-ga John-il jaesan-il nŏmgi-össda
 I-nom John-acc property-acc transfer-past
 'I transferred John my property.'

Sentence (118b), on the other hand, is not needed, since we already have an appropriate way of saying it, using *tell*.

The last question is why Dative-shift in English and double-accusativization in Korean are blocked in the 'goal-oriented' constructions such as (123) and (124).

123. a) John stole a book from Mary.

b)* John stole Mary a book.

124. a) nae-ga John-il/egesõ don-il ppaeeas-össda

I-nom John-gen/abl money-acc take-away-past

'I took away money from John.'

b)* nae-ga John-il don-il ppaees-össda

I-nom John-acc money-acc take-away-past

'I took away John money.'

Ikegami (1981, 1982) pointed out that, although the source and the goal are on an equal footing from a logical point of view, the realization of the source tends to be more marked than that of the goal in language. The markedness of Source is exemplified in (125) and (126).

125. a) John was/went there.

b) John came from there.

126. a) Run [to] behind the wall.

b) Run from behind the wall.

In (126a), *behind the wall* can be Locative or Goal without any marker, whereas *behind the wall* in (126b) must have *from* to be interpreted as Source. The reason for the markedness of Source is obvious from a functional viewpoint. The actual temporal flow where a transfer takes place is always from Source to Goal. It would be plausible, then, to assume that the linguistic expression of transfer or change is strongly constrained so that it reflects this natural information flow. Because of this constraint, an expression for a change is interpreted as a Source-Goal pattern unless it is overtly marked for the reverse interpretation. A Goal-oriented construction, which goes against this flow, tends to require an overt marker for Source. For this reason, *Mary* in *John stole Mary a book* is interpreted as a Goal, and the sentence cannot mean *John stole a book from Mary*.

We have so far argued that the Dative-shift rules in English

and Korean are semantic processes. Our semantic analysis provides a satisfactory explanation of the properties of Dative-shifts in English and Korean which cannot be properly accounted for in the discourse analyses of Dative-shift proposed by Givón and Erteschik-Shir. Our analysis does not preclude discourse approaches to Dative-shift. In Korean and Japanese, the purely pragmatic word-order variation and the change in case-marking, which is semantically motivated, are kept apart.

Reference

- Allerton, D.J.
1978 'Generating indirect objects in English', *Journal of Linguistics* 14: 21-33.
- Allwood, J., L.G. Anderson and Östen Dahl
1977 *Logic in Linguistics* (Oxford University Press).
- Anderson, J.M.
1971 *The Grammar of Case: Towards a Localistic Theory* (Cambridge University Press).
- Anderson, R.S.
1977 'Comments on the Paper by Wasow', in Culicover, P., T. Wasow and A. Akmajian (eds.), *Formal Syntax* (New York: Academic Press).
- Auwera, J.V.D.
1981 *What do We Talk about when We Talk? — Speculative grammar and the semantic and pragmatic focus* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins BV).
- Barnes, B.K.
1985 'A Functional Explanation of French Nonlexical Datives', *Studies in Language* 9-2: 159-95.
- Beedham, C.
1981 'The Passive in English, German and Russian', *Journal of Linguistics* 17: 319-26.
- Bresnan, J.
1978 'A realistic transformational grammar', in Halle, M., J. Bresnan and G. Miller (eds.), *Linguistic Theory and Psychological Reality* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press).
- 1981 'Poliadicity: Part 1 of a Theory of Lexical Rules and Representations', in Hockstra, T., H.V.D. Hulst and M. Moortgat (eds.), *In Lexical Grammar*

Dative-Shift : Discourse Approaches vs. Semantic Approaches (SONG)

(Foris Publications).

Channon, R.

1982 '3-2 Advancement, Beneficiary Advancement, and With', *Barkley Linguistic Society* 8: 271-82.

Chung, S.

1976 'An Object-creating Rule in Bahasa Indonesia', *Linguistic Inquiry* 7: 41-87.

1983 *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology* (Basil Blackwell).

Curme, G.O.

1931 *Syntax* (D.C. Heath and Co.).

Dik, S.C. (ed.)

1984 *Advances in Functional Grammar* (Dordrecht: Foris Publications).

Dubinsky, S.

1985 'Oblique to Direct Object Advancement in Japanese', *Linguistic Analysis* 15: 57-75.

Erteschik-Shir, N.

1979 'Discourse Constraints on Dative Movement', in Talmy Givon (ed.), *Syntax and Semantics*, v. 12: Discourse and Syntax.

Falts, L.M.

1978 'On Indirect Objects in Universal Syntax', *Chicago Linguistic Society* 14: 76-87.

