

### Lexical splits in ditransitive constructions

This talk (based on a joint work with Martin Haspelmath and Bernard Comrie; Malchukov, Haspelmath & Comrie 2010) examines lexical preferences in the ditransitive domain, that is preferences of semantic ditransitives (featuring Agent, Theme and Recipient arguments) and related verbs for certain constructions. In particular, it will be discussed how alignment preferences for indirective (T=P vs. R), secundative (T vs. P = R), or neutral (T = P = R) alignment extend over the ditransitive domain (see Dryer 1986, Siewierska 2003; Haspelmath 2005 on ditransitive alignment). These issues have not been studied systematically so far in the typological literature. One observation, due to Kittilä (2006), is that ‘give’-verbs show a strong preference for neutral alignment (coding through a double object construction), also when compared with other verbs in the ditransitive domain. In a similar vein, Croft *et. al.* (2001) propose the hierarchy of transfer verbs (give > send > throw) which reflects relative preference of individual verbs for the double object construction in Germanic languages. This leaves open a question what other alignment preferences are manifested by different verb classes in the ditransitive domain and, broader, in the domain of three-place predicates (see Margetts & Austin 2006 for an overview of verb types in this domain). In my talk I address apart from the allative extension (discussed by Croft *et. al.*), the benefactive (from ‘give’ to ‘build (for)’, etc), the malefactive (from ‘give’ to ‘steal/snatch’-verbs), as well as the instrumental (from ‘give’ to ‘hit’-verbs) extensions, and argue that the latter extensions are also gradient. I also show how individual (sub-)hierarchies can be combined into a single semantic map that constrains lexical splits in the ditransitive domain. The paper presents cross-linguistic evidence for the map, as well as addresses some problematic data. It will be argued that counterexamples can be attributed to interfering factors such as verb polysemy or the structural type of the ditransitive (basic vs. derived ditransitives). It will finally be shown that the same map can be used to restrict cross-linguistic variation with respect to other coding strategies (indexing/cross-referencing), as well as predict distribution of applicative markers (also for languages featuring several applicatives).

#### References

- Croft, W., J. Barðdal, W. Hollmann, M. Nielsen, V. Sotirova, and C. Taoka. 2001. Discriminating verb meanings: The case of transfer verbs. Handout, LAGB Autumn Meeting, Reading.
- Dryer, Matthew S. 1986. Primary objects, secondary objects, and antitativity. *Language* 62: 808-45.
- Haspelmath, M. 2005b. Argument marking in ditransitive alignment types. *Linguistic Discovery* 3.1:1-21 (free online journal, <http://linguistic-discovery.dartmouth.edu/>)
- Kittilä, S. 2006. The anomaly of the verb ‘give’ explained by its high (formal and semantic) transitivity. *Linguistics* 44.3: 569–612.
- Malchukov, A. L., M. Haspelmath, & B. Comrie. 2010. Ditransitive construction: a typological overview. In , Malchukov, A. L., M. Haspelmath, & B. Comrie (eds.). *Studies in ditransitive constructions: a comparative handbook*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Margetts, A. & P. Austin. 2007. Three participant events in the languages of the world: towards a crosslinguistic typology. *Linguistics* 45.3: 393-451.
- Siewierska, Anna. 2003. Person agreement and the determination of alignment. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 101.2: 339-370.