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ABSTRACT
This paper shows the realization of arguments of Latinate double object verbs and an analysis of their inherent semantic meaning in the Late Middle English and early Modern English periods, hence in the time-span when they were borrowed into English. The main aim of this paper is to show that although Latinate verbs occur in a construction with what seems to be an allative preposition, not all of them lexicalize movement in the inherent meanings. In contrast, some Latinate verbs lexicalize only a caused possession. What is more, this paper shows that the caused possession Latinate verbs select a different variant of prepositional object construction than the one selected by Latinate verbs lexicalizing movement.
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1 The issue

The study of dative alternation in ModE tackles the issue of the structure selection of Latinate double-object verbs.¹ The main controversy comes from the observation that the majority of double object verbs realize their arguments in two ways, whereas Latinate verbs select only one of the two available options (see, among others, Levin, 1993; Pinker, 1989; Krifka, 1999). The first of the variant realizations of arguments is double object construction (henceforth DOC). In this construction the arguments of a verb are realized as NPs, for example I give Mary (some) flowers every day, with Mary as an indirect object and flowers as a direct object. An alternative to DOC is a prepositional object construction (henceforth POC), which requires that the indirect object is realized as a PP headed by the preposition to, for example, I give (some) flowers to Mary every day. Surprisingly, Latinate verbs occur only in the latter construction. Yet, before I proceed with the discussion of Latinate verbs, let us introduce some details of the alternating constructions relevant to further discussion.

Given that some double object verbs occur only in one construction while the others in both constructions (dative alternation²), the question arises as to what criterion determines the

¹ I am grateful to Terence Clark-Ward for his comments on the material in the ModE section of the paper and professor Joanna Blaszczak for her comments on the pre-final version of this paper.

² The etymological analysis of the Latinate double-object verbs in Appendixes 3 and 4 in Sówka-Pietraszewska (2011) shows that they were borrowed typically from French in the late Middle English period or the early Modern English period.

² Dative alternation involves an alternation between the double object construction and the prepositional object construction. The term dative is used rather conventionally as having to do with a real or metaphorical transfer of possession, but not as referring to the case assignment.
selection of a relevant construction or variant constructions. One of these criteria is the nature of the meaning of a verb. According to the recently prevailing polysemy approaches, the fact that a verb occurs in both variants is a result of the polysemy of its inherent meaning, that is, DOC and POC are associated each with one of the respective meanings of a given verb. In a nutshell, DOC encodes a possession change event in which the recipient comes into possession of a theme, whereas POC expresses a caused motion imposed on the theme when it is moved from the agent to the goal or recipient. The pairing of POC with a caused movement derives from the observation that it is a construction commonly found with caused motion verbs, some of which involve a continuous imparting of force, e.g., push or haul. I will use Pinker’s (1989) linearized tree representations to illustrate the semantic events represented by the constructions. That is, I assume for DOC the following representation: \[ N_P_0 \text{causes} N_P_1 \text{to have} N_P_2 \], whereas in the case of POC the representation is as follows: \[ N_P_0 \text{causes} N_P_2 \text{to go to} N_P_1 \]. The main claim of the polysemy approaches is that only verbs that lexicalize caused possession and caused motion occur in both constructions. If a verb has only one of those meanings, it is associated with its respective construction.

What seems to be the main drawback of these approaches is the analysis of the caused possession verb give, which is said to involve movement in its POC variant. After all, it is a well-known fact that give takes a path with no internal structure for the movement to take place. The path in such a POC involves only agent and recipient; cf. *I gave flowers all the way to Mary. or *I gave flowers from Mary to Susan. Another problematic issue for the polysemy approaches is the fact that POC, due to the character of its preposition, is said to involve an intended possessor rather than a factual possessor. Again data from give contradicts this statement as, regardless of the structure, this verb lexicalizes only a successful possession; cf. *I give flowers to Mary, but she never gets them.

