

<https://helda.helsinki.fi>

Dative shift in a language without dative? The (allative) case of Finnish

Kittila, Seppo

2014-11

Kittila , S 2014 , ' Dative shift in a language without dative? The (allative) case of Finnish ' ,
Linguistics , vol. 52 , no. 6 , pp. 1461-1498 . <https://doi.org/10.1515/ling-2014-0026>

<http://hdl.handle.net/10138/250875>

<https://doi.org/10.1515/ling-2014-0026>

other

publishedVersion

Downloaded from Helda, University of Helsinki institutional repository.

This is an electronic reprint of the original article.

This reprint may differ from the original in pagination and typographic detail.

Please cite the original version.

Seppo Kittilä

Dative shift in a language without dative? The (allative) case of Finnish

Abstract: Dative shift is a two-fold process that affects both the morphological coding and the order of T and R arguments of a three-participant construction, as in *the teacher gave a book to the student* vs. *the teacher gave the student a book*. Across languages, dative shift tends to express similar functions including differences in animacy, definiteness, semantic role of arguments, affectedness of recipient and permanence of transfer. This is understandable, since dative shift increases the formal transitivity of the affected clauses, and all the expressed functions are somehow related to transitivity. The goal of this paper is to study whether, and to what extent, mere changes in word order suffice to express the functions of dative shift. The examined language is Finnish, which suits very well for this purpose due to its relatively free word order and inherently different coding of Theme and Recipient. It can be hypothesized that mere word order changes readily express features related to definiteness and animacy, while they are less capable of expressing features such as affectedness of the recipient.

Keywords: Finnish, dative shift, allative case, argument marking, word order

DOI 10.1515/ling-2014-0026

1 Introduction

A number of languages allow variation in the coding of three-participant¹ clauses, where the morphological marking and the order of the objects may vary. Some examples are found in (1)–(3):

¹ In this paper, the label “three-participant construction” refers to any construction involving three arguments regardless of how the arguments are coded. I have preferred this term to ditransitive clause because the label “ditransitive” has a somewhat specialized use, for example, in Construction Grammar. However, wherever the original work cited uses the label ditransitive, this has been retained.

Seppo Kittilä: General Linguistics, P.O. Box 24, 00014 University of Helsinki, Finland.
E-mail: kittila@mappi.helsinki.fi

(1) English

- a. *The father gave a ball to the child*
- b. *The father gave the child a ball*

(2) Korean

- a. *kica-ka enehakca-eykey chayk-ul ponay-ss-ta*
journalist-NOM linguist-to book-ACC send-PAST-IND
'The journalist sent a/the book to the linguist'
- b. *kica-ka enehakca-lul chayk-ul ponay-ss-ta*
journalist-NOM linguist-ACC book-ACC send-PAST-IND
'The journalist sent the linguist a book'
(examples courtesy of Jae Jung Song)

(3) Indonesian

- a. *Mereka mem-bawa daging itu kepada dia*
they TRANS-bring meat the to him
'They brought the meat to him.'
- b. *Mereka mem-bawa-kan dia daging itu*
they TRANS-bring-BEN him meat the
'They brought him the meat.'
(Siewierska 1998a: 183)

The three languages above manifest the changes in coding somewhat differently. In English, the indirect object (preceded by *to*) of a three-participant construction is promoted to direct (primary) object status (signaled by the immediate verb-after position) without any changes in verbal morphology. The Korean examples differ from the English examples in that there is no change in the linear order of objects, but the changes are only morphological. Examples in (3) are similar to (1) as regards the changes in argument marking and order, but in (3) verbal morphology is also affected.

Examples such as those in (1)–(3) are not at all rare cross-linguistically, but similar cases are attested in a number of languages scattered around the globe (see, e.g., Blansitt 1973; Dryer 1986; Haspelmath 2007; Kittilä 2007; Heine and König 2010, see, however, Siewierska 1998b and Malchukov et al. 2010 for an opposite claim). The kind of variation exemplified in (1)–(3) is typically known as *dative shift* or *dative alternation* (the first of these terms is adopted in this paper). In this process, an indirect object is promoted to direct/primary object status, which increases the formal transitivity of the affected clause; it has two direct object-like arguments instead of one. The change is thus from an indirect object construction (IOC) to a double object construction (DOC). This often also affects

the order of objects, which changes from T-R to R-T² (see Heine and König 2010 for more examples and discussion, see also (9) from Wolof, Primus 1998: 441; Blansitt 1973). In some cases, verb morphology is also affected as a result of dative shift. Dative shift is thus typically a two-fold process, in which both the marking and the order of objects are modified. Of these, changes in argument coding can be regarded as more important, and mere changes in the order of the two objects usually do not suffice for labeling a process as dative shift. Word order changes can be seen as a by-product of the more important changes in argument coding. For example in English, changes in the relative order of T and R are possible only in case their coding is also modified.

Even though dative shift is primarily a formally defined process, its effects are not restricted to form. For example, in English dative shift is usually (yet not necessarily) applicable to animate objects only, which may be said to underline the recipient-like nature of promoted R's (see e.g., Pinker 1989; Rappaport Hovav and Levin 2008; Bresnan and Nikitina 2009; Coleman 2009 for more detailed discussions). In Korean, on the other hand, R's in the accusative are regarded as more topical than R's in the dative. Across languages, dative shift expresses similar functions, including discourse-referentiality, topicality, information flow, definiteness or animacy of the objects, semantic roles of the objects (goal vs. recipient), permanence of transfer and affectedness of R (see Section 2 for more discussion, and Kittilä 2007 for a cross-linguistic examination of similar cases). Many of these functions are easily accounted for. For example, direct objects usually refer to highly affected participants, which explains the relation between affectedness and dative shift.

The present paper is also concerned with cases in which the order of objects changes. However, in contrast to (1)–(3), the paper examines cases where only the order of objects is affected without this having any consequences for the morphological coding of objects, or the verbal morphology of clauses. The goal of the paper is to examine whether mere changes in the linear order of R and T can express functions similar to those expressed by dative shift, where also argument marking is affected. The focus of the paper lies on one language, namely Finnish, but I hope that the results of this paper are applicable to similar studies in other languages, or at least similar studies in other languages will follow. Finnish codes R and T distinctively; T appears in the accusative or in the partitive case, while R

² In this paper, the labels T and R refer to arguments, while the labels recipient and theme refer to the corresponding semantic roles. R argument comprises all the instances of indirect object regardless of whether the reference is to a (human) recipient or a (inanimate) goal argument. The labels Theme and Recipient, written with initial capitals, refer to the grammatical roles of Theme and Recipient.

bears allative or illative coding (the variation between allative and illative is not considered in this paper, see below). As a result, there is no ambiguity involved regardless of the order of the two objects. Second, and more importantly (and perhaps also related to the inherently distinct coding of R and T), Finnish is a language with a relatively free word order, including the order of R and T (see also Primus 1998: 450; Vilkuna 1998: 185; Kaiser 2000: 112), and as has been stated by Rappaport Hovav and Levin (2008: 161), languages with a relatively free word order do not require dative shift. (4a) and (4b) are thus both grammatical sentences of Finnish, while (4c) is not, consider:

(4) Finnish

- a. *vanhempi anto-i lapse-lle kirja-n*
 parent.NOM give-3SG.PAST child-ALL book-ACC
 ‘The parent gave a book to the child/the child a book’
- b. *vanhempi anto-i kirja-n lapse-lle*
 parent.NOM give-3SG.PAST book-ACC child-ALL
 ‘The parent gave a book to the child/the child a book’
- c. **vanhempi anto-i lapse-n kirja-n*
 parent.NOM give-3SG.PAST child-ACC book-ACC
 (For: The parent gave a book to the child/the child a book)

(4a) and (4b) are equally grammatical, and in this particular case, the meanings expressed by the clauses are very close to each other. (4c), in turn is ungrammatical in the meaning given in brackets. The paper concerns cases such as (4a) and (4b) in which the order of the objects varies, but in which there are no other changes in their coding. Cases in which one of the objects is fronted (such as *lapselle vanhempi antoi kirjan* or *kirjan vanhempi antoi lapselle*) are not taken into account, since these cases are too different from instances of dative shift. Also, the variation between allative and illative in R coding lies outside the scope of this paper (the variation is primarily determined by animacy of R). This follows, because the paper focuses on changes caused by mere modifications of word order. The goal of the paper is to study what happens, when the recipient occupies the immediate post-verbal slot, but when this is not accompanied by other formal changes. Differently, for example, from Kaiser (2002), the paper is concerned with other features than definiteness and animacy as well. The data used is elicited, i.e., the investigation at hand is not a corpus-based study (see, however, Kaiser 2002; Bresnan et al. 2007 for similar, corpus-based studies). Elicited examples also make it possible to better focus on the cases relevant to this study. The paper does not aim at presenting any statistical data for the discussed cases.

Before proceeding further, it is in order to briefly discuss the semantics of the Finnish allative, since the nature and the polysemy of the allative case is relevant to the examples discussed below. Allative is one of the six primary local cases of Finnish along with inessive, elative, illative, adessive and ablative. Basically, allative codes goal-oriented movement (which may be completed or ongoing) or placement of an object onto a flat surface, as shown in examples in (5):

(5) Finnish

- a. *lapsi* *juok-si* *koulu-lle*
 child.NOM run-3SG.PAST school-ALL
 ‘The child ran to the school’
- b. *lapsi* *laitto-i* *lelu-n* *pöydä-lle*
 child.NOM put-3SG.PAST toy-ACC table-ALL
 ‘The child put the toy on the table’

The functions illustrated in (5a) are both relevant to the discussion in this paper, and they explain the use of the allative for coding of recipient and beneficiary roles, illustrated in (6) (see also (4)):

(6) Finnish

- a. *vanhempi* *lähett-i* *kirjee-n* *lapse-lle*
 parent.NOM send-3SG.PAST letter-ACC child-ALL
 ‘The parent sent the letter to the child’
- b. *vanhempi* *leipo-i* *kaku-n* *lapse-lle*
 parent.NOM bake-3SG.PAST cake-ACC child-ALL
 ‘The parent baked a cake for the child’

The use of the allative for the functions illustrated above is best explained by its ability to code movement towards into the vicinity of something without actually entering the entity in question. Illative case, which implies that the movement is into something, is too concrete in meaning for this function. This difference is relevant to the cases discussed below, where the variation is sometimes between concrete and abstract motion (reception). With the illative case, similar variation is not possible, and the differences between allative and illative cases are thus not discussed in this paper.

