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1 Introduction

This paper examines the so-called Double Object (DO) constructions in English and Korean. Two kinds of DO constructions are under investigation: goal and benefactive DOs. Following the usual convention, a DO whose prepositional dative (henceforth PP) counterpart is headed by to is termed a goal DO and a DO whose PP counterpart is headed by for is termed benefactive DO. The two types of DOs are exemplified below.

(1) a. John gave a book to Mary. (Goal PP)  
   b. John gave Mary a book. (Goal DO)  
(2) a. Mary baked a cake for John. (Benefactive PP)  
   b. Mary baked John a cake. (Benefactive DO)

In this paper, we examine two issues. First, we examine the syntactic and semantic properties of English and Korean DO constructions. Through this crosslinguistic comparison, we show that they share certain structural and semantic similarities, but that they also differ in some important respects. Secondly, we provide a more in-depth study of the DO constructions in Korean, which has been less extensively studied than their English counterparts.

A close examination of the DO constructions in the two languages reveals that goal DOs in English and Korean are structurally comparable:

* Maria Luisa dedicates this article to Mohanan in fond memory of their graduate years together and the many fruitful discussions on metrical theory and vowel harmony.
Both are ‘low applicatives’ (in the sense of Pylkkänen 2002). On the other hand, benefactive DOs in the two languages are structurally distinct: While English benefactive DOs are low applicatives, Korean benefactive DOs are high applicatives. This syntactic distinction has a semantic correlate: While goal DOs in both languages and benefactive DOs in English encode a (prospective) possession relation, which is claimed to be a property of low applicatives in general, Korean benefactive DOs encode a wider benefactive meaning and are not restricted to the prospective possession relation that characterizes the English benefactive DO. Turning to Korean DO constructions, we first show, on the basis of the low adverb placement and scrambling tests, that the goal argument and benefactive argument occupy different structural positions. Specifically, the beneficiary in the benefactive DOs is structurally higher than the goal argument. The beneficiary is located above vP, while the goal argument is located below vP. We then take the question of whether the beneficiary is base-generated higher than vP, or it is moved into a vP external position. We provide evidence in favor of the first position.

2 The syntax and semantics of goal and benefactive DOs in English

As is well-known, English DOs exhibit asymmetric c-command properties with respect to binding and NPI licensing, which suggests that the first DP complement is structurally higher than the second one. (cf. Barss and Lasnik 1986, Larson 1998, Aoun and Li 1989, Pesetsky 1995, among others.)

(3) a. I showed Mary herself.
   b. *I showed herself Mary.

(4) a. I showed no one anything
   b. *I showed anyone nothing.

The same c-command asymmetries between the two objects are also attested with benefactive DOs.¹

(5) a. I got every worker, his, paycheck.
   b. *I got its, owner every paycheck,.

(6) a. (?) I bought no one anything.
   b. *I bought anyone nothing.

¹ Note that reflexives are not possible as themes in benefactive DO constructions. Thus, we cannot construct a benefactive counterpart of goal DOs in (3a).
Turning to the semantic properties of English DOs, the DO construction is semantically different from the PP construction in subtle ways.\(^2\) (cf. Green 1974, Oehrle 1976, Tremblay 1991, Pesetsky 1995, den Dikken 1995, Harley 1995, 2002, among others.) In the DO construction, the first DP complement is understood as the prospective possessor of the second DP complement (i.e. the direct object), where ‘possessor of x’ is an abstract and very general relation (comparable to the relation entertained by the possessor and its sister NP in nominal phrases); see the implication below (7a), (8a), and (9a). We will refer to this layer of meaning proper to the DO construction as the Poss meaning or Poss constraint.\(^3\) The PP construction, on the other hand, is interpreted as transfer of the object denoted by the direct object to a physical location denoted by the PP, as shown by the contrast in (10). In other words, the goal argument in the PP construction is uniquely locational.

(7)  
   a. The revolution gave the country a new government.
       Cf. The country has a new government.
   b. *The revolution gave a new government to the country.

(8)  
   a. The war years gave the journalist a new perspective.
       Cf. The journalist has a new perspective.
   b. *The war years gave a new perspective to the journalist.

(9)  
   a. The noise gave Mary a headache.
       Cf. Mary has a headache.
   b. *The noise gave a headache to Mary.