The analysis in this paper will be based on the ‘Verb-sensitive’ approach of Rappaport Hovav and Levin (2005, 2008), according to which it is the verb that determines the meaning of a construction. As a result, DOC and POC with give realize only the caused possession meaning, as only a caused possession is lexicalized by this verb. This observation implies that there must be two different variants of POC since give and give-type verbs do not lexicalize movement, in contrast to motion verbs, which involve movement in their inherent meanings. The analysis in this paper provides more evidence for this claim drawn from Latinate verbs and at the same time contributes to the heated debate on the structure selection of Latinate verbs in (late) Modern English (ModE) (Krifka, 1999, 2004; Pinker, 1989; Grimshaw and Prince, 1986; Grimshaw, 2005, et al.). Since Latinate verbs have been thoroughly analyzed in present-day English, the data for this research is taken from outside the realm of ModE. The analysis takes account of the constructions in which Latinate double object verbs realized their arguments in the late Middle English period (ME) and early Modern English (early ModE) period. Such an analysis will help modern approaches to answer the question of the meaning lexicalized by Latinate verbs as well as the question of the manner in which successful possession change meaning is realized in POC.

---


4 For details, see Rappaport Hovav and Levin (2008, p. 138).

5 Give-type verbs (verbs that inherently signify acts of giving): feed, give, lease, lend, loan, pass, pay, peddle, refund, render, rent, repay, sell, serve, trade (Levin, 1993, p. 45).
As far as the structure selection of Latinate verbs is concerned, it seems that it is a phonological constraint that restricts their structure selection to POC (see Grimshaw and Prince, 1986; Grimshaw, 2005). This constraint requires that the verb which occurs in DOC is either a monosyllabic verb or a verb with initial stress; another option is a verb with a second syllable stress if the first syllable is a schwa. Latinate verbs do not conform to any of these requirements. They are all polysyllabic with the stress on the second syllable. As a result, they occur in POC. This paper will not tackle the findings of the phonological approach, but will provide historical evidence for the claim that the structure selection of POC does not predetermine the meaning of motion in Latinate verbs, as POC, apart from DOC, also can realize the meaning of a successful possession change. Although this claim may seem controversial, data from the history of the English language provides support for this statement and the relevant facts are presented in the following sections in this paper.

This paper is organized as follows: sections 2 and 3 provide details of the classification of Latinate verbs into different semantic groups. This classification will be applied to ModE and later verified against data from the history of English. The next section takes an historical view on POC and provides evidence for two types of POC with double object verbs in the history of English. The last section shows the historical analysis of Latinate verbs and their structures. The main result of this section is that the structure selection of Latinate verbs does not contradict their inherent meaning; namely, Latinate possession change verbs and caused motion verbs map their arguments on different variants of POC. The data for the historical analysis will be drawn from the Helsinki Corpus TEI XML Edition, first edition (2011) (HC). HC is a compiled and coded corpus. It contains c. 150,000 words. The parts of the corpus used in this analysis were the M3 period (1350-1420) containing 184,230 words, the M4 period (1420-1500) containing 213,850 words and EModE1 (1500-1570), which contains 190,160 words, EModE2 (1570-1640) containing 189,800 words and EModE3 (1640-1710) with 171,040 words. Searches for constructions with Latinate verbs were lexical searches. The data verbs for the search are given in the next section.

2 Major classes of double object verbs. Introducing Latinate verbs into the picture

Levin (1993, p. 45) provides a list of double object verbs in ModE divided into semantic classes. The verbs are additionally categorized as alternating verbs and non-alternating verbs (DOC variant only and POC variant only). In Levin’s approach, Latinate verbs are classified as non-alternating verbs which select a POC variant. The list of Latinate verbs includes: address, administer, broadcast, convey, contribute, delegate, deliver, denounce, demonstrate, describe, dictate, dispatch, display, distribute, donate, elucidate, exhibit, express, explain, explicate, forfeit, illustrate, introduce, narrate, portray, proffer, recite, recommend, refer, reimburse, remit, restore, return, sacrifice, submit, surrender, transfer, transport (Levin 1993, p. 46).

This list includes mainly transitive verbs, e.g., recommend or portray that can select an indirect object. There is only one ditransitive verb in this group, namely deliver. Since this is an analysis of double object constructions, the scope of the analysis has been limited to the Latinate verbs found in the HC, in double object constructions in the respective periods. As a result, this analysis will focus on the predecessors of the following verbs: address meaning ‘to speak to somebody’, administer, convey, contribute, deliver, refer, restore, submit and surrender. Let us next divide these verbs into subgroups on the basis of their inherent meaning.
3 Subtypes of Latinate verbs in ModE

In her classification, Levin (1993) points out that Latinate verbs could be allotted to the already existing semantic groups in her classification. At first sight it seems that for example deliver could join the group of send verbs and that the semantic meaning of donate makes it a perfect match with the other give verbs. The only problem is that all verbs in these send and give classes occur in alternating structures and we know that Latinate verbs have different structure preferences. This was one of the reasons that made Levin (1993) categorize them as belonging to a separate group of Latinate verbs. The other criterion was their common descent. Levin does not provide any further group-internal semantic divisions.

