1. Introduction

In this paper I am going to discuss constructions with two objects in English (1), Russian (2) and Georgian (3):

(1) John gave Mary the book.

(2) Vasja ot dal Maše knigu
     Vasja gave Masha.DAT book.ACC
     ‘Vasja gave Masha the book.’

(3) šota- m levan-s c’igni misca
     Shota-ERG Levan-DAT book.NOM 3SG.give.AOR.3SG
     ‘Shota gave Levan the book.’

Although the sentences in (1)-(3) look similar on the surface level, I will argue that there is an important difference between their structures that can be identified with the help of repetitive adverbs: English *again*, Russian *opjat’* ‘again’ and Georgian *isev* ‘again’.  

In the recent literature ([Cuervo 2003], [Schäfer 2008] among others) it has been argued that interpretation of dative / applied arguments and their position in the syntactic structure strongly depend on event structure of verbs with which they combine. Under the approach developed in [Cuervo 2003], for example, the event structure of a verb is represented in syntax by different flavors of *vs* (*vDO*, *vGO*, *vBE*). Dative arguments, which are introduced by an applicative projection, differ with respect to where they are introduced in the syntactically represented lexical decomposition of a given verb. Under this view, crosslinguistic variation in structures with two objects arises due to the properties of applicative projections: applicative projections in different languages differ with respect to what they can take as their complement and with respect to what projections can take them as their complements. This approach assumes that all the differences between structures where an applied argument is higher than the direct object are determined by the event structure of a given verb.

A natural question that arises then is the following: what evidence can we make use of in order to determine the exact placement of applicative arguments in lexical decompositions of verbs? Appealing to semantics of predicates and to interpretations of applied arguments does not seem to be good enough: we do not want the syntactic representation to be entirely determined by semantics of lexical items.

The question of validity of lexical decomposition is itself an important issue. Many researches ([Harley 1996], [Harley 2002], [Beck & Johnson 2004], [Jung & Miyagawa 2004] among others) have been arguing for the lexical decomposition of *GIVE* in syntax as *CAUSE* to *HAVE* in the similar vein as *KILL* has been suggested to be syntactically represented as *CAUSE* to *DIE* in the

---

1 The study has been supported by Russian Foundation for Basic Research (grant # 14-06-00435).

2 I will use small caps *AGAIN* to refer to this kind of repetitive adverbs generally and words in italics (*again*, *opjat’, *isev*) to refer to concrete lexical items of English, Russian and Georgian.
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approach of generative semantics [McCawley 1976]. Setting the details of different analyses aside, many approaches share the idea that in ditransitive constructions a direct object and an indirect object are merged together (forming small clause / low applicative / PP / HaveP) excluding the verb ([Kayne 1984], [Pesetsky 1995], [Harley 1996], [Harley 2002], [Cuervo 2003], [Beck & Johnson 2004], [Jung & Miyagawa 2004], [McIntyre 2006], [Pylkkänen 2008], [Schäfer 2008], [Lomashvili 2010], [Harley & Jung 2015], [Harley & Miyagawa, in press]). This idea is illustrated with the PP structure [Harley 2002: 4] in Figure 1.

Figure 1: Double Object Structure (adapted from [Harley 2002: 4])

This line of reasoning begets a question of whether such lexical decomposition of ditransitives is universal or appears to be a peculiarity of English double object construction. Do all languages have GIVE which can be decomposed as CAUSE to HAVE?

The question of how event structures of verbs are mapped into syntax will be central to my discussion of Russian and Georgian structures with two objects throughout this paper. I am going to argue that lexical decomposition of predicates like GIVE in syntax is not universal. While some languages like English may indeed decompose their ditransitives syntactically, Russian and Georgian do not exhibit such decomposition. I am also going to claim that the exact placement of applicative arguments in structures with lexically decomposed verbs could be determined with the help of items that can single out subevents in predicates’ semantics. In this paper I will use repetitive adverbs (AGAIN) as such items. The basic idea that I am going to explore is that if a dative argument is part of some subevent \( e_1 \), then it should be in the scope of the repetitive adverb that singles out that subevent \( e_1 \). I am going to show that both Russian and Georgian have constructions where a dative argument is a participant of a stative subevent of a predicate, but, crucially, ditransitive sentences are not among such constructions.

This paper is organized as follows. In section 2 I will present a major contrast with respect to availability of different readings of AGAIN in English on the one hand and in Russian and Georgian on the other hand. In addition, I will show that German patterns with English with respect to the availability of different readings of AGAIN and provides further support for the syntactic nature of AGAIN’s ambiguity. In section 3 I will present the syntactic approach to the semantics of AGAIN ([von Stechow 1996], [Beck & Johnson 2004], [Beck 2005], among others), which will be adopted throughout this paper. In section 4 I will briefly touch upon the issue of the entailment problem and the reality of restitutive readings of AGAIN. In section 5 I will discuss how restitutive readings of again support the small clause analysis of the English double object construction [Beck & Johnson 2004]. In section 6 I will argue for the absence of lexical decomposition in Russian and Georgian ditransitives. I am going to claim that there is no small clause in syntax that corresponds to the stative subevent of GIVE verbs in Russian and Georgian. In section 7 I will show that both Russian and Georgian have structures where datives are part of
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2. Ditransitives AGAIN: crosslinguistic variation

Russian and Georgian contrast with English with respect to the availability of restitutive readings of AGAIN in ditransitive clauses. This contrast is illustrated (4)-(6):

(4) Thilo gave Satoshi the map again. [Beck & Johnson 2004: 113]
   a. Thilo gave Satoshi the map, and that had happened before. repetitive
   b. Thilo gave Satoshi the map, and Satoshi had had the map before. restitutive

(5) Maša opjat’ otdala Vasja knigu.
   Masha again gave Vasja.DAT book.NOM
   a. Masha gave Vasja the book, and that had happened before. repetitive
   b. *Masha gave Vasja the book, and Vasja had had the book before. *restitutive

(6) dγes Levan-ERG Shota-DAT book.NOM again 3SG.give.AOR.3SG
   a. Levan gave Shota the book today, and that had happened before. repetitive
   b. *Levan gave Shota the book today, and Shota had had the book before. *restitutive

In (4) we see that English again can have both the repetitive and the restitutive reading with the ditransitive give. Under the first (repetitive) reading, the whole event of Thilo giving the map to Satoshi has been repeated. Under the second (restitutive) reading, it is only the state of Satoshi having the book that took place again. The sentences in (5) and (6) illustrate that Russian opjat’ (‘again’) and Georgian isev (‘again’) do not show the same ambiguity when combined with ditransitive verbs. The restitutive reading, under which the state of Vasja/Shota having the book is repeated, is unavailable in these languages.

Note that providing a coherent context for sentences like (5) and (6) does not make the restitutive reading of AGAIN any more acceptable ((7)-(8)).