The organization of the paper is as follows. In Section 2, I will discuss the functions of dative shift across languages. This is followed by an examination of the expression of these functions in Finnish by changing the mere order of T and R. In Section 4, the rationale behind the attested cases will be discussed. Section 5 summarizes the central findings of the paper.

2 Functions of dative shift across languages

2.1 Preliminaries

In this section, I will briefly discuss previous studies of dative shift, as they are relevant to the present paper. The discussed features comprise animacy, semantic role, definiteness/referentiality, topicality, information structure, permanence of transfer and affectedness (see Iwasaki and Sadler 2006; Kittilä 2007; Rappaport Hovav and Levin 2008; Bresnan and Nikitina 2009 for more detailed discussions). Especially, the functions of dative shift related to discourse-pragmatic factors, such as animacy, referentiality, topicality and accessibility in English have been discussed by numerous scholars (see, e.g., Collins 1995, Givón 1979: Ch. 4; Thompson 1990, 1995; Wierzbicka 1986). Iwasaki and Sadler (2006) discuss the effects of changes in linear order of Theme and Goal in Japanese. In this section, all of the functions expressed by dative shift will be discussed. In addition to the illustration of the examined cases, I will also briefly discuss their rationale.

2.2 Animacy and semantic role

Animacy (and prominence) affects the formal treatment of arguments in a variety of ways across languages. For example, many languages accord animate and inanimate objects distinct formal coding, a phenomenon known as Differential Object Marking (see, e.g., Bossong 1985). Animacy is highly relevant to dative shift as well. For instance, dative shift is in many languages applicable to animate objects only, and the cross-linguistically dominant order of T and R is R-T (see, e.g., Sedlak 1975: 125; Heine and König 2010), which is also largely explainable by animacy; animate arguments precede inanimate ones. This is especially evident if T and R both surface as direct objects, i.e., when the dative shift applies (see also Blansitt 1973: 9–13; Primus 1998: 493–440). Put another way, dative shift often stresses the animacy of R. Quoting Heine and König (2010: 94, see also Faltz 1978; Lu and Luo 2007): “Since prominent arguments tend to precede less prominent ones and R is generally more prominent than T, the ordering R-T is crosslinguistically the expected one.”

English very well conforms to the principle quoted above. Dative shift is usually applicable only to animate R's, while dative shift produces an infelicitous construction in case R is inanimate (see Levin and Rappaport Hovav 2008; Bresnan and Nikitina 2009). Similar examples are attested in Fongbe and Drehu, as shown in (7) and (8):

(7) Fongbe

- a. *kokú so àson o ná Àsíbá*
 Koku take crab DEF give Asiba
 ‘Koku gave the crab to Asiba.’
- b. *koku so àkwe ná kùtonû*
 Koku take money give Cotonou
 ‘Koku gave money to Cotonou (a place name).’
- c. *kokú ná Àsíbá àson*
 Koku give Asiba crab
 ‘Koku gave Asiba crab.’
- d. *kokú ná àson Àsíbá*
 Koku give crab Asiba
 ‘Koku gave Asiba crab.’
- e. **koku ná kùtonû àkwe*
 Koku give Cotonou money
 (Koku gave Cotonou money.)
 (Lefebvre and Brousseau 2002: 445–448)

(8) Drehu

- a. *Eni a hamëë angeic la itus.*
 I PRES give him the book
 ‘I give him the book.’
- b. *Eni a hamëë Wasinemu la itus.*
 I PRES give Wasinemu the book
 ‘I give Wasinemu the book.’
- c. *Eni a hamëën la itus kowe la nekönatr.*
 I PRES give the book to the child
 ‘I give the book to the child.’
 (Moyses-Faurie 1983: 161–162, cited from Haspelmath 2007: 86–87)

In the languages above, the motivation of dative shift varies. In English and Fongbe, animacy *per se* conditions the marking, which means that animate R's allow dative shift, while dative shift is inapplicable to inanimate R's. Fongbe and English differ from each other formally in that in Fongbe the linear order of objects is free if they are both zero marked, while English only allows the order R-T if dative shift applies. In Drehu, in turn, dative shift is rather conditioned by animacy hierarchies, as the examples in (8) show. In (8a)–(8c), R is animate, but its coding nevertheless varies. In Drehu, pronouns and names of persons rank high for animacy and they thus surface as direct objects. Animate common nouns are not considered animate enough, because of which they

do not immediately follow the verb, and they are preceded by a preposition (see Haspelmath 2007 for more examples of animacy hierarchy effects on ditransitive coding).

Animacy of arguments is generally intimately associated with semantic roles. We may thus approach cases such as (7) and (8) also from the viewpoint of semantic roles, and say that in Fongbe and Drehu (and also English), recipients (as a semantic role) allow dative shift, while goals (mere endpoints of transfer) do not. This is not a novel approach to dative shift, and the close relation between animacy and recipient has been noted, for example, by Pinker (1989), Goldberg (1992), and Bresnan and Nikitina (2009) (see also Lefebvre and Brousseau 2002: 446 for more references); a DOC involves a recipient, and an IOC a goal (see also Rappaport Hovav and Levin 2008 for a more detailed discussion of this). As stated by Rappaport Hovav and Levin (2008: 144 and the references therein) “the double object construction typically arises with animates, since they are typical potential recipients”. This explanation appears as valid to Fongbe as well. The order of the arguments in a DOC is not relevant to the semantic role borne by arguments, but their coding is. R’s coded as direct objects are seen as bearing the role of recipient, not that of a goal. The relation between animacy and semantic role is thus very evident in (7) and (8). Humans are usually more elaborately marked as Goals/ Locations, as has been noted, for example, by Comrie (1986) (see Kittilä and Ylikoski 2011 for a detailed discussion of formal markedness of human Goals in Uralic languages).

2.3 Definiteness, referentiality and information structure

In general, information structure plays a very important role for dative shift across languages (see the references above), especially definiteness, topicality and referentiality are relevant to both coding and order of arguments. Animacy, definiteness and referentiality are closely related, and animate arguments tend to be highly definite and familiar in discourse, too (see Rappaport Hovav and Levin 2008: 157 for a remark on the definiteness of Recipients and Themes). However, this is not a necessary correlation (i.e., animate arguments may be indefinite and inanimate arguments may be definite), and in some languages the applicability of dative shift and/or the ordering of the two objects is not conditioned by animacy alone, but definiteness, referentiality and information structure in more general terms must also be considered, and they may even override animacy in some cases (see Primus 1998: 456 for Turkish). Heine and König (2010: 95) also note the importance of referentiality/definiteness to the ordering of ditransitive objects:

With regard to the referentiality domain, referentially identifiable and/or existentially presupposed arguments tend to precede other arguments. It is in particular discourse-configurational languages that are sensitive to this domain, that is, languages where the linear order of participants is determined exclusively or primarily by their discourse functions (such as topic, focus, new vs. given, etc.).

The quote from Heine and König also refers to languages in which the order of objects may be altered without any other changes in their coding (such as Finnish to be discussed in detail in Section 3). Unsurprisingly, however, referentiality/definiteness is relevant to dative shift as well, as the examples in (9) and (10) show (see also Rappaport Hovav and Levin 2008: 157):

(9) Wolof

a. *jox naa xale bu jige'en ji benn velo*
 give S.1.SG child DET woman DET one bicycle
 'I gave the girl a bicycle.'

b. *Jox naa velo bi ci benn xale bu jige'en.*
 give S.1.SG bicycle DET to one child DET woman
 'I gave the bicycle to a girl.'

(Becher 2005: 19)

(10) Gá

a. *ótó há é bi lé tso-bí*
 Oto gave his child the doll
 'Oto gave his child a doll'

b. *ótó kè tsò-bí lé há è bí lé*
 Oto took doll the gave his child the
 'Oto gave the doll to his child'

(Sedlak 1975: 144, cited from Trutenau 1973: 76)

In both Wolof and Gá, the variation between IOC and DOC is conditioned by the definiteness/referentiality of T. If T is low in definiteness, as in (a), both languages employ a double object construction. This can be regarded as the typical case, since due to animacy, R usually outranks T in definiteness. On the other hand, an IOC construction must be used in case T is definite. These cases represent the mirror image of dative shift that applies whenever T is definite, but also here the variation between IOC and DOC, and thus dative shift as the label is typically used, is conditioned by definiteness in Wolof and Gá. Further examples of similar variation are found, for example in Koromfe (Rennison 1996: 69–70) and Àkán (Sàhà and Ézè 1997: 143–44).

In (9) and (10), T's and R's are both nominal elements, whose definiteness varies contextually. Moreover, it is typical of languages to treat pronouns and nouns differently with regard to their coding in three-participant constructions (see also Primus 1998: 450; Blansitt 1973: 9–13). Pronouns are by definition referential, which makes these differences relevant to the discussion here. Examples are found in (11) and (12) (examples taken from Haspelmath 2007: 80):

(11) English

- a. *She gave me the book/She gave the book to me*
- b. *She gave Kim the book/She gave the book to Kim*
- c. *?She gave me it/?She gave me it/She gave it to me*
- d. **She gave Kim it/*She gave it Kim/She gave it to Kim*

(12) French (glosses as in (11))

- a. *elle me donna le livre/elle donna le livre à moi*
- b. **elle donna Kim le livre/elle donna le livre à Kim*
- c. *elle me le donna/elle le donna à moi*
- d. **elle le donna Kim/elle le donna à Kim*

English and French are similar to Wolof and Gá in that the definiteness of T has consequences for the coding of three-participant constructions. In both languages, an IOC (and the order T-R) is possible regardless of the definiteness of T (and R), while DOC (and the order R-T) occurs only with indefinite T's and definite R's (see Haspelmath 2007: 80). In other words, dative shift applies only in case R is definite and T indefinite, which corresponds to the typical transfer scene coded by a three-participant construction. One of the functions of the dative shift is thus to highlight the prototypical nature of the denoted event of transfer. The main difference to (9) and (10) is that in (11) and (12), the variation between IOC and DOC is conditioned by the nature of T and R. Pronouns (and also proper nouns) are inherently referential and thus highly definite.

It is interesting to note that in all the languages discussed in this section, the variation between DOC and IOC is primarily conditioned by features of T. One reason for this may be found in the typically animate nature of R, which renders the definiteness of R inherently rather high. Typical R's must have animate referents, because they need to complete the event by accepting the transfer, which is not possible for inanimate entities. Differences in their definiteness are thus less relevant to the coding of three-participant constructions. T, on the other hand, is typically inanimate and less definite, which makes its definiteness a feature that needs to be highlighted. We may also say that the function of IOC is to code cases that deviate from the expected pattern (cases where T outranks R in definiteness).