Since the main claim in this paper is that Latinate verbs can express the meaning of caused possession and caused motion, the aim of this section is to preliminarily divide these verbs into two groups: (i) caused possession and (ii) caused motion verbs. I will do this division now, for the ModE data and in the later sections I will draw evidence from the history.

In order to elaborate on the semantic encoding of Latinate verbs under investigation, we need to recall the list from section 2. The inventory of verbs from section 2 includes address, administer, convey, contribute, deliver, recommend, restore, submit and surrender. The basic criterion used in examining the caused possession event is the well-known ‘but clause’ test. It shows that with some dative verbs the meaning of caused possession can be easily negated, whereas with some verbs it is strengthened.

(1) a. He addressed dark questions to me, but I was interested in the news, so did not listen.
b. My GP administers the drug to me, but I never bought it.
c. The sovereign conveyed some messages to his people, but they never got them.
d. The students contributed their own time to the presentation project, but it misfired.
e. *John delivers flowers to Mary every day, but she never gets them.
f. He recommended this book to me, but I never read it.
g. The mayor restored the old house to the owners, but they never bought it.
h. He surrendered himself to authorities, but they never arrested him.
i. *The student submitted the paper to the teacher, but the teacher never got it.

The results of this test with the Latinate verbs being investigated show that they fall into two broad groups. The first group contains verbs lexicalizing a caused possession: deliver and submit. The manner of the possession change event lexicalized by these verbs will be discussed later, but for now the examples show that these verbs involve a caused possession event. The second group includes verbs of communication: address, administer, recommend, and verbs associated with a change of possession meaning: contribute, restore and surrender.

---

6 An anonymous reviewer suggested marking this sentence with an asterisk. This approach would classify restore as a caused possession verb.

7 Rappaport Hovav and Levin (2008) define a caused possession event as restricted only to the meaning lexicalized in give and give-type verbs. Neither of these verbs involve motion in the possessional field.
These verbs licence the ‘but clause’, which indicates that the success of the possession change event from an agent to a new possessor encoded in these verbs may be easily challenged.

In order to answer the next question of whether the possession change event in the selected Latinate verbs involves a change in physical location, I will apply a ‘source phrase’ test presented in Rappaport Hovav and Levin (2008, p. 139) for give. This test examines the path constituent involved in the meaning of a verb. It is a fact that only those verbs that lexicalize a change in physical location can take a PP with a directional meaning, as movement is a component of their root meaning. The result of this is that they inherently select a path argument with a spatial goal; see (2a). In contrast, give-type verbs do not lexicalize movement. Consequently they ignore spatial goals but always take recipients. A caused possession lexicalized in the meaning of give and give-type verbs does not involve movement, and accordingly it does not take a conceptual path argument; see (2b).

(2) a. Agent \(\rightarrow\) …….Theme …GOES….\(\rightarrow\) New Location [spatial Goal] 
   b. Agent \(\rightarrow\) …….Theme ……………\(\rightarrow\) New Possessor [Recipient]

Such a path, as in (2a), is taken to have an internal structure, which can be modified by, for example, introducing another source for the possession change event, distant from the agent, as indicated by the underlined part in: John threw the ball from Jack to Jill. This PP, modifying the path of the throwing event, is called a ‘source phrase’. As shown in Rappaport Hovav and Levin (2008, p. 139) for give, give-type verbs do not licence the ‘source’ phrase because – since they do not involve movement – their path has no internal structure. It is questionable whether they involve a path at all.  

8 Now, the ‘source’ phrase test with the analysed Latinate verbs has offered the following results, see (3) below.

(3) a. ?He addressed dark questions from him to the audience.
   b. *My GP administers these drugs from my husband to me.
   c. The sovereign conveyed the goods from his division to his people.
   d. The students contributed their own time from the project planning to the presentation.
   e. *The dairy delivers milk from the shop to individual customers every day.
   f. *He recommended this book from my boss to me.
   g. ?The mayor restored the old house from the old owners to the new owners.
   h. He surrendered himself to the local authorities rather than to the state authorities.
   i. *The student submitted the paper from the biology teacher to the PE teacher.