(7) a. Context: Vasja had always had the book “Two captains” by Kaverin; he had never given it to anyone. One day he accidentally left the book at Masha’s place…

   b. #I togda Maša opjat’ otdala /otpravila /vernula Vasja knigu.
      and then Masha again gave /sent /returned Vasja.DAT book.NOM
      Expected reading: ‘And then Masha gave /sent /returned Vasja the book, and Vasja had had the book before.’

   c. #I togda Maša opjat’ otdala /otpravila /vernula knigu Vasja.
      and then Masha again gave /sent /returned book.NOM Vasja.DAT
      Expected reading: ‘And then Masha gave /sent /returned the book to Vasja, and Vasja had had the book before.’

(8) a. Context: Levan had always had this book; he had never given it to anyone. One day he accidentally left it at Shota’s place…
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b. #sota-m levan-s c’igni isev misca
Shota-ERG Levan-DAT book.NOM again 3G.give.AOR.3SG
/ga-u-gzavn-a /da-u-brun-a
PVB-3APPL-send-AOR.3SG /PVB-3APPL-return-AOR.3SG
Expected reading: ‘Shota gave /sent /returned Levan the book, and Levan had had the book before.’

c. #sota-m c’igni levan-s isev misca
Shota-ERG book.NOM Levan-DAT again 3G.give.AOR.3SG
/ga-u-gzavn-a /da-u-brun-a
PVB-3APPL-send-AOR.3SG /PVB-3APPL-return-AOR.3SG
Expected reading: ‘Shota gave /sent /returned the book to Levan, and Levan had had the book before.’

This observation holds not only for verbs ‘give’ (the Russian otdavat’, the Georgian micema), but for other ditransitive verbs (‘send’, ‘return’) as well. In addition, examples (7) and (8) illustrate the fact that the order of the two objects (DAT ACC ((7b), (8b)) and ACC DAT ((7c), (8c))) does not play a role in the availability of the restitutive reading: the reading is absent with both orders.³

English is not the only language that exhibits restitutive readings of AGAIN in ditransitive clauses. Another language that has two readings of AGAIN with ditransitive verbs is German (9).

(9) …dass Hans dem Mädchen ein Buch wieder gab.
that Hans DEF.neut.DAT girl INDEF.neut.ACC book again gave
a. ‘…that Hans gave the girl a book, and Hans had given the girl a book before.’ repetitive
b. ‘…that Hans gave the girl a book, and the girl had had the book before.’ restitutive

What is more, German provides evidence that the ambiguity in question is syntactic in nature: the position of wieder (‘again’) affects the availability of the restitutive reading. While the preverbal position of wieder makes both repetitive and restitutive readings available (9), only the repetitive reading is possible if wieder is separated from the verb by one or more arguments. This is illustrated in (10)-(11).

(10) …dass Hans dem Mädchen wieder ein Buch gab.
that Hans DEF.neut.DAT girl again INDEF.neut.ACC book gave
a. ‘…that Hans gave the girl a book, and Hans had given the girl a book before.’ repetitive
b. ‘…that Hans gave the girl a book, and the girl had had the book before.’ */restitutive

(11) …dass Hans wieder dem Mädchen ein Buch gab.
that Hans again DEF.neut.DAT girl INDEF.neut.ACC book gave
a. ‘…that Hans gave the girl a book, and Hans had given the girl a book before.’ repetitive
b. ‘…that Hans gave the girl a book, and the girl had had the book before.’ */restitutive

Note that the ditransitive sentences in (9)-(11) show the same pattern with respect to the availability of restitutive readings as sentences with lexical accomplishments such as öffnen

³ One might wonder whether the position of the repetitive adverbs opjat’ and ise’ affects the availability of the restitutive reading. In both languages the most natural position for repetitive adverbs is the preverbal position; other placements of these adverbs are either marked or ungrammatical. It will be shown in section 6.1. that both opjat’ and ise’ can generally have restitutive readings when they immediately precede the verb. So the impossibility of the restitutive reading in (5)-(8) cannot be due to preverbal placement of the repetitive adverbs.
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(‘open’) [von Stechow 1996]: both types of clauses allow the restitutive reading only when the adverb is adjacent to the verb:

(12) Ali Baba Sesam wieder öffnete [von Stechow 1996: 3]

Ali Baba again opened

a. Ali Baba opened Sesam, and Ali Baba had opened Sesam before. repetitive

b. Ali Baba opened Sesam, and Sesam had been open before. restitutive

(13) Ali Baba wieder Sesam öffnete [von Stechow 1996: 3]

Ali Baba again opened

a. Ali Baba opened Sesam, and Ali Baba had opened Sesam before. repetitive

b. Ali Baba opened Sesam, and Sesam had been open before. *restitutive

The observed data from English, Russian, Georgian and German bring us to the following question: what underlies the crosslinguistic variation with respect to the availability of restitutive readings in ditransitive structures? Why is the restitutive reading present in English and German, but unavailable in Russian and Georgian? There could be several reasons for this state of affairs. First, this difference between languages could be caused by different properties of repetitive adverbs. The ditransitive structures themselves could be the same, but divergent properties of Georgian isetv and Russian opjat’ could be responsible for the absence of restitutive readings. Second, semantics of ditransitive predicates in Russian and Georgian could differ from English: it could be the case that Russian and Georgian ditransitive verbs lack the stative subevent in their semantics. Finally, it could turn out that it is impossible to build up a small clause (low applicative / PP / HaveP) in Russian and Georgian. It could be the case that the small clause is underivable due to the absence of the relevant functional heads in the lexical inventory of Russian and Georgian. Alternatively, it could be that the small clause structure is in principle derivable, but is not interpretable. Georgian and Russian could lack a special interpretational principle (principle R proposed in [Beck & Snyder 2001], [Beck 2005] or its equivalent) that allows to interpret the combination of a verb and a small clause (LowAppl / PP / HaveP). I am going to investigate the possibilities mentioned above in section 6. But first I would like to briefly introduce the syntactic approach to the ambiguity of AGAIN (sections 3–4) that I am going to adopt and review the analysis of again with ditransitive structures in English proposed in [Beck & Johnson 2004] (section 5).

3. Syntactic approach to the semantics of AGAIN

There are two principal approaches to the ambiguity of AGAIN: under the semantic approach ([Fabricius-Hansen 2001], [Jäger, G. & R. Blutner 2000], among others) different readings of AGAIN emerge due to the lexical ambiguity of repetitive morphemes. Under the syntactic approach ([von Stechow 1996], [Beck & Johnson 2004], [Beck 2005] et al.), which I will adopt in this paper, different readings of AGAIN are attributed to different attachments of AGAIN in the syntactic representation. The semantics of AGAIN is taken to be always the same and involve repetition of some event. Different readings of AGAIN reflect its modification of different subevents in the syntactically represented lexical decomposition: the subevent that is modified by AGAIN is understood as being repeated. If AGAIN modifies the whole event, the repetitive reading arises. Modification of a stative subevent of a predicate gives rise to the restitutive reading.