Dative shift is used for coding canonical cases, and it thus underlines the definiteness of R.

Thus far, cases have been discussed, in which definiteness and/or referentiality determines the use of dative shift. Before proceeding to the discussion of other features, it is important to note that information structure in general (and thus, for example topicality) plays a very important role in the ordering of clausal constituents, and thus also the ordering of R and T. For example, Thompson (1995: 156) has stated that in English information flow conditions the order of R and T; prepositional object marks new information, while R's that are old information surface as primary objects. In other words, an earlier position of R in the clause indicates that it is more active in the discourse and thus more topic-worthy (Thompson 1995: 157–158), while non-active referents presenting new information are marked with *to*. The average distance of post-verbal Recipients is 1,4 sentences from their last mention, while the average is 5 sentences for Recipients following T's (Thompson 1995: 168). Givón (1979: Ch. 4) also points to the importance of topicality. For example, names and pronouns immediately follow the verb. I fully agree with these authors in that information structure plays a very important role in the ordering of R and T. However, in this paper information structure is only one of the features considered, because the goal of the paper is to arrive at a broader, theoretical understanding of the factors that underline the ordering of R and T in Finnish, a language lacking a genuine dative shift.

2.4 Permanence of transfer

The relevance of permanence of transfer for the coding of three-participant constructions has been shown, for example, by Kittilä (2007: 153–155) and Daniel et al. (2010: 291–301). Especially the differences between temporary and permanent transfer seem to be relevant to the coding of three-participant constructions across languages. Examples are found in (13) and (14):

(13) Indonesian

- a. *Ali memberikan kado itu kepada Amir*
 Ali AV.give-kan present that to name
 'Ali gave the present to Amir'
- b. *Ali memberi Amir kado*
 Ali AV.give name present
 'Ali gave Amir present'
- (Examples courtesy of I Wayan Arka)

(14) Fongbe

- a. *kokú so àson o ná Àsibá*
 Koku take crab DEF give Asiba
 ‘Koku gave the crab to Asiba’
- b. *kokú ná Àsibá àson*
 Koku give Asiba crab
 ‘Koku gave Asiba crab’
- c. *kokú ná àson Àsibá*
 Koku give crab Asiba
 ‘Koku gave Asiba crab’
- (Lefebvre and Brousseau 2002: 448)

Examples in (a) denote temporary transfer, while (13b) and (14b)–(14c) code permanent transfer, or at least permanent transfer is the preferred reading for these examples. As expected, dative shift applies if the denoted transfer is conceptualized as permanent. In Indonesian, the use of DOC in (13b) implies that Ali is also the beneficiary in the denoted situation, i.e., the transfer is permanent (I Wayan Arka, p.c.). This reading is possible also in (13a), but it is the only reading available for (13b). In Fongbe, in turn, the IOC, illustrated in (14a) cannot indicate permanent transfer that yields changes in the possessive relations, but the reading is rather something like ‘Koku gave the crab to Asiba for keeping’. Examples (14b) and (14c), on the other hand, only allow a reading in which Asiba is a recipient and the transfer is permanent. It is perhaps interesting to note here that in Fongbe, the order of objects is not relevant, but whether the denoted transfer is permanent or not is indicated by the marking of R. The relevance of aspect to the coding of three-participant constructions and dative shift is also expected, since recipients of permanent transfer are more likely to use the transferred entity for a specific purpose, which increases their affectedness and thus the overall transitivity of the denoted event. As such, the transfer may be successfully completed irrespective of whether it is permanent or not.

2.5 Higher affectedness of the recipient

As has been noted by numerous scholars (see e.g., Hopper and Thompson 1980: 252; Dixon 1994: 23), accusative (or similar) coding of direct objects indicates a higher degree of affectedness of the patient, while any other kind of marking (e.g., in the dative or partitive) is related to a lower degree of affectedness. Similar variation is, perhaps unsurprisingly, attested also for R. Two examples are given in (15) and (16):

(15) Alamlak

- a. *yima-r kahpa-m nanho met-t-n*
 person-3SG.M oil-3PL my woman-3SG.F-S.SET
hëta-më-r-m
 put.REC.PAST-3SG.M-3PL
 ‘A man put oil on my wife’ (implication: the oil did not affect her)
- b. *yima-r nanho met-t kahpa-m*
 person-3SG.M my woman-3SG.F oil-3PL
hëta-më-r-t
 put-REC.PAST-3SG.M-3SG.F
 ‘A man put oil on my wife’ (implication: the oil did affect her)
 (Bruce 1984: 238)

(16) Dutch

- a. *Fred gaf een wandelstok aan Tom*
 Fred gave a walking.stick to Tom
 ‘Fred gave a walking stick to Tom’
- b. *Fred gaf Tom een wandelstok*
 Fred gave Tom a walking.stick
 ‘Fred gave Tom a walking-stick’
 (Janssen 1997: 281)

As the free translations of (15) imply, the referent of R is directly affected in (15b), while in (15a) it remains unaffected by the given event. In Dutch, the use of the double object construction implies that the denoted act of giving concerns the recipient somehow (the recipient, for example, needs the walking stick for some specific purpose), while clauses such as (16a) merely express the fact that a walking stick was given to Tom without any reference to whether this had any impact on the recipient (Janssen 1997: 281). Similar examples are attested also in English, where sentences like *I taught Greek to Harry* and *I taught Harry Greek* differ from each other in that in the second case it is more likely that learning actually happened (see, e.g., Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 130).

It is, however, important to note that affectedness of the recipient and affectedness of the patient are somewhat differently motivated. In the case of patients, affectedness refers to a salient change of state in the patient participant, as in *the boy smashed the vase with a hammer* or *the teacher painted the house red*. For recipients, in turn, successfulness of the transfer is of the utmost importance for affectedness; only if the theme has been successfully transferred can the recipient be affected, because only then the recipient can use the transferred entity for his/her purposes (see also Rappaport Hovav and Levin 2008: 145, 154).

For example, in *the parent gave the child money* the child can be affected by the transfer in that s/he uses the transferred money for, e.g., buying a book. Moreover, the affectedness is typically pragmatic in nature, semantics of giving does not entail that the transferred entity is used for a specific purpose. The transfer does not, however, need to be permanent for the recipient to be affected, which distinguishes (13) and (14) from (15) and (16). Moreover, the nature of affectedness is different. In the case of patients, affectedness implies a salient change of state that the patient undergoes as a completely passive participant. On the other hand, the affectedness of recipients is typically less salient; for example, a recipient may purchase something with an amount of money transferred to his/her possession, which may not be observable by others (see Kittilä 2008 for a discussion of this). Finally, the affectedness of recipients requires that the recipient be somehow actively involved in the event, e.g., s/he needs to use the transferred entity for a certain purpose in order to be affected. As Janssen (1997: 281) points out, the transfer concerns the recipient somehow.

Affectedness of the recipient discussed above can also be said to be related to iconicity discussed by Iwasaki and Sadler (2006: 470). Iconicity means in this context that the order (and also the marking) of Theme and Recipient reflects the order in which they are manipulated in the denoted event. In typical cases, the referent of the Theme is manipulated first, because the agent transfers it to the recipient, the ultimate endpoint of the transfer. This explains why the order Theme-Recipient occurs more frequently. However, we may deviate from iconicity, for example, for highlighting the higher affectedness of the recipient. In this case, the ordering of T and R may stress the fact that the recipient is seen as the primary target of the event, while the affectedness of the Theme is backgrounded. In this case, the construction resembles a Patient-Instrument construction, where the Patient precedes the Instrument, even though the Instrument needs to be manipulated prior to the affectedness of the patient. In a similar vein, for example, the money transferred to the recipient can be seen as an instrument needed to cause a change of state in the recipient. It is also important to note that in dative shift, the case marking of arguments is affected, which further underlines the higher affectedness of recipients that receive the same coding as O's.

2.6 Conclusion

In this section, I have discussed the basic functions expressed by what can be labeled as dative shift across languages. These functions can in principle be divided into two; those related to the information structure and those associated with transitivity. Both of these functions are easily accounted for, because case

marking in general is related to both of these notions. First, as has been shown, among others, by Aissen (2003), definiteness directly affects the marking of direct objects in many languages; only definite Patients may receive overt (accusative) coding in case a language has definiteness-determined variation in object coding. In Finnish, the variation is between accusative and partitive. Second, case marking is one of major mechanisms of argument marking, which is intimately related to transitivity (see, e.g., Hopper and Thompson 1980 and Næss 2007). For example, only affected objects receive accusative marking in languages such as Finnish, while less affected objects typically occur in other cases (such as partitive). We may hypothesize that case marking is more directly related to transitivity and order of arguments to information structure, because changes in case marking occur regardless of changes in information structure; for example, verb classes are dividable based on case marking, and these differences are often related to transitivity. Ordering of arguments, in turn, is less strictly determined by semantics, and we may therefore expect them rather to manifest other features, such as the information status of arguments. This hypothesis will be tested in the following section.

3 Dative shift in Finnish?

3.1 Preliminaries

In this section, the “Finnish dative shift”, i.e., the variation in the order of T and R will be examined in detail. This will be achieved by examining the functions typically associated with dative shift. The functions are taken up in the order they were discussed in Section 2. The goal of this examination is to study whether mere changes in the linear order of objects may produce semantic changes similar to those caused by dative shift across languages. It is hoped that this will shed some light on whether changes in argument marking or changes in word order are more directly responsible for expressing the functions typically associated with dative shift, even though this is only the first study on this topic, and more detailed in-depth studies are needed.

Before proceeding to the discussion itself, it is in order to note that the features discussed below have been chosen, because they are the most common functions associated with dative shift across languages, as shown in Section 2. It is possible that other functions play a role for the ordering of Recipient and Theme in Finnish (and also other languages lacking genuine dative shift), but the purpose of this study is to take a look at whether mere changes in word order are

related to the dative shift in other languages. The features have not been chosen, because they would be especially relevant to Finnish, but the purpose of the study is to examine whether mere changes in the order of T and R suffice for expressing functions expressed by dative shift cross-linguistically.