(10)  
   a. *John sent New York a letter.\(^4\)
   b. John sent a letter to New York.

There has been much debate in the literature as to whether the relation between the DO and the PP forms is derivational (e.g. Larson 1988, den

---

\(^2\) Our discussion of PP constructions here is restricted to the goal PP construction, excluding the benefactive PP construction.

\(^3\) Along with the semantic constraint on the DO form, there is a ‘morphological’ constraint. This constraint states that verbs of Germanic (or native) origin can readily appear in that construction, but not verbs of Latinate origin. Examples violating the morphological constraint are illustrated below. There is no deep grammatical reason why this morphological constraint should hold. It is a remnant of the Germanic origins of the construction; cf. Green 1974, Oehrle 1976, Stowell 1981. The discussion in this paper is restricted to the DO constructions violating the semantic constraint.

(i) *Sue built us the house.
(ii) *Sue constructed us the house. (Pinker 1989: 45)

\(^4\) The following pair shows the restriction on DOs is not due to animacy per se: We gave the house a new roof; *we gave a new roof to the house.
Dikken 1995) or projectional in nature (e.g. Pesetsky 1995, Pylkkänen 2002, Harley 1995, 2002). We endorse here the general view outlined in den Dikken 1995’s analysis of DOs, in which the prospective possessor relation arises from an extra-layer of verbal structure headed by an abstract (low applicative) V*, generated above the prepositional structure, as shown in (11a). The lowest V (with the P incorporated) moves to V*, forming a complex predicate, and the goal argument moves to the Spec of this complex predicate, as shown in (11b). This complex predicate establishes the Poss relation between the DP goal and the DP theme.

\[(11)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{[Bill } \text{v } [ \text{V* [a book [give [P Maryi ]]]]]] \\
\text{b. } & \text{[Bill } \text{v } [ \text{Maryi, [V*-give-P [a book [(give-P) (Maryi)]]]]]]}
\end{align*}
\]

In the case of A-movement, it is generally the case that the lowest copy in the chain is deleted. This explains the contrasts in (7)-(9) and in (12) below (from Richards 2001).

\[(12)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{The Count gave Mary the creeps.} \\
\text{b. } & \text{*The Count gave the creeps to Mary.}
\end{align*}
\]

Yet, there is some evidence that a prepositional layer of structure does underlie the DO construction. As noted by Richards op.cit. (note 4), when the object of the Preposition is heavy, examples like (12b) become grammatical. See also Bresnan and Nikitina (this volume) for similar examples with varying degree of PP heaviness.

\[(13)\] The Count gives the creeps to anyone who talks to him for five minutes.

We analyze such cases as having a structure comparable to (11b), in which the highest copy of the A-chain has been deleted. This option is available only for “heavy” constituents, possibly due to a strong preference for placing such constituents at the end of the sentence.

As for the English benefactive DO, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, it is reasonable to assume that it has essentially the same grammar as the goal DO. Besides the asymmetric c-command relation between the first and second DP complements illustrated in (5) and (6), it also exhibits comparable semantic properties. Indeed, benefactive DOs in English also obey the Poss constraint, as illustrated by the following contrasts from Jackendoff 1990, who attributes them to Jane Grimshaw:

\[(14)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{Bill poured Mary some coffee.}
\end{align*}
\]
The impossibility of stative verbs (e.g. *hold) and verbs of consumption or removal (e.g. *steal) to appear in the benefactive DOs in English also follows from the same constraint; cf. Pylkkänen 2002. Compare these verbs with verbs of creation (e.g. *bake, draw).

On the other hand, the benefactive PP covers a wider benefactive construal. Since the benefactive PP is not an argument of the low applicative V*, it is not subject to the Poss constraint. Thus, the benefactive PP counterparts of the DOs in (16) are well-formed: *Bill held the bag for Mary; *Bill stole the money for Mary.

Note that the benefactive for-PP is not an argument; it is not entailed by the meaning of the lexical verb. Therefore, the benefactive DO form cannot be derived from the benefactive PP form. In the benefactive DO, the dative DP is directly merged with low applicative V*, as shown below. As in (11b), the prospective possession relation between the first and second DPs is established via the complex predicate V*-bake.