---

4 Although the two major views on the semantics of AGAIN have been in competition with each other, see the discussion of the repetitive adverb pacho found in Kutchi Gujarathi [Patel-Grosz & Beck 2014] and the proposal that both analyses of AGAIN can apply simultaneously.
The meaning of *AGAIN* under the syntactic approach ([von Stechow 1996], [Beck & Johnson 2004], [Beck 2005]) can be formulated as follows:

(14) \[[\text{AGAIN}]](P_{s,t})(e) =
\begin{align*}
1 & \text{ iff } P(e) & \& & \exists e' [e' <_T e & \& P(e')] \\
0 & \text{ iff } \neg P(e) & \& & \exists e' [e' <_T e & \& P(e')] \\
\text{undefined otherwise}
\end{align*}

The denotation of *AGAIN* in (14) states that *AGAIN* takes a property of events and an event as its arguments and returns 1 iff the property is true of the event and 0 iff the property is not true of the event. The crucial part of *AGAIN*'s meaning is the presupposition that there is another event that temporally precedes the event under consideration of which the property is true. If the presupposition is not met, the meaning of *AGAIN* is undefined.

The two readings of *AGAIN*, presented in (15) and (16), differ with respect to what event does *AGAIN* take as its argument.

(15) **The repetitive reading of *AGAIN***
Yesterday Ali Baba opened Sezam. Today Ali Baba opened Sezam again.
*AGAIN*'s presupposition: there has been another event of Ali Baba’s opening Sezam that temporally precedes the event of Ali Baba’s opening Sezam that took place today.

(16) **The restitutive reading of *AGAIN***
Sezam had always been open. Yesterday somebody closed it. Today Ali Baba opened Sezam again.
*AGAIN*'s presupposition: there has been another event of Sezam’s being open that temporally precedes the event of Sezam’s being open that took place today.

In (15) *AGAIN* attaches to the whole verbal phrase (VoiceP) and takes the event of Ali Baba’s opening Sezam as its argument. In (16) *AGAIN* attaches to the small clause that represents the stative subevent of the predicate and takes the event of Sezam’s being open as its argument. The two attachment sites of *AGAIN* are illustrated in Figure 2.

**Figure 2:** The two readings of *AGAIN* with lexical accomplishments like ‘open’

Thus, *AGAIN* has uniform semantics under the syntactic approach, and the existence of its different readings is derived from the different types of subevents with which it is combined.
4. Reality of restitutive readings: on the entailment problem

One of the challenges for the syntactic approach to AGAIN has been the entailment problem: the repetitive reading of AGAIN seems to entail the restitutive reading. It is hard to come up with a scenario where the two readings could be distinguished by their truth conditions. Consider the example in (17):

\[(17)\]
\[
a. \ \text{Context:} \\
\text{Maša otkryla dver', no silnyj poryv vetra zakryl ejo.} \\
\text{Masha opened door.ACC but strong blast of wind closed it.} \\
\text{‘Masha opened the door, but the strong blast of wind closed it.’}
\]

\[
b. \ \text{Maša opjat’ otkryla dver’}. \\
\text{Masha again opened door.ACC} \\
\text{‘Masha opened the door again.’}
\]

c. Repetitive reading – TRUE: There has been an event of Masha’s opening the door that temporally precedes the current event of Masha’s opening the door.

d. Restitutive reading – TRUE: There has been an event of the door’s being open that temporally precedes the current event of the door’s being open.

The sentence in (17b) cannot distinguish the two readings of AGAIN truthconditionally (17c)-(17d), because both readings are true under the context in (17a). The question then arises as to whether it can be shown that the repetitive reading and the restitutive readings are indeed distinct and have different truth conditions.

In the recent work on repetitive morphemes ([Alexiadou et al. 2014], [Lechner et al. 2015]) it has been demonstrated that the two readings exhibit different truth conditions in contexts with non-monotone quantifiers like ‘exactly/ only one student’. Consider the Russian equivalent of the example presented in [Lechner et al. 2015: 2]:

\[(18)\]
\[
a. \ \text{Context:} \\
\text{Three students – Masha, Vasja and Petja – were studying in the library. They wanted the window in the library to be open, but the librarian wanted the window to be closed. Masha opened the window, but the librarian closed it. Vasja opened the window, but the librarian closed it. Petja opened the window, but the librarian closed it. Finally, Masha opened the window for the second time.}
\]

\[
b. \ \text{Rovno odin student opjat’ otkryl okno.} \\
\text{exactly one student again opened window.ACC} \\
\text{‘Exactly one student opened the window again.’}
\]

c. Repetitive reading – TRUE (exactly one x > again > x opened the window > the window was open): There exists a student that opened the window and had opened it before, and it is not true that other students opened the window and had opened it before.

d. Restitutive reading – FALSE (exactly one x > x opened the window > again > the window was open): There exists a student that opened the window and no other student opened the window and the window had been open before.
The sentence in (18b) allows us to set the two readings of AGAIN apart: the repetitive reading is true under the context in (18a), but the restitutive readings is false. This suggests that the entailment problem is superficial. Although in many scenarios the repetitive reading seems to entail the restitutive one, their truth conditions are in fact not identical.

5. Ditransitives AGAIN: English

As we have seen in section 2, English again can have both repetitive and restitutive readings in sentences with ditransitive verbs. Beck and Johnson [2004] provide an analysis of this ambiguity, arguing that the two readings arise due to the two different attachments of again in the syntactic representation of ditransitive verbs. Under their analysis, ditransitive verbs such as give are lexically decomposed into the subevent denoting the action undertaken by an agent (represented in syntax by \(v\)) and the stative subevent (represented in syntax by a small clause – HAVEP). When again modifies the \(vP\) denoting the whole event (subevent denoting the agent’s action + the stative subevent), the repetitive reading arises. When again modifies just the small clause, the restitutive reading emerges. The two readings of the sentence in (4), repeated here as (19), receive the analyses in (20) and (21).

(19) Thilo gave Satoshi the map again. [Beck & Johnson 2004: 113]
   a. Thilo gave Satoshi the map, and that had happened before. repetitive
   b. Thilo gave Satoshi the map, and Satoshi had had the map before. restitutive

(20) The repetitive reading of again in English DOC [Beck & Jonshon 2004: 114]
   a. \([vP\ [vP\ {\text{Thilo}}\ [\text{give} \ [\text{BECOME} \ [\text{HAVEP Satoshi HAVE the map}]]] \text{again}]\]
   b. \(\lambda e.\text{again}_e (\lambda e'.\text{give}_e(\text{Thilo}) \& \exists e'' [\text{BECOME}_e (\lambda e''.\text{have}_e'(\text{the_map})(\text{Satoshi})) \& \text{CAUSE}(e'')(e')])\)
   c. Once more, a giving by Thilo caused Satoshi to come to have the map.