Moreover, it must be borne in mind that a clear-cut distinction between word order and case marking is not possible. This means that the discussion below may not have universal validity as regards the division of labor between the two formal mechanisms related to dative shift, but the study is meant as a first step towards this goal, and it is my hope that detailed studies of word order changes in other languages will follow. There are studies that have shown how the order of clausal constituents is relevant to information structure (see references above), but some recent studies (Dalrymple and Nikolaeva 2011; Iemmolo 2011; Shain and Tonhauser 2011) have shown that case marking also plays an important role in the expression of topicality, because DOM is in many languages topicality-conditioned (see, however, Næss 2004 for a different approach). In other words, it is not possible to say definitely which of the mechanisms of dative shift is primarily responsible for which part of the expressed functions (information structure or more transitivity-related issues). The goal of the following discussion is simply to study which of the functions in question can be expressed by word order changes alone. It is also noteworthy that there are not many (if any) studies that would focus on the relation between transitivity and word order alone, but case marking is practically always considered in studies of transitivity.

As has been noted above, there are many studies dealing with dative shift, many of them focusing on English. On the other hand, detailed studies of (other) languages lacking dative shift, and where, for example, changes in the topicality of R and T are expressed solely by modifying the order of R and T are lower in number (some of these studies will be cited when relevant below). An important exception is illustrated by Iwasaki and Sadler's (2006) study of Japanese. Japanese resembles Finnish in that both lack dative shift and their order of T and R is rather free, i.e., not grammatically required, even though R-T is the preferred order. Moreover, the dative codes both goal and recipient in Japanese (Iwasaki and Sadler 2006: 472–473), as the allative codes both functions in Finnish. Iwasaki and Sadler's paper differs from the present study importantly in the fact that the study considers only referentiality, animacy, heaviness of the NP's and information accessibility. The study showed that the order R-T is much more common in Iwasaki's and Sadler's data, which means that iconicity does not alone account for the ordering of T and R (Iwasaki and Sadler 2006: 476). It is not the goal of the present study to say anything about the frequencies of the different constructions, but the goal is to study whether the discussed features potentially contribute to the order of R and T. Iwasaki and Sadler's paper will be re-

ferred to below whenever necessary due to the common features shared by the two languages.

Finally, before proceeding, it is important to note that only cases in which the variation in the order of T and R is in principle free will be taken into account. Basically, this means that cases where the order of T and R is formally conditioned are not considered, since formal requirements often override semantic ones and thus rule out semantic conditioning of word order (see also Primus 1998: 442–443; Kaiser 2002). Consequently, cases like (17) lie outside the scope of this paper:

(17) Finnish

- a. *lapsi anto-i äidi-lle pallo-n, joka ...*
 child.NOM give-3SG.PAST mother-ALL ball-ACC that ...
 ‘The child gave the mother a ball that ...’
- b. *lapsi anto-i pallo-n äidi-lle, joka ...*
 child.NOM give-3SG.PAST ball-ACC mother-ALL that/who ...
 ‘The child gave the ball to the mother who ...’

In Finnish, the relativized word needs to precede immediately the relative pronoun, which is responsible for the variation in the order of T and R in (17). Example (17) is best seen as an instance of principle (d) of Heine and König (2010: 93), namely “Place arguments in accordance with syntactic constraints in the language concerned” (see also Primus 1998: 434–438). In a similar vein, heaviness of the NP’s examined is not taken into account.

3.2 Animacy and semantic role

As shown in 2.2, animacy affects the order of T and R in many languages, especially in languages with dative shift. Word order varies according to the construction type; the order is T-R in an IOC, while the order shifts to R-T in a DOC (see Heine and König 2010). One explanation for these preferences has been proposed by Primus (1998), according to whom case hierarchy and thematic hierarchy of the objects are in harmony in these cases. On these hierarchies, accusative (direct object) marking outranks marking by oblique cases or adpositions (case hierarchy), and the proto-recipient role outranks proto-patient role, for example due to features related to animacy (thematic hierarchy). In a DOC, the argument that ranks higher for both hierarchies precedes the lower ranking argument. The hierarchies also predict that the word order preferences are less clear in case the hierarchies are in disharmony, which is the case in languages such as Finnish (and

also Japanese), where the Recipient outranks the Patient in the thematic hierarchy, while the Patient is higher on the case hierarchy. Hence, the order of the objects is more flexible in Finnish, and animacy does not directly determine the order of objects (see also Vilkuna 1998: 201):

(18) Finnish

- | | | | | |
|----|------------|-----------------------------|------------------|------------------|
| a. | <i>Isä</i> | <i>anto-i/lähett-i</i> | <i>kirja-n</i> | <i>lapse-lle</i> |
| | father.NOM | give-3SG.PAST/send-3SG.PAST | book-ACC | child-ALL |
| b. | <i>Isä</i> | <i>anto-i/lähett-i</i> | <i>lapse-lle</i> | <i>kirja-n</i> |
| | father.NOM | give-3SG.PAST/send-3SG.PAST | child-ALL | book-ACC |
- Both: 'The father gave/send the book to the child/the child a book'

As shown in (18), animate objects (regardless of their role) may precede or follow inanimate objects without any consequences for grammaticality, or even without any clear (grammatically determined) preference for either order. Consequently, animacy cannot be seen as a determining factor of the ordering of T and R in Finnish. One of the reasons for this may also lie in the lack of ambiguity in cases like (18); both differences in animacy and the morphological coding of T and R render an unambiguous reading of (18) possible (see Rappaport Hovav and Levin 2008: 153–154 for a similar remark). However, this is not to say that both orders are equally frequent in actual language use. I am only saying that they are both equally grammatical, and no clear preferences can be spelled out for either of them (for example, Kotilainen (2001: 133) states that in Old Bible texts the order is Recipient-Theme in 61% of the cases, which means that this order is slightly more frequent). A detailed corpus study is needed for presenting any statistically reliable information about the actual frequencies of the two orders (Kaiser (2002) does not discuss animacy at all in her preliminary corpus study of ditransitive verbs in Finnish). In Japanese (Iwasaki and Sadler 2006: 477), there is a clear preference for the R-T order, especially if both arguments rank equally for animacy.

As noted above, animacy is intimately associated with the semantic roles borne by R's. Animate R's usually bear the semantic role of recipient, while inanimate R's usually bear the role of goal (see, e.g., Rappaport Hovav and Levin 2008: 144; Kittilä 2008: 262–263; Bresnan and Nikitina 2009: 162 for similar remarks). In many languages, this difference is expressed (among other things) via dative shift, which applies only to Recipients, not inanimate R's (if there are restrictions on this). In Finnish, case marking directly signals this difference: allative typically codes animate R's, while the illative case (typically coding motion into something, e.g., *laatikko-on*; box-illative, 'into the box') codes inanimate R's bearing the role of goal (these cases are not discussed any further in this paper,

see Kittilä 2008 for a more detailed description of this). The mere order of T and R, on the other hand, does not signal any major differences in semantic roles in typical cases, such as (18), but the allatively coded R bears the semantic role of recipient in both (18a) and (18b) irrespective of the order of arguments. However, this is not the whole truth, and there are also cases in which the role borne by R varies according to its position. Some examples are found in (19):

(19) Finnish

- a. *poika potkais-i pallo-n koulu-lle /koululle pallon*
 boy.NOM kick-3SG.PAST ball-ACC school-ALL
 ‘The boy kicked the ball to the school/the school a ball’
- b. *hän anto-i vauva-n äidi-lle /äidille vauvan*
 s/he.NOM give-3SG.PAST baby-ACC mother-ALL
 ‘S/he gave the child to the mother/the mother a child’

Examples in (19) constitute counter-examples to the generalization made above, because the syntactic position of R has consequences for its semantic role. However, the semantic nature of the denoted events is relevant to the differences. In (19a), the variation is between the roles of goal and recipient-beneficiary (see Van Valin and LaPolla 1997: 384; Kittilä 2005). If the order of the two objects is T-R, R refers to an endpoint of the denoted instance of caused motion. If the order is reversed, the more natural reading is that the school is seen as a recipient-beneficiary, who gains control over the referent of T, and the school is seen as an institution consisting of humans (see also Rappaport Hovav and Levin 2008: 142). The clause would be appropriate, for instance, if a boy earns his school a ball by scoring the winning goal in a final where the winning team also gets the match ball. This semantic difference can be highlighted by adding adverbs such as *saakka* and *asti* (both meaning ‘all the way to’) to (19a); they are felicitous if the order is T-R, while they are less appropriate (yet not completely ruled out) in the opposite order. These adverbs are compatible with motion coding, which explains this difference in grammaticality and underlines the role of goal. In (19b), the variation is determined by affectedness, which is here also at least to some extent related to permanence of transfer. In case the order is T-R in (19b), the reading of the clause is ‘s/he handed the child to the mother’, in which case the recipient is not directly affected in any other way than holding the baby, and the transfer is likely temporary, or the (non-)permanence is irrelevant. R-T order, in turn, implies that the baby is transferred to the domain of possession of the mother, in other words, the sentence is appropriate if someone has gotten the mother pregnant. The degree of affectedness is higher and the transfer is seen as permanent. In (19b), changes in the order of T and R are also related to

definiteness; in the T-R order the referent of the baby is more likely to be definite, while in the reversed order the baby is more likely indefinite.

To sum up the discussion in this section. As shown above, animacy *per se* does not determine the linear order of T and R in Finnish, but both orders are equally possible without any major differences in meaning or grammaticality. However, there are some cases in which the order of T and R is less flexible, and the attested variation is to some extent semantically conditioned. In all these cases, R's that immediately follow the verb are seen as bearing the role of recipient, while the order T-R is rather associated with the semantic role of goal. The findings of this section conform to the cross-linguistic tendency of Recipients following the verb in double object constructions in languages with dative shift (such as English and Fongbe), even though the correlation between the post-verbal position and the role of recipient is not as absolute as in languages with a genuine dative shift. In Japanese, studied by Iwasaki and Sadler (2006), semantic roles borne by T and R become relevant whenever the two arguments are equally animate; the order is Goal-Patient when both are animate and Patient-Goal, when both are inanimate. Similar tendencies are not directly observable for Finnish.