Farmer, A.K.

1984 *Modularity in Syntax: A Study in Japanese and English* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press).

Foley, A.W. and Robert D. Van Valin

1984 *Functional Syntax and Universal Grammar* (Cambridge University Press).

1985 'Information packaging in the clause', in T. Shopen (ed.), *Language Typology and Syntactic Description: Clause Structure*.

Fodor, J.D.

1982 *Semantics: Theories of Meaning in Generative Grammar* (The Harvester Press).

Givón, T.

1979 *On Understanding Grammar* (New York: Academic Press).

Gruber, J.

1976 *Lexical Structure in Syntax and Semantics*, North-Holland Linguistic Series

Dative-Shift : Discourse Approaches vs. Semantic Approaches (SONG)

- 25 (Amsterdam: North-Holland).
- Grunau, J.J.M.
1985 'Towards a Systematic Theory of the Semantic Role Inventory', *Chicago Linguistic Society* 21: Part 1: 144-59.
- Halliday, M.A.K.
1967-68 'Notes on Transitivity and Theme in English', *Journal of Linguistics* 3, 4.
- Hawkins, R.
1979 'On "Generating indirect objects in English": a reply to Allerton', *Journal of Linguistics* 17: 1-9.
- Hockstra, T.
1984 *Transitivity: Grammatical Relations in Government-binding Theory* (Dordrecht: Foris Publications).
- Hopper, P.J.
1985 'Causes and Effects', *Chicago Linguistic Society* 21: 67-88.
- Ikegami, Y.
1975 *Imiron* (Tokyo: Taishukan).
-
- 1981 *Suru to naru no gengogaku* (Tokyo: Taishukan).
-
- 1982 'Source vs. Goal: A Case of Linguistic Dissymmetry', in R. St. Clair and W. von Raffler-Engle (eds.), *Language and Cognitive Styles* (Lisse: Swets and Zeitlinger).
- Jackendoff, R.
1972 *Semantic Interpretations in Generative Grammar* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press).
-
- 1976 'Toward an Explanatory Semantic Representation', *Linguistic Inquiry* v. 7, Number 1: 89-150.
-
- 1983 *Semantics and Cognition* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press).
- Jespersen, O.
1961 *A Modern English Grammar: Part III* (Copenhagen: Munksgaard, and London: Allen and Unwin).
- Kayne, R.S.
1984 *Connectedness and Binary Branching* (Dordrecht: Foris Publications).
- Kim, P.H.

Dative-Shift : Discourse Approaches vs. Semantic Approaches (SONG)

- 1964 *Josŏnŏ dongsa hyŏngyŏngsa ii sang* (Pyongyang: Kwahagwon Press).
- Kim, Y.H.
1978 'Kyŏb-juŏ-ron', *Hang'il* 162: 37-73.
- Kitahara, Y.
1984 *Nihon bunpoo no shooten* (Tokyo: Kyoiku Shuppan).
- Klaiman, M.H.
1982 'Toward a Universal Semantics of Indirect Subject Constructions',
Barkley Linguistic Society, v. 17: 123-35.
- Kuno, S.
1973 *The Structure of the Japanese Language* (Cambridge, Mass. and London:
MIT Press).
- Perlmutter, D. and P. Postal
1977 'Toward a universal characterization of passivization', *Barkley Linguistic
Society* 3: 394-417.
- Ranson, E.N.
1979 'Definiteness and Animacy Constraints on Passive and Double Object
Constructions in English', *Glossa* 13-2: 215-40.
- SONG, N.S.
1987 *Thematic Relations and Transitivity in English, Japanese and Korean*, Un-
published PhD Thesis Submitted to University of London.
-
- 1987 *Empathy-Based Affectedness and Passivization*, *Transaction of the Philolog-
ical Society*, 74-89.
-
- 1989 *Thematic Relations and Ambivalent Verbs*, *Annals of the General Sciences
Institute, Osaka Univ. of Economics and Law* No. 8: 17-40.
- Teramura, H.
1982 *Nihongo noshintakusu to imi* (Tokyo: Kuroshio-shuppan).
- Tokieda, M.
1950 *Nihon bunpoo, koogo hen* (Tokyo: Iwanami).
- Wasow, T.
1980 'Major and Minor Rules in Lexical Grammar', in T. Hoekstra, H.V.D.
Hulst and M. Moortgat (eds.), *Lexical Grammar* (Dordrecht: Foris Publica-
tions).
- Yom Jong Yul
1980 *Munhwa-ŏ hyŏngteron* (Pyongyang: Kim Il Sung University Press).