(21) The restitutive reading of again in English DOC [Beck & Jonshon 2004: 114]
   a. \(\text{Thilo} \ [\text{give} \ [\text{BECOME} \ [\text{HAVEP Satoshi HAVE the map} \text{again}]])\]
   b. \(\lambda e.\text{give}_e(\text{Thilo}) \& \exists e' [\text{BECOME}_e (\lambda e''.\text{again}_e (\lambda e''.\text{have}_e'(\text{the_map})(\text{Satoshi})) \& \text{CAUSE}(e'')(e')])\)
   c. A giving by Thilo caused Satoshi to come to once more have the map.

Beck and Johnson [2004] claim that the presence of both readings of again with the double object construction provides support for the small clause analysis of English ditransitives. Under the syntactic approach to AGAIN, the ability of AGAIN to modify a subevent of a predicate indicates that this subevent is syntactically represented. The fact that dative arguments are understood as participants of stative subevents of ditransitive verbs suggests that they are inside the small clause that represents a given stative subevent syntactically.

Note that Beck and Jonshon’s approach does not imply that components CAUSE and BECOME are introduced into the syntactic representation. Having a verb that combines with a small clause in syntax is sufficient for their analysis. Components CAUSE and BECOME emerge in the semantics of (20) and (21) due to the application of a special interpretational principle R:

(22) Principle R adapted from [Beck 2005: 7]
   If \(\alpha = [\forall \gamma \mathsf{sc}\beta]\) and \(\beta'\) is of type \(<s, t>\) and \(\gamma'\) is of type \(<e, <e, <s, t>>>\) (an n-place predicate), then \(\alpha' = \lambda x_1…\lambda x_n \lambda e. \gamma'(x_1)…(x_n) \& \exists e' [\text{BECOME}_e (\beta') \& \text{CAUSE}(e')(e')].\)
This principle, proposed in [von Stechow 1995] and extensively discussed in [Beck & Johnson 2004] and [Beck 2005], is responsible for “gluing” the verb (an n-place predicate) with a small clause (a property of events) by inserting CAUSE and BECOME into the semantic representation.

To sum up, the ambiguity of English again in the double object construction receives an explanation if we take the restitutive reading of again to be a detector of constituents that denote result states. According to this line of reasoning, different readings of again in ditransitive clauses arise due to its different attachment sites and provide evidence for the lexical decomposition of ditransitive verbs in syntax and for the small clause analysis of the English double object construction. In the following section I am going to address the question of how sentences with ditransitive verbs in Georgian and Russian are different from their English counterparts.

6. Ditransitives AGAIN: Georgian and Russian
In this section I am going to consider several hypotheses about the unavailability of restitutive readings in Georgian and Russian sentences with two objects. I will discuss the properties of Russian opjat’ and Georgian iseβ (section 6.1.), the existence of a stative subevent in semantics of Russian and Georgian ditransitives (section 6.2.), the existence of an interpretation principle required for combining a verb with a small clause (section 6.3.) and the derivability of small clauses in these languages (section 6.4.).

6.1. Properties of AGAIN
The first hypothesis that I am going to explore is that the properties of Georgian iseβ and Russian opjat’ are responsible for the unavailability of restitutive readings in structures with two objects in these languages: these adverbs, unlike English again and German wieder, cannot look inside a decomposition structure of a given verb.

It has been observed ([Rapp & von Stechow 1999], [Beck 2005]) that not all adverbs can access different subevents inside decomposition structures. For example, although German wieder can look into the decomposition structure of lexical accomplishments such as ‘open’ (12), another German adverb meaning ‘again’ – erneut – cannot access result states of the same verbs, as is illustrated in (23).

(23) Maria hat die Tür erneut geöffnet. [Beck 2005: 12]
    Maria has DEF.fem.ACC door again opened
  a. ‘Maria opened the door, and that had happened before.’ repetitive
  b. * ‘Maria opened the door, and the door had been open before.’ *restitutive

Could it be that Russian opjat’ and Georgian iseβ are just like German erneut in that they cannot access result states inside decomposition structures? Before answering this question, I would like to examine the issue of how can adverbs differ with respect to their “vision” abilities. In [Rapp & von Stechow 1999] it has been proposed that the ability to attach to a phrase with a phonetically empty head is what distinguishes adverbs that can look inside decomposition structures from those that cannot. This idea was presented as “the visibility parameter” for decomposition adverbs (24).

(24) The Visibility Parameter for decomposition adverbs
    A D-adverb can / cannot attach to a phrase with a phonetically empty head.

In [Beck 2005] it was observed that the visibility of result states of complex predicates like resultatives is independent from both the visibility of result states expressed by independent syntactic phrases and the visibility of result states in decomposition structures. For example, German decomposition adverb fast ‘almost’ differs from both adverbs like wieder, which can...
access any result state present in syntax, and adverbs like *erneut*, which can modify only
independent syntactic phrases: this adverb can modify any phrases with phonetically overt heads,
but not result states in decomposition structures. For example, *fast* can access the result state
expressed by a result phrase in complex predicate constructions like resultatives (25).

(25) ...weil Ottlie den Tisch fast sauber gewischt hat.
...that Ottlie DEF.masc.ACC table almost clean wiped has
‘Ottlie’s wiping the table caused the table to become almost clean.’ [Beck 2005: 13]

In order to account for the observed variability in properties of decomposition adverbs,
Beck[2005] proposes the modified version of the visibility parameter, presented in (26).

(26) **The modified Visibility Parameter for adverbs** adapted from [Beck 2005: 14]
An adverb can modify
(i) only independent syntactic phrases German *erneut*
(ii) any phrase with a phonetically overt head German *fast*
(iii) any phrase German *wieder*, English *again*

The default setting is (i).

Returning to the properties of Russian *opjat*’ and Georgian *isev*’, I would like to show that the
repetitive adverbs of both languages fall into the third category of adverbs according to the
classification provided by the modified visibility parameter. Examples in (27) and (28) show that
both Russian *opjat*’ and Georgian *isev* can look into the decomposition structure of lexical
accomplishments like ‘open’.

(27) Vasja opjat’ otkryl dver’
Vasja again opened door.ACC
a. Vasja opened the door, and that had happened before. repetitive
b. Vasja opened the door, and the door had been open before. restitutive

(28) a. Context:
    is k’ari qoveltvis iqo γia. gušin is p’irvelad
dexures.
close.AOR.3PL
‘This door had always been open, yesterday it was closed for the first time.’

b. šota-m k’ari isev ga-a-γ-o.
    Shota-ERG door.NOM again PVB-pv-open-AOR.3SG
‘Shota opened the door, and the door had been open before.’ restitutive

Sentences in (27b) and (28b) demonstrate that *opjat*’ and *isev* can have restitutive readings with
verbs *otkryvat*’ (‘open’) and *gayeba* (‘open’). The ability of Georgian *isev* to access the result state
in a decomposition structure is further illustrated in (29) with the verb *dacla* (‘empty’). This
suggests that both decomposition adverbs do not impose any restrictions on the type of phrase that
they can modify.