3.3 Definiteness/referentiality/topicality

Despite the evident co-variation of definiteness and animacy, definiteness, along with specificity and referentiality, does have consequences for the ordering of T and R in Finnish, as it does in many other languages, such as English and Japanese. Referential/definite objects, irrespective of their semantic or grammatical role, tend to precede non-referential/indefinite objects (see also Vilkuna 1998: 201). In other words, the order is old information-new information, as stated by Kaiser (2002: 5). Iwasaki and Sadler (2006) have shown that the order of T and R is strongly affected by the topical status of R as opposed to T. Finnish does not have a grammaticalized system of articles that would code (in)definiteness, but (in)definiteness (along with referentiality/topicality) is coded by other means, such as personal and indefinite pronouns and partitive (vs. accusative/nominative) case (see also Kaiser 2002: 9). For example, participants referred to by personal pronouns are referential and definite, since their referents are active in discourse. Examples are found in (20):

(20) Finnish

- a. *henkilö anto-i lapse-lle kirjo-j-a /kirjoja lapselle*
 person.NOM give-3SG.PAST child-ALL book-PL-PART
 'A person gave the child (some) books/(some) books to the child'

- b. *henkilö anto-i se-n lapse-lle*
 person.NOM give-3SG.PAST it-ACC child-ALL
 /?(*jo-lle-kin*) *lapselle sen*
 /?(some-ALL-CL)
 ‘A person gave it to the child/?the child it’
- c. *henkilö anto-i häne-lle (jonku-n)*
 person.NOM send-3SG.PAST 3SG-ALL (INDEF-ACC)
kirja-n /?jonkun kirjan hänelle
 book-ACC
 ‘A person gave him/her a book/(some book)/some book to her’

In (20a), both objects are nouns, and the differences in referentiality/definiteness are signaled by case marking. The partitive coding of T signals a lower degree of definiteness as opposed to the accusative coding; in (20a), T refers to an unspecified group of books. The order of T and R is rather flexible in (20a), which suggests that T’s in the partitive case are not indefinite enough to be preferably preceded by more definite R’s. Partitively coded T’s thus behave similarly to accusatively coded (and thus more definite) arguments with the same function. The order would be the same in (20a) also if the T were in the accusative case and the reference would be specific group of books.³ The ordering of the objects in (20a) is based on which of the two objects presents new information and which refers to old information, their inherent definiteness is not relevant (see also Kaiser 2002: 6 who further states that the order is DO-IO in case both objects have the same information status). In Japanese, there is a clear tendency for accessible/referential Goals or Patients to precede non-accessible/non-referential ones (Iwasaki and Sadler 2006: 477–478), the order is Goal-Patient if the two arguments equal in accessibility. The preferences for definite – indefinite order are more visible in (20b) and (20c). In (20b), T-R order is more natural, since T clearly outranks R in definiteness/discourse referentiality (Vilkuna 1998: 201 makes a similar note). The reverse order is less natural, even though it cannot be ruled out as ungrammatical. The opposite holds for (20c) where R-T is the expected order due to the pronominal coding of R. In both cases, pronouns have an active discourse referent, which makes them referential, and places them in the immediate post-verbal slot. For example, in (20b) the order T-R is more natural if we have been talking about a book and what happened to it. The reverse (definite –

³ One of the anonymous referees of the paper has pointed out that the partitive may code differences in quantification, which may explain the fact that changes in the case marking are not relevant to the ordering of T and R. This point is in need of more careful examination.

indefinite) order becomes even less acceptable in both (20b) and (20c) if we emphasize the indefinite nature of the non-pronominal argument by the indefinite pronoun *joku* ‘some’. The order is thus typically theme-rheme in (20b) and (20c).

Examples in (20) illustrate cases in which the two objects display relatively evident differences in definiteness, especially in cases where only one of the objects surfaces as a pronoun. The examined data shows that referential objects tend to precede less referential objects regardless of the role they bear. This is, however, not the full picture. The contribution of definiteness fades to the background if both objects are highly definite, in which case the order is determined by semantic role to a larger extent. Relevant examples are given in (21) (see also Kaiser 2002: 7–8):

(21) Finnish

- a. *opettaja anto-i se-n häne-lle* /?*hänelle sen*
 teacher.NOM give-3SG.PAST it-ACC s/he-ALL
 ‘The teacher gave it to me/?me it’
- b. *opettaja esittel-i häne-t*
 teacher.NOM introduce-3SG.PAST 3SG-ACC
minu-lla /?*minulle hänet*
 1SG-ALL
 ‘The teacher introduced him to me/?me him’
- c. *opettaja esittel-i minu-t*
 teacher.NOM introduce-3SG.PAST 1SG-ACC
häne-lla /?*hänelle minut*
 3SG-ALL
 ‘The teacher introduced me to him/him me’

In (21a)–(21c), both objects surface as a pronoun. In (21a), the two pronouns differ in animacy⁴, while in (21b) and (21c), both pronouns have animate referents, but the recipient ranks higher on typical animacy hierarchies. However, as (21b) shows, the position of the two objects on animacy hierarchies is not relevant to their ordering, but the preferred order is invariably T-R. We may thus conclude that T tends to occupy the immediate post-verbal slot whenever it is definite, the definiteness of R is irrelevant in this regard. This resembles the situation in English and French discussed above (see (10) and (11)).

⁴ In colloquial speech, the animacy distinction between *hän* and *se* has been largely neutralized.

The results provided by the data discussed above are two-fold: First, we may say that the dominant order of objects in Finnish three-participant constructions is definite-indefinite irrespective of animacy or semantic role of the objects whenever the differences in definiteness are evident. This applies to cases where one of the objects surfaces as a pronoun, while the other object is a noun. On the other hand, objects in the partitive case are not considered indefinite enough for this to have consequences for the preferred order of objects. These findings are in accordance with the cross-linguistic tendencies of T-R order (see e.g., Gast 2007: 35; Haspelmath 2007: 80; Heine and König 2010). In (21), in turn, it was shown that the differences in definiteness affect the object ordering only if one object surfaces as a pronoun, otherwise the linear order is determined to a larger extent by semantic role. Moreover, it should be noted that T seems to occupy the immediate post-verbal slot in cases in which it is highly definite, i.e., whenever it is a pronoun. Finnish thus seems to conform to the American English pattern according to Haspelmath (2007: 80): “American English allows only the IOC when the Theme is a pronoun, and the IOC or the DOC otherwise”, i.e., also in AE the order is T-R in this case. It is perhaps interesting to note in this context that the rather productive and frequent accusative-partitive –variation is not conditioned by animacy in any way, either, but the marking of direct objects is determined by definiteness (along with other features, such as aspect). Moreover, the variation between accusative and partitive on T does not determine the order of T and R in any way, but the same principles of ordering apply regardless of the case marking of T, as discussed above.

3.4 Aspect/permanence of transfer

Permanence vs. non-permanence of transfer is in Finnish expressed in various ways. First, there are verbs that have lexicalized permanence or non-permanence of transfer as a part of their semantics. For example, verbs such as *lainata* ‘borrow/lend’ and *vuokrata* ‘rent’ denote temporary transfer, while verbs such as *lahjoittaa* ‘donate’ and *ostaa* ‘buy’ indicate permanent transfer. Second, aspect may be expressed on T, in which case the partitive case implies temporary transfer, while the accusative case is associated with permanent transfer (this is in accordance with aspect coding on the Patient). One way to study the relation of word order and aspect is to contrast clauses that clearly denote permanent transfer with clauses where the temporary nature of transfer is explicitly coded, as in (22):

(22) Finnish

- a. *opettaja lahjoitt-i kirja-n*
 teacher.NOM donate-3SG.PAST book-ACC
oppilaa-lla /oppilaalle kirjan
 pupil-ALL
 ‘The teacher donated a book to the student/the student a book’
- b. *opettaja ost-i asunnon-n*
 teacher.NOM buy-3SG.PAST flat-ACC
oppilaa-lla /oppilaalle asunnon
 pupil-ALL
 ‘The teacher bought a flat for the student/the student a flat’
- c. *opettaja laina-si kirja-n*
 teacher.NOM lend-3SG.PAST book-ACC
oppilaa-lla /oppilaalle kirjan
 pupil-ALL
 ‘The teacher lent the book to the student/the student a book’
- d. *opettaja vuokra-si asunnon-n*
 teacher.NOM rent-3SG.PAST flat-ACC
oppilaa-lla /oppilaalle asunnon
 pupil-ALL
 ‘The teacher rented a flat to the student/the student a flat’
- e. *anna-t-ko se-n kirja-n minu-lla /minulle sen kirjan*
 give-2SG-Q it-ACC book-ACC 1SG-ALL
 ‘Could you give that book to me/me that book’
- f. *anna-t-ko si-tä kirja-a minu-lla /minulle sitä kirjaa*
 give-2SG-Q it-PART book-PART 1SG-ALL
 ‘Could you pass that book to me/me that book’

In (22a)–(22d), the differences between permanent and temporary transfer are lexical, while in (22e)–(22f) the difference is signaled by case marking. Partitive case is generally related to imperfective aspect, which means that the most natural reading of (22f) is ‘could you pass me that book (for a while)’. The clause cannot indicate permanent transfer. The order of the objects in (22) is relatively free, and we cannot point out any clear preferences for either order regardless of whether the denoted transfer is permanent or temporary. The same referentiality/definiteness generalizations hold for (22) as for the cases discussed in the previous section, but permanence does not contribute to the ordering of objects in any significant way in (22).

In (22), it was shown that mere word order changes do not suffice for highlighting the differences between permanent and temporary transfer. We should

note that the cases discussed in (18) could also be approached from the viewpoint of aspect. In these cases, true recipients of permanent transfer directly follow the verb, while T-R order is favored if the transfer is temporary. This is especially evident in (18a) and (18b). However, it should be noted that we are not dealing with differences primarily related to permanence of transfer here, but the nature of transfer, including the roles involved, is also different. In any case, permanence of transfer does not correlate with word order in any necessary fashion, as the examples in (22) clearly show.