The syntax and semantics of goal and benefactive DOs in Korean

We now turn to DO constructions in Korean, in which the first DP complement is marked Dative (-eykey) and the second DP complement is

\[(19) \begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{John-i Bill-kwa Mary-eykey selo-uy} \\
& \quad \text{John-Nom Bill-and Mary-Dat each other-Gen} \\
& \quad \text{chinkwu-lul sokayhay-ss-ta.} \\
& \quad \text{friend-Acc introduce-Past-Decl} \\
& \quad \text{‘John introduced Bill and Mary each other’s friends.’}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{b.} & \quad \text{*John-i selo-uy chinkwu-eykey} \\
& \quad \text{John-Nom each other-Gen friend-Dat} \\
& \quad \text{Bill-kwa Mary-lul sokayhay-ss-ta.} \\
& \quad \text{Bill-and Mary-Acc introduce-Past-Decl} \\
& \quad \text{‘John introduced each other’s friends Bill and Mary.’}
\end{align*}\]

Given the asymmetric c-command relationship between the two objects, we refer to DAT-ACC construction in Korean, both goal and benefactive, as the Korean DO construction.

Unlike English DOs, Korean DOs lack a PP counterpart. In other words, there is no DO-dative PP alternation in Korean. Therefore, Korean lacks contrasts like the English ones in (9) and (10). Nevertheless, Korean does have forms such as (9a).

\[(20) \begin{align*}
\text{khu-n soum-un Mary-eykey twuthong-ul cwu-ess-ta.} \\
& \quad \text{big-Rel noise-Top Mary-Dat headache-Acc give-Past-Decl} \\
& \quad \text{‘The big noise gave Mary a headache.’}
\end{align*}\]

Based on this similarity, we will make the reasonable assumption that goal DOs in Korean have a structure comparable to that of benefactive DOs in English; see (18) above.

We next turn to the benefactive DOs in Korean. There is an interesting difference between benefactive DOs in the two languages with respect to verbal morphology. Note that in the Korean benefactive DO construction, the presence of the dative case-marked DP (i.e. the beneficiary) is licensed by the presence of the light verb *cwu-*. This implies that *cwu-* introduces the dative-marked argument.\(^7\) In the absence of the benefactive morpheme *cwu-*, only the PP form headed by the benefactive postposition *ulwihay* is possible.\(^8\)

\(^7\) When *cwu-* is used as a lexical verb, it corresponds to the English *give*.

\(^8\) A reviewer reminded us of the following example, which lacks *cwu-* (due to Maling 2001):

\[Na-nun Tom-eykey cenyuk-ul sa-ss-ta \ ‘I bought Tom dinner’ \]. This is the only example of that
The benefactive DOs in Korean and the benefactive DOs in English differ in other important respects. The Korean benefactive DO and its English counterpart do not have exactly the same meaning. In Korean benefactive DOs, the Dative DP has a general benefactive meaning. Thus, there is no oddity in the benefactive DO sentence given below. In this sentence, Mary is interpreted as benefiting from the event of “John’s baking the cake” (on-behalf-of interpretation), but she is not the intended recipient of the cake. On the other hand, its English DO counterpart cannot be used with the on-behalf-of interpretation. In the case of the English benefactive DO, it is clearly the case that the subject’s intention is for the entity denoted by the first object to be the intended recipient of the entity denoted by the second object. In other words, the benefactive DO construction is unambiguously associated with a prospective possessor meaning.

Furthermore, the Korean benefactive DO construction, unlike its English counterpart, is perfectly compatible with stative verbs as well as verbs of consumption and removal.

    John-Nom Mary-Dat cake-Acc bake-L Ben-Past-Decl
    ‘John baked Mary a cake.’

    John-Nom Mary-for cake-Acc bake-L Ben-Past-Decl
    ‘John baked a cake for Mary.’

(22) Pappu-n Mary-lulwihay John-i Mary-eykey kheyikh-ul be busy-Rel Mary-for John-Nom Mary-Dat cake-Acc kwu-e *(cwu)-ess-ta.
    bake-L Ben-Past-Decl
    ‘John baked a cake for the benefit of Mary, who is busy.’

    John-Nom Mary-Dat bag-Acc hold-L Ben-Past-Decl
    ‘John held the bag for Mary.’