(29) a. Context:
es botli qoveltvis iqo carieli
this bottle always was empty
This bottle had always been empty. Today it became full for the first time.

Shota emptied the bottle, and the bottle had been empty before.

To sum up, Russian opjat’ and Georgian isevo do not differ from English again and German wieder with respect to the ability of looking inside a decomposition structure. Both adverbs can modify states that are not expressed by any overt phonetical material, and thus fall into the least restrictive class of repetitive morphemes according to the visibility parameter. This means that the unavailability of restitutive readings in ditransitive structures does not result from the properties of the repetitive adverbs in Russian and Georgian.

6.2. Existence of a stative subevent in semantics

The second hypothesis about the unavailability of restitutive readings in ditransitive structures concerns the semantics of ditransitive verbs. Restitutive readings could be unavailable in Russian and Georgian ditransitives due to the absence of a stative subevent in semantics of ditransitive verbs. The difference between Russian and Georgian on the one hand and English on the other hand then would not be syntactical in nature: the syntax of ditransitives could be identical in these languages, but the semantics of ditransitive verbs would differ.

This hypothesis definitely cannot be maintained for Russian. Although the stative subevent in Russian ditransitives cannot be singled out by opjat’, it can be singled out by another repetitive adverb – obratno ‘again’, as illustrated in (30).

(30) Maša otadala /otpravila /vernula Vase knigu obratno.
Masha gave /sent /returned Vasja.book.OBRATNO
‘Masha gave /sent /returned Vasja the book, and Vasja had had the book before.’

The semantics of Russian obratno differs from the semantics of opjat’: it involves a return to a state in which an entity had been before [Tatevosov 2016]. Two restrictions of obratno follow from its semantics. First, this adverb can modify only those descriptions which have a target state in the sense of [Kratzer 2000]. Second, it can have only restitutive readings. The impossibility of the repetitive reading is illustrated in (31), where in a context with a non-monotone quantifier rovno odin ‘exactly one’ the repetitive reading does not entail the restitutive reading, and only the repetitive reading would make the sentence true.

(31) a. Context
Three students – Masha, Vasja and Petja – were studying in the library. They wanted the window in the library to be open, but the librarian wanted the window to be closed. Masha opened the window, but the librarian closed it. Vasja opened the window, but the librarian closed it. Petja opened the window, but the librarian closed it. Finally, Masha opened the window for the second time.

b. #Rovno odin student otkryl okno obratno.
exactly one student opened window.OBRATNO
‘Exactly one student opened the window again.’ adapted from [Tatevosov 2016: 31]
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The fact that obratno does not allow repetitive readings suggests that obratno cannot attach to different constituents in the syntactic representation and does not necessarily take scope over the phrase with which it combines. This adverb looks into the semantics of a verbal phrase with which it merges and searches for a target state in this semantic representation that it can modify. In other words, obratno can identify the presence of a stative subevent in a predicate’s semantics, but it does not indicate whether it is syntactically represented or not. Thus, the example in (30) shows that there is a stative subevent in the semantics of Russian ditransitives. Therefore, the hypothesis under consideration should be declined.

Georgian represents a more uncertain case with respect to this hypothesis. It is not obvious how to argue for presence or absence of a stative subevent in semantics of Georgian ditransitives, since Georgian does not seem to have any repetitive morphemes with semantics similar to Russian obratno. However, note that Georgian ditransitives can be modified by the adverb uk’an (‘back’) (32), which seems to involve a presupposition that an entity denoted by the direct object had previously been in the possession of an individual denoted by the dative argument.

(32) šota-m levan-s c’igni uk’an gada-u-gzavn-a
Shota-ERG Levan-DAT book.NOM back PVB-3APPL-send-AOR.3SG
/da-u-brun-a
PVB-3APPL-return-AOR.3SG
‘Shota sent /returned Levan the book, and Levan had had the book before.’

Russian has an analogous adverb nazad (‘back’), which also can occur in ditransitive sentences:

(33) ja vzjal etu bumagu, da i otpravil ejo nazad
I took this paper PTCL and sent it.ACC back
lossievskomu s sledujuščim ob"jasneniem…
Lossievsky.DAT with following explanation [Пирогов 2008: 419]
‘I took this paper and sent it back to Lossievsky with the following explanation…’
(Lossievsky had had this paper before)

The question of whether Georgian uk’an and Russian nazad single out stative subevents in semantics of the predicates with which they combine remains an open issue that requires further investigation. If it turns out that they do, then it will provide additional support for the existence of stative subevents in Georgian and Russian ditransitives and against the hypothesis that the absence of stative subevents in semantics of ditransitive predicates is responsible for the absence of restitutive readings in these structures.

The two remaining hypothesis that I am going to consider both imply that the small clause (HaveP / PP / LowAppl) analysis is incorrect for ditransitive structures in Russian and Georgian. The difference between them concerns the reasons for the impossibility of small clauses in Russian and Georgian ditransitive sentences. The hypothesis I am going to investigate in the following section suggests that the impossibility of small clause formation in these languages is due to the absence of the special interpretation principle R: the small clause structure can in principle be derived, but cannot be interpreted. The other hypothesis suggests that the problem with the small clause formation is syntactic in nature: small clauses are not derivable in ditransitive contexts in Russian and Georgian. Note that both hypotheses imply that ditransitive structures of Russian and Georgian differ significantly from those of English.
6.3. No small clause due to uninterpretability

The hypothesis that ditransitive sentences of Georgian and Russian do not involve a small clause structure due to its uninterpretability concerns the existence of the principle R in these languages [Beck 2005]. It could be the case that Russian and Georgian lack this special semantic principle, which allows interpreting the combination of a verb and a small clause by “gluing” them together with the help of CAUSE and BECOME components. The lack of this principle would exclude the small clause structure of ditransitives, because such derivation would not be interpretable, and hence would crash. The principle R, introduced in section 5 (22), is repeated here as (34).

(34) **Principle R** adapted from [Beck 2005: 7]

If \( \alpha = [\nu \gamma \text{sc}\beta] \) and \( \beta' \) is of type \(<s, t>\) and \( \gamma' \) is of type \(<e, <e, <e, <e, <e, t>>>) \) (an n-place predicate), then \( \alpha' = \lambda x_1 \ldots \lambda x_n \lambda e. \gamma'(x_1)(x_2) \ldots (x_n) \& \exists e' [\text{BECOME}_e(\beta') \& \text{CAUSE}_e(e')] \).

The following question then arises: do Georgian and Russian need such the principle R or its equivalent for interpretation of other constructions in these languages? Do these languages exhibit constructions where a verb successfully combines with a small clause with no problems of interpretability? I would like to argue for the positive answer to this question: both languages can successfully interpret combination of a verb and a small clause.

In order to show that this is the case, I am going to examine AGAIN in the context of verbs with lexical prefixes. My argumentation will be built on the assumption that lexical prefixes of Russian and Georgian enter the derivation as heads of small clauses that are complements of verbs, as has been proposed for Russian lexical prefixes in [Svenonius 2004]. Under the view that lexical prefixes head their own projections, they take PPs as their complements and direct objects as their subjects. This is illustrated in Figure 3, which represents the structure of the VP in (35).

