

As showed above, there is a similarity between those constructions in light of the fact that not all ,only some, verbs allow each constructions. Furthermore, according to Bruening(2010), there is a asymmetry between dative constructions and double object constructions in terms of the scope of quantifier.

- (13) a. I gave a different candy bar to every child. (every > a)
b. I gave a different child every candy bar. (*every > a) (Bruening 2010:292)

As example (13) shows, in case of dative constructions, goal argument has wider scope than theme argument while in double object constructions, theme argument has wider scope than goal argument. In other words, in (14a) below, the interpretation is that the number of medals corresponds to the number of athletes. In contrast, in (15a) below, the interpretation is that all the medals is given to one athlete. In the same manner, there is the same asymmetry in scope mentioned above in locative constructions.

- (14) a. I presented a different medal to every track and field athlete. (every > a)
b. I loaded a different pile of boxes on every tractor-trailer rig. (every > a)
(15) a. I presented a different track and field athlete with every medal. (*every > a)
b. I loaded a different tractor-trailer rig with every pile of boxes. (*every > a)
(Bruening 2010:295)

All these things considered, it is found that dative constructions and locative constructions are similar. it is also found out that with-structure in (4a-b) converted through locative alternation is similar to double object constructions. Therefore, the structure of the dative constructions and locative constructions is likely to be analyzed alike. Hallman(2015) analyzed the dative constructions with “Cause X to have Y’ method. Also, Hallman(2015) analyzed the locative constructions with ”Cause X to be Y“ method.

There is a little difference, but the basic structure is similar to each other. I will accept Hallman’s structure but don’t accept the opinion that locative constructions and dative constructions are different constructions. Moreover, through this analysis, the economy of language will be come true. Further other constructions will be able to be analyzed with this structure.

3. Conclusion

From the similarity of dative constructions and locative constructions appearing superficially to semantic and syntactic feature, we examined that the two constructions are similar and through this it is likely that those constructions are the same constructions. Furthermore, it is found out that with-structure in (4a-b) converted through locative alternation is similar to double object constructions. There is a difference in surface structure, though. That is, double object constructions consist of DP+DP while with-structure in (4a-b) is composed of DP+PP like dative constructions. If also these two constructions can be seen the same constructions, the economy principle of language will be fulfilled.

4. Reference

- [1] Lee, Wonbin. 2013. Some Notes on Double Object Constructions in English. *The New Korean Journal of English Language and Literature* 55.1, 255-272
<https://doi.org/10.25151/nkje.2013.55.1.012>
- [2] Lee, YeonWha. 2014. Locative Alternation and Theme-Goal Asymmetry. *The Journal of Studies in language* 30.3, 559-579
- [3] Shin, Heung Taek. 2015. A Study of the Semantic and Syntactic Differences between the Double Object Construction and the Prepositional Dative Construction in English. doctorate thesis. Pusan National University
- [4] Larson, Richard. 1988. On the Double Object Construction. *Linguistic Inquiry* vol 19(3), 335-391
- [5] Hallman, Peter. 2015. Syntactic Neutralization in Double Object Constructions. *Linguistic Inquiry* 46(3), 389-424
https://doi.org/10.1162/LING_a_00187
- [6] Levin, Beth. 2006. English Object Alternations: A Unified Account. Unpublished ms,
- [7] Harley, Heidi, and Hyun Kyoung Jung. 2015. In Support of the PHAVE Analysis of the Double Object Construction. *Linguistic Inquiry* 46(4), 703-730
https://doi.org/10.1162/LING_a_00198
- [8] Bruening, Benjamin. 2010. Double Obejct Constructions Disguised as Prepositional Datives. *Linguistic Inquiry* 41(2), 287-305
<https://doi.org/10.1162/ling.2010.41.2.287>