    John-Nom Mary-Dat money-Acc steal-Past-Decl
    ‘John stole Mary the money.’

type and it is clearly idiomatic, as shown by the fact that a change in the choice of object gives rise to an ungrammatical example.
Even intransitive verbs can appear in the benefactive construction in Korean, as shown below. Recall that the benefactive construction in English denotes a prospective possession relation between the two objects and as such, it cannot appear in a structure lacking a direct object.

    John-Nom Mary-Dat smile-L Ben-Past-Decl
    ‘John smiled for Mary.’

    John-Nom Mary-Dat no wage-with work Ben-Past-Decl
    ‘John worked for Mary for free.’

    John-Nom Mary-Dat speak Ben-Past-Decl
    ‘John spoke for Mary.’

According to Pylkkänen who has identified two types of applicative heads (i.e. high and low applicatives), the semantic properties discussed above are exactly those of the high applicative construction. The high and low applicatives have distinct semantics. While the low applicatives denote a relation between two individuals entering into a possessive relation with each other, the high applicatives denote a relation between an individual and an event. More concretely, in the Korean benefactive construction illustrated above, the Dative Case marked argument is the benefactor of the event denoted by verbal complement of $cwu$-. As in Korean, the DO construction in Venda, which is classified as a high applicative is also compatible with stative verbs and intransitives:

(25) a. Ndi-do-shum-el-a musadzi (intransitive verb)
    Ndi-FUT-work-APPL-FV lady
    ‘I will work for the lady.’

b. Nd-o-far-el-a Mukasa khali (stative verb)
    1sg-PAST-hold-APPL-FV Mukasa pot
    ‘I held the pot for Mukasa.’ (Pylkkänen 2002: 25)

Given the resemblance between the DO constructions in Venda and Korean, we assume that the benefactive DO in Korean is a high applicative. We furthermore assume that the light verb $cwu$-, which licenses the Dative Case-marked argument, is generated higher than the lexical verb, as shown in (26) (the structure corresponds to the example in (21a)). In the remainder of this section, we will provide supporting evidence for the proposed structure.
The first piece of evidence can be gleaned from the low adverb placement test. Given the assumption that low adverbs like the manner adverb *ppalli* ‘quickly’ and the instrumental adverb *phokhu-lo* ‘fork with’ demarcates the vP boundary (cf. Ko 2005), the relative positioning of these low adverbs in the constructions under discussion reveals the relative structural positions of the dative arguments and, indirectly, of the V that licenses them. Neither the manner nor the instrumental adverbs can precede the –eykey marked argument in the benefactive DO; see (27) and (28). On the other hand, they can precede the –eykey marked argument in the goal DO construction; see (29) and (30). These contrasts provide evidence that the –eykey marked argument in the benefactive DO construction is located above vP, while the –eykey marked argument in the goal DO construction is located below vP. Furthermore, the low adverb placement test indirectly reveals the position of *cwu-. The co-dependency between the Dative case-marked argument and *cwu- implies that *cwu- introduces (or licenses) that argument, which is projected above the vP. This fact suggests that *cwu- is
higher in the structure than the \( \nu P \), which in turn suggests that \( c\text{wu-} \) is also higher than the abstract \( V^* \).

     John-Nom quickly Mary-Dat bag-Acc hold-L Ben-Past-Decl

(28) a. ??John-i tulaipe-lo Mary-eykey computer-lul
     John-Nom screwdriver-with Mary-Dat computer-Acc
     kochi-e cwu-ess-ta.
     fix-L Ben-Past-Decl
b. John-i Mary-eykey tulaipe-lo computer-lul
     kochi-e cwu-ess-ta.
c. John-i Mary-eykey computer-lul tulaipe-lo
     kochi-e cwu-ess-ta.

     John-Nom quickly Mary-Dat steak-Acc give-Past-Decl

     John-Nom fork-with Mary-Dat steak-Acc give-Past-Decl

The scrambling test lends further support for the proposed structure of the Korean benefactive DO and concomitantly for the proposal that the Dative case-marked arguments in the goal DO and in the benefactive DO are associated with distinct structural positions in Korean. The results of the scrambling test show that the Dative case-marked argument in the goal DO construction is contained within \( \nu P \), while the Dative case-marked argument in the benefactive DO construction is outside the \( \nu P \). As illustrated by the contrast between (31) and (32), the Accusative-marked object may scramble across the Dative-marked object in the goal DO construction, but not in the benefactive DO construction.