(35) Vasja za-brosil mjač v vorota.

Vasja PVB-throw ball in goal

‘Vasja threw the ball into the goal.’

**Figure 3:** Lexical prefixes as heads of small clauses (35)

When AGAIN modifies verbs with lexical prefixes, it can have the restitutive interpretation. This can be demonstrated for both Russian (36b) and Georgian (36c):

(36) **Restitutive readings of AGAIN with verbs with lexical prefixes**

a. Context:

Shota had never been to this mountain before. One day he was flying in an air balloon and landed on the top of it. Then he went down the mountain. After that…
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b. Shota opjat’ zabratsja na goru.
   Shota again PVB-climb on mountain
   ‘Shota climbed up the mountain, and Shota had been on the mountain before.’

c. šota ise`v a-vid-a mta-ze
   Shota again PVB-go-AOR.3SG mountain-on
   ‘Shota climbed up the mountain, and Shota had been on the mountain before.’

Note that the context in (36a) makes it clear that Shota had never climbed this mountain before, so the repetitive interpretation is inappropriate under this scenario. The event that is being repeated in (36b)-(36c) is the event of Shota’s being on (top of) this mountain. The availability of the restitutive reading of AGAIN in (36b)-(36c) supports the small clause analysis of these predicates. This analysis is sketched out for Russian zabratsja (‘climb’) and Georgian asvla (‘climb’) in Figures 4 and 5 respectively.

**Figure 4:** The small clause analysis of Russian zabratsja (‘climb’) (36b)

```
    VP
      V
        -bira- OPJAT'
          RP
            restitutive
              RP
                DP
                  R'
                    Shota
                      PP
                        za na goru
```

**Figure 5:** The small clause analysis of Georgian asvla (‘climb’) (36c)

```
    VP
      restitutive
        RP
          V
            I
              RP
                ISEV -vid-
                  DP
                    R'
                      šota PP R
                        mta-ze a
```

If Russian and Georgian did not have means of interpreting the combination of a verb and a small clause (the principle R or its equivalent), the sentences in (36b) and (36c) should be uninterpretable and lead to the derivation crash. The fact that these sentences are grammatical suggests that Russian and Georgian do not differ from English with respect to the availability of a mechanism that allows to interpret small clauses merging with verbs. Thus, uninterpretability...
cannot be the problem that prevents building a small clause structure for sentences with ditransitive verbs in Russian and Georgian.

Beck[2005] ties the principle of interpretation R together with a more general parameter – the complex predicate parameter that was proposed in [Snyder 2001] and [Beck & Snyder 2001]. A formulation of this parameter is presented in (37). The complex predicate parameter is assumed to be responsible for a range of constructions (38): resultatives, verb-particle constructions, put-locative constructions, make-causative constructions and others.

(37) **Complex Predicate Parameter**


One grammatical parameter is responsible for the availability of complex predicate constructions (resultatives, verb-particle constructions and others).

(38) **Constructions that depend on the Complex Predicate Parameter**

a. John painted the house red.  
   **resultative**

b. Mary picked the book up / picked up the book.  
   **verb-particle**

c. Fred made Jeff leave.  
   **make-causative**

d. Fred saw Jeff leave.  
   **perceptual report**

e. Bob put the book on the table.  
   **put-locative**

f. Alice sent the letter to Sue.  
   **to-dative**

g. Alice sent Sue the letter.  
   **double object dative**

(adapted from [Snyder 2001: 4])

If a language has a positive value for this parameter, it can exhibit the constructions in (38). If, however, it has a negative value for the complex predicate parameter, the constructions in (38) should not exist in this language. According to [Beck 2005], English, German, Japanese, Korean and Mandarin Chinese (among others) have a [+ ] value for this parameters. Languages like French, Hebrew, Hindi and Spanish, on the other hand, have a [ - ] value. For Beck[2005] what unites all the constructions in (38) is the necessity of the interpretability principle R for their successful interpretation. Languages allowing the constructions in (38) have this interpretation principle; languages that disallow such constructions do not have the principle R in their inventory of semantic principles.

The existence of the complex predicate parameter as it is formulated in [Snyder 2001], [Beck & Snyder 2001] and [Beck 2005] seems dubious in the light of the Russian and Georgian data that we have observed so far. We have seen that both languages have structures where a verb is successfully combined with a small clause – structures with lexical prefixes which are analogous to the verb-particle constructions found in English and German. The principle R is required for interpretation of these sentences just like it is required for other constructions in (38). But then the absence of the double object construction in Russian and Georgian remains a puzzle: if these languages have a [+ ] value for the complex predicate parameter, why cannot they have a small clause derivation of ditransitive sentences?

---

5 There are other candidates for the structure involving a verb combining with a small clause in Georgian: sentences with predicates kona ‘have’ and moèveneba ‘seem’ ((i)-(ii)).

(i) Levan-s [k’ari qovelvis γia] hkonda
   Levan-DAT door.NOM always open 3SG.have.IMPERF.3SG
   ‘Levan always had the door open.’

(ii) Tanya-s [Nino mtvrali] mo-e-chven-a
    Tanya-DAT Nino.NOM drunk PVB-3APPL-seem-AOR.3SG
   ‘Nino seemed drunk to Tanya.’
Despite the fact that the complex predicate parameter incorrectly ties the constructions in (38) together, there might be some interesting correlation between the existence of resultatives in a language and the presence of a small clause in sentences with ditransitive verbs. Note that English and German, which can have restitutive readings in ditransitive structures that support the small clause analysis, have resultatives ((39)-(40)), while Georgian and Russian, which do not have restitutive readings in ditransitive structures, do not have resultatives of the same sort.

(39) hammer the metal flat

(40) den Tisch sauber wischen
    DEF.masc.ACC table clean wipe

‘wipe the table clean’

A possible interconnection between the existence of resultatives and the availability of restitutive readings in ditransitives could have to do with the absence of overt lexical material in the head of a small clause. It could be that Russian and Georgian cannot have small clauses with null heads, unlike languages like English and German. This would explain the absence of the restitutive construction and the double object construction in these languages, both of which involve a small clause with a null head. I leave this tentative proposal for further investigation.

To sum up, in this section I have shown that Russian and Georgian can in principle interpret combinations of verbs and small clauses. Hence, uninterpretability cannot be responsible for the absence of small clauses in ditransitives and the unavailability of restitutive readings.

6.4. No small clause due to underivability
In the previous sections (6.1. – 6.3.) I have ruled out three hypotheses about the unavailability of restitutive readings in Russian and Georgian ditransitives. I have demonstrated that properties of AGAIN in these languages do not differ from the properties of English again, that ditransitive predicates have a stative subevent in their semantics and that the principle required for the interpretation of a verb merging with a small clause is independently needed in both Russian and Georgian.