3.5 Higher transitivity (affectedness of the recipient)

Cases in which higher affectedness of the recipient contributes to the linear ordering of T and R were discussed already in 3.2, where the co-variation of animacy and semantic roles was examined. Semantic roles differ from each other also according to affectedness; animate recipients can be regarded as more affected than inanimate goals, for example, because animate recipients are capable of using the transferred entity for a specific purpose, while inanimate goals are not (see Kittilä 2008 for a more detailed discussion). Similarly, to languages with dative shift, the order of the objects is R-T in these cases, as the data in (18) showed. A few examples lending further support to this claim are found in (23):

(23) Finnish

- a. *professori lahjoitt-i kirja-t koulu-lle /koululle kirjat*
 professor.NOM donate-3SG.PAST book-PL school-ALL
 ‘The professor donated the books to the school/the school the books’
- b. *vanhempi anto-i rahat-t lapse-lle /lapselle rahat*
 parent.NOM give-3SG.PAST money-PL child-ALL
 ‘The parent gave money to the child/the child money’
- c. *opettaja lähett-i ohje-et*
 teacher.NOM send-3SG.PAST instruction-PL
opiskelija-lle /opiskelijalle ohjeet
 student-ALL
 ‘The teacher sent the instructions to the student/the student instructions’

In (23), the Recipient is conceived of as more affected if it immediately follows the verb, whereas the order T-R is associated with less affected recipients. For example, in (23a) the most natural reading with the R-T order is that the school needed the books, which were then delivered by the professor. In other words, the denoted transfer had a specific purpose, which also contributes to the higher

affectedness of the recipient; it is more probable that the transferred entity will be used (i.e., read) in this case. A similar analysis is applicable to (23b) and (23c). In (23b), it is possible to specify the purpose for which the money was given to the child (e.g., *vanhempi antoi lapselle rahat pyörä-än* ‘bike-ILL’) ‘the parent gave the child money for the bike’, if the order is R-T, while this is less appropriate if R follows T. The normal reading of (23c) with R-T order is that the student needed some instructions that were delivered to him/her by the teacher, which affected the student in that s/he was able to perform the action s/he had in mind. In Janssen’s words (Janssen 1997: 294), the denoted transfer concerns the recipient more if the order is R-T, which also makes it more affected. If, on the other hand, R follows T in (23a)–(23c), it is rather seen as a mere endpoint of transfer necessary for the denoted event to be completed successfully, but whose affectedness is not entailed or specified in any way. For example, the reading of (23a) in this case would be that the school had not asked the professor to donate any books, but s/he does so spontaneously. This also decreases (but does not exclude) the likelihood that the books will be used and that the recipient will be affected.

Examples in (23) can also be approached from the perspective of definiteness. As has been noted above, the order of T and R in Finnish is usually old-new, i.e., definite objects precede indefinite ones. Put another way, the object that immediately follows the verb refers to information that is active as we speak; the referent of the object has been mentioned earlier in discourse. The focus is thus on what happens to the referent of the object (see also Primus 1998: 453). In case the recipient represents old information, it is seen as more affected, since the clause is concerned with the consequences the denoted event has on the recipient. On the other hand, clauses displaying T-R order highlight the consequences on the theme, which also renders the affectedness of the recipient lower, even though pragmatically the recipient may still be the more affected participant of the given event (due to the correlation between animacy and affectedness).

Above, it was noted that successful transfer is one of the features associated with the affectedness of R. In (23), successful transfer as such is irrelevant, because all the cases discussed involve a recipient. Somewhat different examples are provided in (24):

(24) Finnish

- | | | | | |
|----|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|--|
| a. | <i>heit-i-n</i> | <i>häne-lle</i> | <i>pallo-n,</i> | <i>mutta hän ei saanut sitä kiinni</i> |
| | throw-PAST-1SG | 3SG-ALL | ball-ACC | but s/he did not catch it |
| b. | <i>heit-i-n</i> | <i>pallo-n</i> | <i>häne-lle,</i> | <i>mutta hän ei saanut sitä kiinni</i> |
| | throw-PAST-1SG | ball-ACC | 3SG-ALL | but s/he did not catch it |
- ‘Both: I threw a ball to him/her, but s/he did not catch it’

In (24), the added adverbial clause underlines the fact that the transfer was not successful. This has no bearing on the order of T and R, but both orders are equally possible regardless of whether the unsuccessful nature of the transfer is highlighted or not.

4 Discussion

4.1 Preliminaries

This paper has investigated whether mere changes in word order causes semantic/pragmatic changes similar to those produced by dative shift, i.e., cases in which both the order of arguments and their coding are affected. It has been shown that mere changes in argument order may express some of the functions of dative shift (or at least the effects are similar to those produced by dative shift), while in other cases the differences in the linear order of T and R do not have any major consequences for the reading of clauses. In this section, I will discuss the rationale behind the discussed cases. The examination concerns both facets of dative shift (word order changes and changes in argument coding) and their contribution to coding the features discussed in this paper. I will first discuss the relevance of the findings to dative shift and why certain functions are more readily expressed by word order changes alone. This is followed by a discussion of the importance of the findings to argument marking at a more general level in Section 4.3.

4.2 Changes in the order of R and T as an instance of dative shift?

As has been noted several times in this paper, dative shift is a two-fold process comprising both changes in argument marking and linear order of arguments. In some cases, it may be difficult to tease these two aspects apart, but changes in argument marking may be said to be the more important feature of these two for two reasons. First, in some languages, such as English⁵ and Swedish, the linear order of T and R may be modified only if the morphological coding of arguments is altered. Second, there are languages, such as Korean and Fongbe, where changes in argument marking suffice for expressing the functions of dative shift,

⁵ As shown by Gast (2007), in certain varieties of British English, changes in the order are possible also otherwise.

and changes in word order are optional. In Finnish, in turn, changes in the case marking of arguments often signal differences in semantic roles as well, which does not necessarily correspond to a change in the order of arguments. The two features of dative shift can moreover be said to be related to different semantic and pragmatic facets of meaning. Word order is typically associated with information/discourse structure and it thus codes features such as definiteness, animacy and referentiality of arguments. For example, animate arguments tend to precede inanimate arguments and definite/referential arguments occur before indefinite/non-referential ones (see e.g., Primus 1998; Heine and König 2010, Iwasaki and Sadler 2006 for Japanese). On the other hand, morphological coding of arguments (including case marking and marking by adpositions) is one of the central mechanisms of transitivity expression, and it is thus related to the coding of semantic roles and features like affectedness, agency and aspect (see e.g., Næss 2007; Kittilä 2011 for more detailed discussion). However, it is important to note that definiteness/topicality is often expressed by case, as the cross-linguistically rather common Differential Object Marking shows (see Iemmolo 2011 for a recent discussion). Based on this, we could expect that the “Finnish dative shift” readily expresses differences in the pragmatic status of arguments, while transitivity-related features are less relevant in this regard. In languages with a genuine dative shift, on the other hand, all of the features related to word order and transitivity are potentially expressed by dative shift. In some cases, such as the coding of definiteness, dative shift can be seen as overkill, since mere word order changes would in principle suffice to express the function in question. However, in many languages the two mechanisms go hand in hand and we may therefore say that also argument coding is relevant to features such as topicality.

The predictions made above are largely borne out by Finnish data, especially as regards the features typically associated with word order. As shown in Section 3.3, definite/referential arguments tend to precede indefinite/non-referential arguments in three-participant constructions. This is especially evident in case only one of the objects is active in the discourse and is thus coded by a pronoun; this argument tends to precede the nominal argument irrespective of its semantic role. This is in line with the cross-linguistic tendencies of word order, including the order of T and R (see Blansitt 1973; Primus 1998; Iwasaki and Sadler 2006; Haspelmath 2007; Heine and König 2010). Finnish also conforms to the tendency that T's tend to be placed before R's in case both of them are highly definite, e.g., if they are both pronominal (see Haspelmath 2007: 80). On the other hand, animacy *per se* does not determine the order of T and R in any significant way in Finnish. The order is relatively free, and definiteness and topicality are more relevant to the ordering of objects. This is also in line with crosslinguistic data; similar tendencies are found in other languages without dative shift (see, e.g.,

Iwasaki and Sadler 2006 for Japanese). Moreover, in languages with dative shift, the order is R-T only if both objects surface as bare NP's (not case-marked or marked by an adposition, see Primus 1998: 439). In some of these languages, such as Dutch, the order is less rigid in an IO construction (see Holmberg and Rijkhoff 1998: 81). If both objects have an animate referent, the order is more typically T-R, which is probably expected due to the predominance of this order in cases where both objects are highly definite. Based on Finnish data, we may thus conclude that changes in morphological argument marking are not necessary for coding differences in definiteness and animacy, but mere word order changes suffice for this. Moreover, the governing principles are the same regardless of whether these features are expressed by genuine dative shift or by word order changes alone.

The expression of transitivity-related features via dative shift is expected. Dative shift promotes a peripheral R into the clause core making it a direct/primary object, which also increases the formal transitivity of the clause; the result is a construction with two direct (or primary) object-like arguments. In Finnish, there are no changes in the morphological coding of arguments, which may lead us to think that transitivity-related features are not relevant to object ordering. Moreover, the non-core (allative) marking of R could be taken as a sign of lower transitivity: the accusative codes highly affected objects, while any other kind of marking indicates a lower overall transitivity. Consider:

(25) Finnish

muurari maala-si talo-n /talo-a
 bricklayer paint-3SG.PAST house-ACC/house-PART
 'The bricklayer painted the house (completely)/part(s) of the house'

However, as shown in (23), and also (18), there are cases in which changes in word order may be claimed to have some consequences for transitivity-related features, especially affectedness. This is evident in two cases. First, there are cases, in which the immediate post-verbal slot is associated with the semantic role of recipient, while mere endpoints of transfer (goal) tend to follow T. Examples were given in (18). Second, a given instance of transfer may have a more specific purpose if R is placed before T. Recipients outrank goals in affectedness (for example, a human recipient may use the transferred entity for a specific purpose, while an inanimate goal cannot), which makes their affectedness relevant in this case. Examples were illustrated in (23). On the other hand, word order changes are not related to permanence or non-permanence of transfer in any significant way, as shown in (22).

The differences in the expression of affectedness and permanence of transfer via word order changes can be explained by the different nature of the features in

question. Affectedness is a feature associated primarily with objects and their referents. Moreover, recipient may be said to be the most affected participant of transfer events (see Kittilä 2008: 260–264), in which regard recipients resemble patients of transitive events. Patients of transitive events immediately follow the verb, which is the slot reserved for affected participants. This is also the slot that Recipients coded identically to Patients take as a result of dative shift. As a result, the mere placing of R may be expected to be relevant to its degree of affectedness; the immediate post verbal slot is reserved for more affected recipients. Moreover, we may add that the contrast here is between mere recipients and recipient-beneficiaries (such as *the teacher baked me a cake*.) Recipients may be seen as mere endpoints of transfer, whose degree of affectedness is not specified. Recipient-beneficiaries, in turn, are not only recipients of transfer, but they can further be seen as beneficiaries, who use the transferred entity for a specific purpose. This increases their degree of affectedness. The distinction between these roles is not ad hoc, but it has been shown to be formally manifest, for example by Kittilä (2005). In contrast to affectedness, permanence of transfer, or aspect in general, is not a feature related to a single participant, but it is rather a feature of the whole event. Aspect is thus also a feature relevant to the overall transitivity of a clause, but it is harder to associate it with one participant only. It is therefore natural that case frames are modified to express differences in aspect. For example, in the languages illustrated in (15)–(16), the case frame changes from IOC to DOC whenever the permanence of transfer is highlighted. In Fongbe, only changes in argument marking are necessary. On the other hand, consequences of word order changes for the clause structure are less dramatic. This may suggest that they are less capable of expressing features related to the clause as a whole, a prediction that is verified by Finnish data. The permanence of transfer may be said to affect the order of objects only in cases where differences in permanence are implied by the semantic roles involved, which is expected based on the brief discussion above.