     John-Nom Mary-Dat bag-Acc hold-L Ben-Past-Decl
     *John held Mary the bag.
     John-Nom bag-Acc Mary-Dat hold-L Ben-Past-Decl
     John-Nom Mary-Dat steak-Acc give-Past-Decl
‘John gave Mary steak.’

Interestingly, the benefactive applicatives in Bantu languages, which are classified as a high applicative by Pylkkänen, pattern together with the Korean benefactive DOs with respect to scrambling. This resemblance adds additional support to the high applicative status of the Korean benefactive DO construction. As in Korean, in Bantu, the theme argument cannot precede (i.e. scramble over) the benefactive argument in the absence of object agreement. This is illustrated by the examples below.

(33) a. Chitsiru chi-na-gul-ir-a atsikana mphatso
    fool SP-Past-buy-APPL-fv girls gift
    ‘The fool bought a gift for the girls.’ (Chichewa: Marantz 1993)
b. *Chitsiru chi-na-gul-ir-a mphatso atsikana
    fool SP-Past-buy-APPL-fv gift girls

(34) a. N-a-i-lyi-i-a m-ka k-elya
    Foc-SP-Prs-eat-APPL-fv wife food
    ‘He is eating food for his wife.’ (Chaga: Bresnan and Moshi 1993)
b. *N-a-i-lyi-i-a k-elya m-ka
    Foc-SP-Prs-eat-APPL-fv food wife

To summarize, in this section, we have shown that the goal and benefactives in the English DO constructions, as well as the goal in the Korean DO, are low applicatives (merged in a position located within v\text{P}), while the benefactive in the Korean DO construction is a high applicative (merged in a position located above v\text{P}).

An alternative that comes to mind for the Korean benefactive DO is the following. It could be the case that the benefactive dative in Korean (as in English) is generated within v\text{P} and is then moved to a v\text{P} external position when \text{cwu-} is present. We argue against this alternative in the next section.9

---

9 Given the assumption that a numeral quantifier and its host NP form a constituent (cf. Spotticche 1988), the easiest way to decide between these two positions (i.e. base generation and movement) is to check the positions of the benefactive dative and its associated numeral quantifier in relation to the position of the low adverb. If it is possible for the numeral quantifier associated with the benefactive dative to surface to the right of the low adverb such as the manner or instrumental adverb, then it may be assumed that the benefactive dative is base-generated below the low adverb which demarcates the v\text{P} boundary. However, this prediction is not testable since a Dative case-marked object in Korean (whether it be a benefactive or goal argument), cannot license a floating quantifier; see examples below. Thus, in order to establish the base position of the benefactive dative, we have to resort to some other (indirect) test. We
4 The Korean benefactive dative: base-generated or not?

The interesting point about the structure in (26) is that the Dative case-marked argument in the benefactive DO construction in Korean not only asymmetrically c-commands the Accusative case-marked argument (i.e. the theme), but it also asymmetrically c-commands the base position of the subject. Indeed, if the proposed structure is the correct one, we expect to see an asymmetry between the benefactive dative and the goal dative in terms of their relative structural position in relation to the subject’s base position. The weak-cross over facts discussed below suggest that the benefactive is merged higher than the subject’s base position, while the goal is merged lower than the subject’s base position.

As is well-known, when fronting a wh-phrase that is c-commanded by a DP containing a pronoun, the pronoun cannot be interpreted as bound by the wh-phrase (i.e. the so-called weak crossover effect). As shown below, the benefactive dative, but not the goal dative, gives rise to a weak-crossover effect.

(35) a. Etten sacang-nim₃-kkeyse ku₃-uy cikwon-eykey
     which present-Hon-Nom he-Gen worker-Dat
     wolkup-ul ponay-ss-ni?
     paycheck-Acc send-Past-Q?
     ‘Did which president, send his worker a paycheck?’

b. ??Etten sacang-nim₃-kkeyse ku₃-uy cikwon-eykey
   which present-Hon-Nom he-Gen worker-Dat
   kapang-ul tul-e cwu-ess-ni?
   bag-Acc hold-L Ben-Past-Q?
   ‘Did which president, hold his worker a bag?’

The goal-benefactive dative asymmetry in (35) suggests that the benefactive dative asymmetrically c-commands the subject while the goal dative does not. This in turn suggests that the benefactive dative is higher than the subject, which in turn is higher than the goal dative. This leads to the conclusion that the benefactive dative is structurally higher than the goal dative, investigate this issue through the relative position of the benefactive dative in relation to the base position of the subject and to the position of the goal dative.