This points out to the conclusion that ditransitive sentences in Georgian and Russian do not contain small clauses due to their underivability: small clauses cannot be built in ditransitive contexts due to the absence of the relevant functional heads (LowAppl / HAVE / particular kinds of null P/R) in the lexicons of these languages. Thus, the syntax of ditransitive clauses in Georgian and Russian differs significantly from the syntax of similar sentences in English. Georgian and Russian do not have a small clause /LowAppl /HaveP /PP in the structure of ditransitive clauses that is present in English. Unlike in English, in these languages GIVE is not syntactically CAUSE to HAVE. An important consequence of this is that lexical decomposition in syntax is not universal: languages vary with respect to how they map event structures of similar predicates onto syntactic representations.

7. Restitutive readings of AGAIN with datives
Although Russian and Georgian ditransitives do not contain small clauses, both languages have other constructions with dative arguments where datives are interpreted as being participants in the stative subevent present in the lexical decomposition of a verb. In this section I am going to discuss one such construction in Georgian (section 7.1.) and one in Russian (section 7.2.), and outline some properties that are common for the two constructions.
7.1. **Locative datives in Georgian**

Georgian sentences with locative version exemplify the structure where a dative argument is a participant of the stative subevent that can be singled out by the restitutive reading of AGAIN. In this construction the dative argument is interpreted as a goal, and it falls into the scope of AGAIN when it has the restitutive reading. The examples of the restitutive reading of Georgian *isev* in the sentences with locative version are presented in (41)-(43).

(41) a. Context:
Two books have been always lying on the table, one under the other. One day Shota took the upper book from the table (for the first time) in order to read it. After some time…

b. ŝota-m es c’igni im c’ign-s *isev da-a-d-o
Shota-ERG this book.NOM that book.DAT again PVB-LOC-put-AOR.3SG
‘Shota put this book on that book, and this book had been on that book before.’

(42) a. Context:
This dress had always had all the buttons. Yesterday Nino accidentally torn one of the buttons from the dress. Today…

b. nino-m ᵇili k’aba-s *isev mi-a-k’er-a
Nino-ERG button.NOM dress-DAT again PVB-LOC-sew-AOR.3SG
‘Nino sewed the button to the dress, and the button had been on the dress before.’

(43) a. Context:
Givi and Levan had been inseparable friends since childhood. But one day they had a serious fight and stopped talking to each other. Shota wanted to reconcile the two friends and he succeeded in doing that.

b. ŝota-m givi levan-s *isev da-a-axlov-a
Shota-ERG Givi.NOM Levan-DAT again PVB-LOC-bring.close-AOR.3SG
‘Shota brought Givi close to Levan, and Givi and Levan had been close (friends) before.’

The scenarios in (41a), (42a) and (43a) provide contexts for the restitutive reading of AGAIN. In sentences (41b), (42b) and (43b) *isev* attaches in syntax to the constituent that represents the stative subevent of the predicates ‘put’, ‘sew’ and ‘bring close’. We can see from the interpretations that dative arguments are inside these constituents. In (41b) the event that is being repeated is the state of one book being on top of the other book. In (42b) the event of the button being on the dress is repeated. In (43b) the state of Givi’s being friends with Levan takes place again.

The dative arguments in (41b)-(43b) are situated lower than the direct objects, consider (44)-(45):

(44) globalizacia-m didi da ᵇa’t’ara kveq’n-eb-i
globalization-ERG big and small country-PL-NOM
mi-a-b-a ertmanet-s (*kveq’n-eb-s ertmanet-i)
PVB-LOC-tie-AOR.3SG each.other-DAT ( country-PL-DAT each.other-NOM)
‘The globalization tied big and small countries to each other.’
[Nash 2016: 12]

(45) linch-ma mi-a-ker-a ertmanet-s daukavshirebeli
Lynch-ERG PVB-LOC-sew-AOR.3SG each.other-DAT unrelated
ep’izod-eb-i (*epizod-eb-s ertmanet-i)
episode-PL-NOM ( episode-PL-DAT each.other-NOM)
‘Lynch sewed unrelated episodes to each other.’
[Nash 2016: 12]
The sentences in (44)-(45) show that dative reciprocals can be bound by direct objects, but not the other way around. Hence, dative arguments are c-commanded by direct objects in the construction with locative version.

7.2. Locative applicatives in Russian

Russian also has a construction where the dative argument is a participant of the stative subevent singled out by AGAIN – a construction with locative applicatives (“N-applicatives” in the terminology of [Пшехотская 2012]). Russian opjat’ can have the restitutive reading in this construction, and the dative argument falls into the scope of the restitutive opjat’. This is illustrated in (46)-(48).

(46) Maša opjat’ položila knigu Vase na stol.
    Masha again put book.ACC Vasja.DAT on table
    a. Masha put the book on the table for Vasja, and that had happened before.  
       repetitive
    b. Masha put the book on the table for Vasja, and Vasja had had the book on 
       the table before. 
       restitutive

(47) Maša opjat’ pobelila stenu mame v komnate.
    Masha again whitened wall.ACC mother.DAT in room
    a. Masha whitened the wall in the room for the mother, and that had happened 
       repetitive
       before.
    b. Masha whitened the wall in the room for the mother, and the mother had had 
       restitutive 
       the wall white in the room before.

(48) Vasja opjat’ posadil dočku Mashe na stul.
    Vasja again seated daughter.ACC Masha.DAT on chair
    a. Vasja seated the daughter on the chair for Masha, and that had happened 
       repetitive
       before.
    b. Vasja seated the daughter on the chair for Masha, and Masha had had the 
       restitutive 
       daughter sit on the chair before.

In (46b) the event of Vasja’s having the book on the table is being repeated. In (47b) the event of the mother’s having the wall white in the room is being repeated. In (48b) the event of Masha’s having the daughter sit on the chair is being repeated. In all these sentences the dative argument is interpreted as a possessor of the small clause that represents the stative subevent: “the book is on the table”, “the wall in the room is white”, “the daughter sits on the chair”.

The locative phrase is crucial for the availability of the restitutive reading of opjat’ in these sentences. Compare (5), repeated here as (49), with (50) and (51). In a ditransitive clause that lacks the locative phrase (49) the restitutive reading is unavailable. When the goal argument is introduced instead of the indirect object with the same verb (otdavat’ (‘give’)), the restitutive reading becomes available. What is being repeated in this case is the state of the son being at the school. When a dative argument is added into this structure (50), the restitutive reading remains possible. The event that is being repeated in this case is the state of Petja having the son at his school. The dative argument here is interpreted here as a possessor of the state, not as a recipient.