Differences in the information structure of argument slots in three-participant constructions are also relevant to the differential expression of aspect and affectedness. As noted above, the immediate post verbal slot is reserved for definite, topical arguments, while new information and indefinite arguments follow definite arguments. This has clear consequences for affectedness and thus for the ordering of objects in cases such as (23). If R immediately follows the verb, it is focused on, which also highlights its affectedness. The clause is about the recipient and the effect the denoted event has on it (see Janssen 1997: 294 for a similar remark on Dutch). It is also more likely that the transferred entity will be used for a specific purpose in these cases, which lends further support to the distinction between recipients and recipient-beneficiaries. On the other hand, if

T precedes R, T's affectedness is more in the foreground, which renders the affectedness of the recipient lower, or rather unspecified in many cases. The recipient is seen merely as an endpoint of transfer, whose presence is implied by verb semantics. This is also in line with the lower affectedness of peripheral arguments (see 4.3 for a more detailed discussion). The Finnish data also shows that it is not necessary for R to be coded as a direct object to be focused on, but mere changes in word order suffice for this purpose. On the other hand, focusing on the recipient does not have any consequences on permanence of transfer. One of the reasons for this may lie in the fact that recipients are endpoints of transfer regardless of whether the denoted instance of transfer is permanent or not. Whether the focus lies on the recipient or not is not relevant in this regard. It thus seems that changes in argument coding and case frames are necessary for expressing differences in aspect, which is only expected based on its clausal nature.

4.3 Consequences for the theory of argument marking

In Section 4.2, I discussed the relevance of the findings of this paper to dative shift. In this section, their relevance to the theory of argument marking at a more general level will be briefly discussed.

First of all, the data examined in this paper lends further support to the findings of studies concerned with the relation of overt coding of arguments and their order. It has often been argued that word order is relatively free in cases where (morphological) coding of arguments suffices for distinguishing between Agent and Patient (see, e.g., Siewierska 1998b: 509–513; Sinnemäki 2008), or T and R (see, e.g., Sedlak 1975: 125; Holmberg and Rijkhoff 1998: 81; Kittilä 2006: 15–16). This prediction is verified by Finnish data. The changes in argument order do not affect the semantic role assignment of T and R in any way; T bears the role of theme and R the role of recipient regardless of the order in which the arguments appear. On the other hand, in languages without morphological case marking, changes in word order have consequences for the semantic role assignment of arguments. The Finnish data is also in line with Primus's generalization that the order of T and R is more flexible whenever case hierarchy and thematic hierarchy are not in harmony. It is, however, important to bear in mind that the order is free only as regards the semantic role assignment of the two objects. There are cases in which changes in argument order have consequences for features like affectedness, as shown in (18) and (23). The order is not completely free in these cases, because it has a semantic basis. We may thus conclude that the order may not be manipulated for pragmatic reasons whenever it serves a more semantically determined function, as in (18) and (23), where semantics overrides pragmatics. This

finding is in line with earlier studies that have shown that it is more important for a language to express semantic functions than pragmatic ones. Case marking or word order is freely manipulated for pragmatic reasons only if they are not needed for expressing semantic functions. Languages that primarily mark topic, and only secondarily semantic role, are in the clear minority cross-linguistically (Lisu, reported by Li and Thompson (1976: 472) seems to be one of the few exceptions here).

As was also noted above, Finnish conforms to the tendency that word order is generally related to definiteness and specificity; definite/referential arguments tend to precede indefinite/non-referential arguments. This is very evident in (20) and (21), for example. On the other hand, animacy does not determine the order of objects in any relevant manner, as shown in (18). These differences are not unduly surprising if we consider their motivation. Animacy is an inherent feature of participants (and the nouns denoting them); arguments either have or do not have an animate referent. This does not vary depending on the context.⁶ This renders explicit formal coding of animacy superfluous; it does not express any information that could not be retrieved otherwise. It is also important here that Finnish codes T and R distinctively, because of which ambiguity does not arise regardless of whether the referents of R and T are both animate or not. In languages where animacy affects the order of T and R, changes often occur when formal devices are necessary for explicit disambiguation. This occurs, e.g., in cases such as *the president introduced the minister to the teacher*. In Finnish, word order is never needed for disambiguation of T and R, whence word order changes may be used to express other functions. On the other hand, definiteness is a contextual feature, and one and the same entity can be definite or indefinite depending on context. On this basis, it seems natural that languages develop ways of marking definiteness, while formal coding of animacy is less relevant (even though it is attested in many languages, such as those with DOM). What is also relevant here is that Finnish has grammaticalized means for coding the definiteness of T (it may occur in the accusative or in the partitive), but not for coding the definiteness of R (allative vs. illative variation is not relevant in this regard). This has the consequence that changes in argument order are the only means available for highlighting the definiteness of R. This lends further support to the generalization mentioned above. Since word order is not needed for disambiguation of semantic roles (i.e., it does not have a semantic function), it may be manipulated for expressing (in)definiteness or (non-)topicality of arguments.

⁶ Animacy hierarchies are not considered here, since they are not motivated by the inherent animacy of nouns.

The findings of the paper also underline the formally peripheral nature of semantically less central participants. Core participants appear close to the verb, while constituents referring to peripheral participants (such as manner, time, and location) usually appear further away from the verb, i.e., the clause core. As shown in (23), R's that bear the role of affected recipient usually immediately follow the verb, while recipients whose affectedness is not specified, and which can thus be seen as mere endpoints of transfer tend to follow T. Affected recipients are thus similar to patients, while unaffected recipients resemble more peripheral participants. This is in line with dative shift as well, where affected recipients behave like direct objects, while other kinds of recipient formally resemble optional obliques. Moreover, this underlines the relevance of affectedness to the centrality of participants; affected participants are more tightly related to the clause core, and they thus appear closer to the verb. As pointed out by Næss (2004), only affected objects are in many languages treated as real objects. Affected participants are more salient and they are thus more relevant to our conceptualization and classification of events. This is more evident in languages with dative shift, where R is also morphologically a direct/primary object, which makes their placement after the verb natural. However, as the Finnish data shows, the ordering may be conditioned by semantics alone; the formally more core-like T follows the allatively coded R whenever it is necessary to underline the affectedness of the recipient. Word order is the only means available for this, because the morphological coding of R may not be manipulated. We may also note that the immediately post-verbal placing of affected recipients also provides us with further evidence for the more affected nature of highly definite/referential objects. It has been argued by many scholars (see e.g., Hopper and Thompson 1980: 252; Næss 2004: 1190–1194) that definite objects are more affected than indefinite objects, which is one of the reasons proposed for DOM. As the Finnish data shows, differences in case marking are not necessary for this, but mere changes in the linear order of arguments may suffice. In both cases, definiteness and affectedness co-vary, but in different ways.

To summarize, the brief discussion above has shown that despite the functional differences between word order and argument coding, both of them may in favorable conditions express the same (or at least similar) functions. This is especially evident for word order. Regardless of whether a language has a genuine dative shift or not, it can express differences in, for example, definiteness. Moreover, languages have mechanisms for expressing functions that are not directly inferable from the inherent nature of participants. For example, Finnish has developed means for expressing the definiteness of R via word order, while this cannot be expressed by case marking (for indirect objects). On the other hand, animacy does not affect the order of T and R in any significant manner,

because this is an inherent feature of arguments, in addition to which animacy never yields ambiguity due to the inherently different coding of T and R. What is also interesting here is that there seem to be only a handful of languages in which dative shift without changes in argument order is possible. Examples are illustrated by Fongbe and Korean, but these languages seem to be in the minority typologically. This may be taken as evidence for the fact that languages strive for economy. In case mere word order changes are possible (as in Finnish) and can express the necessary functions, more complex processes such as dative shift are not needed.

5 Summary

This paper has concerned the effects of word order on the reading of three-participant constructions in Finnish. The goal was to investigate whether mere changes in word order may express functions similar to those expressed by dative shift across languages. Finnish suits very well for this purpose for its inherently differential marking of T and R and its relatively free word order.

Dative shift is a formally defined process, which affects the marking and order of T and R in three-participant constructions. Effects of dative shift are, however, not only formal. Dative shift has a number of semantically determined functions as well. These include the expression of animacy, semantic role (typically recipient vs. goal), definiteness/referentiality/topicality, aspect (permanence of transfer) and affectedness of the recipient. The expression of these functions seems to be rather common across languages. Many of the functions are related to transitivity, for example in light of Hopper and Thompson's seminal list of transitivity parameters.

The two formal features of dative shift may be said to be associated with different functions. Word order is typically related to features such as animacy and definiteness, while case marking typically codes semantic roles, aspect and affectedness, and also animacy in some cases. The hypothesis put forward in this paper was thus that word order changes readily express definiteness and also animacy, while the expression of other features is more restricted in nature. This hypothesis was confirmed for definiteness and aspect, the first of which is related to word order changes, while the latter is not in any significant way related to changes in the linear order of T and R. Differences in semantic roles are partly related to dative shift, and true recipients rather appear in the immediate post-verbal slot than elsewhere in the clause. On the other hand, the hypothesis is not confirmed for other features associated with dative shift. First, animacy does not affect the order of T and R in any important fashion in Finnish, while animacy is

typically relevant to dative shift. Second, there are cases in which mere changes in the linear order of T and R suffice for coding differences in affectedness. The immediate post-verbal slot is reserved for highly affected recipients and also R's that bear the role of recipient-beneficiary. One of the reasons suggested for this were the differences in the information status of the two object slots in three-participant constructions. In case the R immediately follows the verb, the focus lies on it, and the clause is more about the recipient, which increases its affectedness.⁷

The findings of the paper have also relevance to theories of argument marking. The paper has shown, for example, that core participants, especially affected core participants, appear closer to the clause core than participants whose affectedness is lower, or not specified. We should, however, bear in mind that the claims put forward in the paper are based on one language only, which renders detailed studies of similar topics in other languages necessary.

Acknowledgments: Academy of Finland (project number 1127724) has provided financial support for this study. I am also grateful to the anonymous referees of *Journal of Linguistics* and *Linguistics* for their invaluable feedback on an earlier version of this paper. All the remaining flaws are naturally my sole responsibility.