    John-Nom 3-CL-Gen friend-PL-Dat present-Acc give-Past-Decl
    ‘John gave three friends a present.’

    John-Nom friend-PL-Dat 3-CL present-Acc give-Past-Decl
    ‘John gave three friends a present.’
precisely the conclusion that we have reached independently in the preceding section based on the distribution of low adverbs and the scrambling test.

Further evidence for the claim that the benefactive dative is directly merged above vP by the distribution of numeral quantifiers. The benefactive dative may intervene between the subject and the numeral quantifier associated with the subject. On the other hand, when the goal dative splits the subject and its associated numeral quantifier, the resulting sentence is degraded; see the contrast between (36b) and (37b). While the latter is less than perfect, the former is worse. It should be noted that both the benefactive and the goal dative can precede the subject and its associated numeral quantifier; see (36c) and (37c).

    student-PL-Nom 3-CL Mary-Dat present-Acc give-Past-Decl
    ‘Three students gave Mary a present.’

    b. ??Haksayng-tul-i Mary-eykey sey-myeng senmwul-ul cwu-ess-ta.
       student-PL-Nom Mary-Dat 3-CL present-Acc give-Past-Decl

       Mary-Dat student-PL-Nom 3-CL present-Acc give-Past-Decl

(37) a. Haksayng-tul-i sey-myeng Mary-eykey kulim-ul
    student-PL-Nom 3-CL Mary-Dat drawing-Acc
draw-L Ben-Past-Decl
    ‘Three students drew Mary a drawing.’

    b. ??Haksayng-tul-i Mary-eykey sey-myeng kulim-ul
       student-PL-Nom Mary-Dat 3-CL drawing-Acc
draw-L Ben-Past-Decl

    c. Mary-eykey haksayng-tul-i sey-myeng kulim-ul
       Mary-Dat student-PL-Nom 3-CL drawing-Acc
draw-L Ben-Past-Decl

How can we account for the above goal-benefactive dative asymmetry? The asymmetry can be attributed to the Cyclic Linearization Principle (CLP) put forth by Fox and Pesetsky 2005 and Ko 2005. According to the CLP, the relative ordering contained in a spell-out domain is established through a Spell-out operation at each cycle (namely, vP and CP). The linear ordering established at the end of each Spell-out domain cannot be erased and must be preserved at PF. As such, an ordering information in a lower
spell-out domain should be consistent with a new one computed in a higher spell-out domain in order to avoid an ordering contradiction at PF. Consider the case of a subject and its numeral quantifier (NumQ) in Korean. These originate in Spec of v and they are linearized with respect to other elements contained within vP (such as the goal argument) at the vP cycle. Within that cycle, the subject and its NumQ is recorded as preceding the goal argument. Consequently, subsequent scrambling (at higher cycles) cannot contradict that order. This explains the ungrammaticality of (36b). On the other hand, a vP-external element (such as the benefactive argument) does not get linearized with the subject and its NumQ until the CP cycle. Therefore, scrambling of the subject across the benefactive argument (with NumQ stranding) at the CP cycle (prior to Spell-out) can occur without giving rise to a linearization contradiction at PF. This explains the wellformedness of (37b). Thus, if we assume the CLP, we can account for the above asymmetry provided that the goal dative originates within vP while the benefactive dative originates above vP.

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we have examined the structural and semantic properties of English and Korean DO constructions. We have argued that the goal and benefactive argument in the English DO are contained within the same verbal projection in which the subject is generated (namely, vP) and that this is also the case for the goal argument in the Korean goal DO. On the other hand, we have argued that the benefactive argument in the Korean ben DO is generated outside the vP, namely in the Spec of the high applicative verb cwu-. These results have important implications. If the arguments of the lexical verb are contained within the lowest verbal projection, the results suggest that while the goal is directly selected by the lexical verb, the benefactive is not (see Jackendoff 1990 for the same conclusion). Furthermore, the fact that the benefactive can either be generated higher than the subject (as in Korean) or lower than the subject (as in English) suggests, mutatis mutandis, that the subject is not directly selected by the verb either (as argued by Marantz 1984 and Kratzer 1999).
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