(49) Maša opjat’ otdala Vase knigu. (=5)
    Masha again gave Vasja.DAT book.NOM
    a. Masha gave Vasja the book, and that had happened before.  
       repetitive
    b. *Masha gave Vasja the book, and Vasja had had the book before. 
       *restitutive
(50) Maša opjat’ otdala syna v školu.
Masha again gave son.NOM in school
a. Masha sent the son to school, and that had happened before.  
   repetitive
b. Masha sent the son to school, and the son had been at school before.  
   restitutive

(51) Maša opjat’ otdala syna Petja v školu.
Masha again gave son.NOM Petja.DAT in school
a. Masha sent the son to Petja to school, and that had happened before.  
   repetitive
b. Masha sent the son to Petja to school, and Petja had the son at (his) school before.

The dative argument in the locative applicative structure is merged lower than the direct object. Examples (52)-(53) illustrate that the dative reciprocal can be bound by the direct object, but the accusative reciprocal cannot be bound by the dative argument. This suggests that the dative argument is c-commanded by the direct object. The example in (54) shows that the dative reciprocal that is bound by the direct object can be a participant of the stative subevent identified by opjat’.

(52) Vasja posadil devoček drug drugu na stulja.
   Vasja seated girls.ACC each other.DAT on chairs
Lit. ‘Vasja seated girls to each other, on the chairs.’

(53) *Vasja posadil drug druga devočkam na stulja.
   Vasja seated each other.ACC girls.DAT on chairs
Expected lit. reading: ‘Vasja seated each other, to the girls, on the chairs.’

(54) Vasja opjat’ posadil devoček drug drugu na stulja.
   Vasja again seated girls.ACC each other.DAT on chairs
a. Lit. ‘Vasja seated girls, to each other, on the chairs, and that had happened repetitive before.’
   b. Lit. ‘Vasja seated girls, to each other, on the chairs, and the girls, had sat by restitutive each other, on the chairs before.’

It can also be demonstrated that the dative argument forms a constituent with the locative phrase. When the dative argument is a wh-word, it can pied-pipe the prepositional phrase to the left periphery:

(55) [Komu na stol] Maša položila knigu?
   who.DAT on table Masha put book.ACC
Lit. ‘To whom on the table did Masha put the book?’

(56) [Komu na stul] Vasja posadil devočku?
   who.DAT on chair Vasja seated girl.ACC
Lit. ‘To whom on the chair did Vasja seat the girl?’

(57) [Komu v školu] Maša otdala syna?
   who.DAT in school Masha gave son.ACC
Lit. ‘To whom to school did Masha send the son?’
To sum up, both Georgian and Russian exhibit constructions where the dative argument is a participant of the stative subevent of a predicate that can be singled out by AGAIN. These constructions share the following properties. First, predicates that participate in these constructions denote change of an object’s location. Second, there is a goal argument in these constructions. In Georgian the dative argument itself is a goal; in Russian the goal is introduced by a prepositional phrase. Finally, in both the locative version construction and the locative applicative construction the dative argument is c-commanded by the direct object.

Note that analogous constructions are impossible in English: English disallows PP-complements in the double object construction [McIntyre 2011]. While Russian can add an applied argument to the prepositional phrase (60) that can be further moved above the direct object (59), no such derivation is possible in English (58).

(58) *They sent her a doctor into the building.

(59) Oni otpravili ej vrača na dom.
    they sent she.DAT doctor.ACC on home
    Lit. ‘They sent her a doctor home.’

(60) Oni otpravili vrača ej na dom.
    they sent doctor.ACC she.DAT on home
    Lit. ‘They sent a doctor her home’

This contrast puts forward another interesting question of whether the absence of a small clause structure in ditransitives is related to the possibility of locative applicative / locative version constructions.

8. Conclusion

In this paper I have investigated a difference between ditransitive clauses in Russian and Georgian on the one hand and in English on the other hand: while AGAIN can have the restitutive reading in English ditransitives, this reading is impossible in Russian and Georgian sentences with ditransitive verbs. I have examined several hypotheses about the nature of this crosslinguistic variation. First, I have demonstrated that this variation is not related to the properties of AGAIN in these languages. Second, I have shown that the unavailability of the restitutive reading in Georgian and Russian ditransitives cannot be explained by the absence of the stative subevent in the semantics of these predicates. Third, I have argued that the difference under consideration could not have emerged due to the absence of a special semantic principle that allows to interpret the combination of a verb and a small clause in Georgian and Russian, since both languages require some version of this principle for interpretation of other constructions. Finally, I have arrived at the conclusion that the crosslinguistic variation with respect to the availability of restitutive readings of AGAIN in ditransitives reflects different syntactic structures present in languages. While English ditransitives involve a small clause /HaveP /LowAppl /PP, there is no such phrase in the structure of Russian and Georgian ditransitive clauses. Any analysis that argues for the same structures of ditransitives in Russian and English [Bailyn 2009] or Georgian and English [Lomashvili 2010], regardless of how it derives DAT > ACC and ACC > DAT orders, misses this generalization.

I have also shown that both Russian and Georgian have constructions where a dative argument is a participant of a stative subevent that is represented syntactically. These constructions in Russian and Georgian are different, but they share several properties: the predicates that participate in these constructions denote change of location, there is a goal argument in these
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constructions and the dative argument is merged lower than the direct object in the syntactic representation.

There are many important questions that are left open in this paper. First, if the small clause analysis cannot account for the properties of Russian and Georgian ditransitive clauses, the question remains as to what analysis is correct for such sentences in these languages. It seems that there is no uniform structure for ditransitives and both ACC > DAT and DAT > ACC are attested with different ditransitive verbs in these languages, see [Boneh & Nash, submitted] for discussion of the hierarchical order of arguments in Russian ditransitives and [Nash 2016] for discussion of the same issues in Georgian. The approach presented in this paper makes the following prediction with respect to the ACC > DAT and DAT > ACC orders. The restitutive reading should be available at least in some ACC > DAT configurations, since when the dative argument is merged low, it can be represented as a participant of a small clause or a prepositional phrase. Under the DAT > ACC order, however, the restitutive reading of AGAIN would be unexpected, since the dative argument in this configuration is introduced higher than the lowest subevent of the predicate.

Second, it would be interesting to see how repetitive morphemes interact with datives other than that found in ditransitive clauses: benefactive datives, affected arguments, high datives.

Third, further investigation is required on the subject of how different repetitive morphemes interact with dative arguments: what can English re- and back, Russian obratno and nazad, Georgian uk’an tell us about the syntax and semantics of structures with datives?

Finally, the correlation between the presence of resultatives in a given language and the presence of a small clause in ditransitive sentences presents an interesting puzzle that seems to be worth pursuing.

9. Notation conventions
1, 2, 3 – 1st, 2nd, 3rd person
NOM – nominative
ERG – ergative
ACC – accusative
DAT – dative
AOR – aorist
IMPERF – imperfect
PVB – preverb
pv – preradical vowel
APPL – applicative
LOC – locative version
SG – singular
PL – plural
DEF – definite
INDEF – indefinite
masc – masculine
fem – feminine
neut – neuter
PTCL – particle
SC – small clause
<τ – the temporal precedence relation
s – type of events
e – type of entities
t – type of truth conditions
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