References

- Aissen, Judith. 2003. Differential object marking: iconicity vs. economy. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 21. 435–483.
- Becher, Jutta. 2005. Ditransitive Verben und ihre Objekte im Wolof: Positionsregeln und Kombinierbarkeit. *Hamburger Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere (HAAP)* 3. 13–27.
- Blansitt, Edward L., Jr. 1973. Bitransitive clauses. *Working Papers on Language Universals* 13. 1–26.
- Bossong, Georg. 1985. *Empirische Universalienforschung: Differentielle Objektmarkierung in den neuiranischen Sprachen*. Tübingen: Narr.
- Bresnan, Joan, Anna Cueni, Tatiana Nikitina & Harald Baayen. 2007. Predicting the dative alternation. In Gerlof Boume, Irene Krämer & Joost Zwarts (eds.), *Cognitive Foundations of Interpretation*, 69–94. Amsterdam: Royal Netherlands Academy of Science.
- Bresnan, Joan & Tatiana Nikitina. 2009. The gradience of the dative alternation. In Linda Uyechi & Lian Hee Wee (eds.), *Reality exploration and discovery: Pattern interaction in language and life*, 161–184. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

⁷ One of the anonymous referees of the paper points out that the relative topicality of T and R makes an important contribution in this regard. However, this topic cannot be fully addressed in this paper and this is best left for future studies on the topic.

- Bruce, Les. 1984. *The Alambalak language of Papua New Guinea (East Sepik)*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Colleman, Timothy. 2009. Verb disposition in argument structure alternations: A corpus study of the dative alternation in Dutch. *Language Sciences* 31. 593–611.
- Collins, Peter. 1995. The indirect object construction in English: An informational approach. *Linguistics* 33(1): 35–49.
- Comrie, Bernard. 1986. Markedness, grammar, people, and the world. In Fred R. Eckman, Edith A. Moravcsik & Jessica R. Wirth (eds.), *Markedness*, 85–106. New York: Plenum.
- Daniel, Michael, Zaira Khalilova & Zarina Molochieva. 2010. Ditransitives in East Caucasian: A family overview. In Andrej Malchukov, Martin Haspelmath & Bernard Comrie (eds.), *Studies in ditransitive constructions. A comparative handbook*, 277–315. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Dalrymple, Mary & Irina Nikolaeva. 2011. *Objects and information structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dixon, R. M. W. 1994. *Ergativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dryer, Matthew. 1986. Primary objects, secondary objects and antitdative. *Language* 62(4). 808–845.
- Faltz, Leonard M. 1978. On indirect objects in universal syntax. *Chicago Linguistic Society* 14. 76–87.
- Gast, Volker. 2007. *I gave it him* – On the motivation of the ‘alternative double object construction’ in varieties of British English. *Functions of Language* 14(1). 31–56.
- Givón, Talmy. 1979. *On understanding grammar*. New York: Academic Press.
- Goldberg, Adele E. 1992. The inherent semantics of argument structure: the case of the English ditransitive. *Cognitive Linguistics* 3(1). 37–74.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 2007. Ditransitive alignment splits and inverse alignment. *Functions of Language* 14(1). 79–102.
- Heine, Bernd & Christa König. 2010. On the linear order of ditransitive objects. *Language Sciences* 32(1). 87–131.
- Holmberg, Anders & Jan Rijkhoff. 1998. Word order in the Germanic languages. In Anna Siewierska (ed.), *Constituent order in the languages of Europe*, 75–104. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hopper, Paul & Sandra A. Thompson. 1980. Transitivity in grammar and discourse. *Language* 56(2). 251–299.
- Iemmolo, Giorgio. 2011. *Towards a typological study of differential object marking and differential object indexation*. Pavia: University of Pavia dissertation.
- Iwasaki, Noriko & Misumi Sadler. 2006. Iconicity and viewpoint in determining the word order in dative construction in Japanese. *BLS (Berkeley Linguistic Society)* 30. 468–480.
- Janssen, Theo A. J. M. 1997. Giving in Dutch: An intra-lexematical and inter-lexematical description. In John Newman (ed.), *Linguistics of giving*, 267–306. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Kaiser, Elsi. 2000. A first look at the syntactic structure of Finnish ditransitive verbs. In Jason D. Haugen & Travis Louthain (eds.), *Proceedings of the Twelfth Student Conference in Linguistics*, 111–126. Cambridge, MA: MIT Working Papers in Linguistics.
- Kaiser, Elsi. 2002. The syntax-pragmatics interface and Finnish ditransitive verbs. In M. van Koppen, E. Thrift, E. J. van der Torre & M. Zimmermann (eds.), *Proceedings of the 9th Annual Conference of the Student Organization of Linguistics in Europe (ConSOLE IX)*. Downloadable: <http://www-bcf.usc.edu/~emkaiser/Kaiser-2002-Console.pdf>.

- Kittilä, Seppo. 2005. Recipient prominence vs. beneficiary prominence. *Linguistic Typology* 9(2). 269–297.
- Kittilä, Seppo. 2006. Object-, animacy- and role-based strategies: a typology of object marking. *Studies in Language* 30(1). 1–32.
- Kittilä, Seppo. 2007. On the encoding of transitivity-related features on the indirect object. *Functions of Language* 14(1). 149–164.
- Kittilä, Seppo. 2008. Animacy effects on differential Goal marking. *Linguistic Typology* 12(2). 245–268.
- Kittilä, Seppo. 2011. Transitivity typology. In Jae Jung Song (ed.), *The Oxford handbook of linguistic typology*, 346–367. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kittilä, Seppo & Jussi Ylikoski. 2011. Remarks on the coding of Goal, Recipient and Vicinal Goal in European Uralic. In Seppo Kittilä, Katja Västi & Jussi Ylikoski (eds.), *Case, animacy and semantic roles*, 29–64. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Kotilainen, Lari. 2001. *Antaa*-verbi ja tyypillinen antaminen [the verb ‘give’ and prototypical giving]. In Pentti Leino, Ilona Herlin, Suvi Honkanen, Lari Kotilainen, Jaakko Leino & Maija Vilkkumaa (eds.), *Roolit ja rakenteet* [Roles and constructions], 125–167. Helsinki: SKS.
- Lakoff, George & Mark Johnson. 1980. *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lefebvre, Claire & Anne-Marie Brousseau. 2002. *A grammar of Fongbe*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Li, Charles & Sandra Thompson. 1976. Subject and topic: a new typology of language. In Charles N. Li (ed.), *Subject and topic*, 458–489. New York: Academic Press.
- Lu, Bingfu & Tianhua Luo. 2007. A comparison on orders of S, O, V and R, T, V. Paper presented at the Conference on Ditransitive Constructions, 23–25 November 2007, Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, Leipzig.
- Malchukov, Andrej, Martin Haspelmath & Bernard Comrie. 2010. Ditransitive constructions: A typological overview. In Andrej Malchukov, Martin Haspelmath & Bernard Comrie (eds.), *Studies in ditransitive constructions; a comparative handbook*, 1–64. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Moyse-Faurie, Claire. 1983. *Le drehu, langue de Lifou (Iles Loyauté)*. Paris: SELAF.
- Næss, Åshild. 2004. [What markedness marks: the markedness problem with direct objects](#). *Lingua* 114. 1186–1212.
- Næss, Åshild. 2007. *Prototypical transitivity*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Pinker, Steven. 1989. *Learnability and cognition: the acquisition of argument structure*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Primus, Beatrice. 1998. The relative order of recipient and patient in the languages of Europe. In Anna Siewierska (ed.), *Constituent order in the languages of Europe*, 421–473. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Rappaport Hovav, Malka & Beth Levin. 2008. The English dative alternation: The case for verb sensitivity. *Journal of Linguistics* 44(1). 129–167.
- Rennison, John R. 1996. *Koromfe*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Sáàh, Kòfí K. & Éjiké Èzè. 1997. Double objects in Àkân and Ígbo. In Rose-Marie Déchaine & Victor Manfredi (eds.), *Object positions in Benue-Kwa*, 139–151. The Hague: Holland Academic Graphics.
- Sedlak, Philip A. S. 1975. Direct/indirect object word order: a cross-linguistic analysis. *Working Papers on Language Universals* 18. 117–164.

- Shain, Cory & Judith Tonhauser. 2010. The synchrony and diachrony of differential object marking in Paraguayan Guaraní. *Language Variation and Change* 22(3). 321–346.
- Siewierska, Anna. 1998a. Languages with and without objects. *Languages in contrast* 1(2). 173–190.
- Siewierska, Anna. 1998b. Variation in major constituent order, a global and a European perspective. In Anna Siewierska (ed.), *Constituent order in the languages of Europe*, 475–551. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Sinnemäki, Kaius. 2008. Complexity trade-offs in core argument marking. In Matti Miestamo, Kaius Sinnemäki & Fred Karlsson (eds.), *Language complexity: Typology, contact, change*, 67–88. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Thompson, Sandra A. 1990. Information flow and dative shift in English discourse. In Jerold A Edmondson, Crawford Feagin & Peter Mühlhäusler (eds.), *Development and Diversity: Language Variation Across Time and Space*, 239–253. Dallas, TX: Summer Institute of Linguistics, University of Texas at Arlington.
- Thompson, Sandra A. 1995. The iconicity of “dative shift” in English: Considerations from information flow in discourse. In Marge E. Landsberg (ed.), *Syntactic iconicity and linguistic freezes: The human dimension*, 155–175. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Trutenau, H. Max J. 1973. The verbal status of the NP-linker in Gã. *Studies in African Linguistics* 4. 71–80.
- Van Valin, Robert & Randy LaPolla. 1997. *Syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Vilkuna, Maria. 1998. Word order in European Uralic. In Anna Siewierska (ed.), *Constituent order in the languages of Europe*, 421–474. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Wierzbicka, Anna. 1986. The semantics of ‘internal dative’ in English. *Quaderni di Semantica* 7(1). 121–135.

Appendix. List of abbreviations

ACC	Accusative case	NOM	Nominative case
ALL	Allative case	PART	Partitive case
AV	Active voice	PAST	Past tense
BEN	Benefactive marker	PL	Plural
CL	Clitic	PRES	Present tense
DEF	Definite	Q	Question marker
DET	Determiner	R	Recipient (argument)
DOC	Double object construction	REC.PAST	Recent past
F	Feminine gender	S	Subject of intransitive clauses
ILL	Illative case	SG	Singular
IND	Indicative mood	S.SET	Subject set
INDEF	Indefinite pronoun	T	Theme (argument)
IOC	Indirect object construction	TRANS	Transitive
M	Masculine gender		