We see that the verbs which do not licence a ‘source’ phrase are administer or the caused possession verbs deliver and submit. On the contrary, the PP in POC with address, recommend, contribute, restore and surrender can be modified with a ‘source’ phrase, which demonstrates that they express motion. This provisional analysis of the manner of movement that accompanies a change of possession event will be verified against the historical data in section 5. Now, having arranged the groups of verbs, let us have a closer look at the theories concerning the rise of two variants of POC in the history of English.

8 See the discussion of the Lexicalist theory in Rappaport Hovav and Levin (2008, pp. 137-142).
4 Historical account on POC

This analysis assumes a historical motivation for the development of different types of POCs and follows from the analysis of double-object constructions in Old English (OE) and their development in ME after the withdrawal of the morphological case system (see Sówka-Pietraszewska, 2011). Sówka-Pietraszewska shows that in OE, give-type verbs selected mainly DOC, while motion verbs, i.e., send and bring commonly occurred in POC. Only after dropping the morphological case system, in the early ME period, give-type verbs started to select POC. McFadden (2002) claims that it was a new type of POC, a give-type POC, which was created in early ME and was conditioned by the disappearance of DOC with the order of verb’s arguments [DO IO]. The order of arguments in which DO c-commanded IO was one of two available base orders in DOC in OE and early ME. In the second of the constructions, the IO c-commanded the DO [IO DO]. Both structures were equally popular in OE (see Koopman, 1990). After the twelfth century, when the base order for English became SVO (for details, see Pintzuk, 1991), there were only two options for the realization of arguments of double object verbs: DOC [IO DO] and POC [DO to-IO].

Given the observation that POC was already present in OE with motion verbs and that with give-type verbs it developed from DOC [DO IO], Sówka-Pietraszewska (2011) claims that in the ME period there were two variants of POC, one with give verbs – dative POC, with the grammaticalized preposition to, whose function was a dative case marker, and the other with motion verbs – directional POC, a remnant construction of the OE era, with a directional (allative) preposition. Both structures had an identical surface make-up, however, only the second one involved a path from an agent towards a spatial goal, while the dative POC only realized a possessional path.

(4) a. Uortigerne nom his sonde; & sende to Sexlonde.
   Vortiger took his messengers and sent to Saxony
   ‘Vortiger took his messengers and sent (them) [Theme] to Saxony [Goal].
   (Layamon: Layamon’s Brut)

   b. & ȝeue to ioseph. þe wes ȝe ȝungeste hap
      and (you) gave to Joseph, who was the youngest happiness
      in Pharaoh’s hall
      ‘…and you gave to Joseph [Recipient] who was the youngest, happiness in Pharaoh’s hall [Theme].’
      (Anonymous: Juliane)

---

9 For a detailed study of the loss of lexical case in the late OE and early ME, its consequences for the distribution of DOC and the theory concerning the rise of to-dative construction, see McFadden (2002). See Allen (1995) for a discussion of the loss of morphological case distinctions in the various dialects.

10 Since in OE and the early ME the surface ordering of arguments was relatively free, in his study of the base order of arguments in DOC, McFadden (2002) excluded from the scope of his analysis constructions in which one of the arguments moved from the base position, e.g., an object moved before the subject, as a result of fronting via topicalization, or the examples where a verb intervenes between two objects (for further details see McFadden (2002) and for details concerning the movement processes in OE and ME see van Kemenade (1987) and Pintzuk (2005) for an alternative account).
In modern literature, various tests are provided that specify the extent of a path (for details, see Rappaport Hovav and Levin, 2008, p. 138). The analysis in the next section will use parts of such tests to analyse the paths with Latinate verbs.

5 Structure selection of Latinate verbs in ME and early ModE

Even a brief look at the data from the historical analysis of the structure selection of Latinate verbs reveals an intriguing observation. Namely, in late ME and early ModE Latinate verbs used to occur in DOC. What is more, surprisingly, the examples found in Visser (§689, p. 626) do not involve only Latinate caused possession verbs, but also caused motion verbs, see (5) below.

(5) a. Sir Thomas Paulmer came to th'elr Warwike, since that time duke of Northumberland, to deliver him his cheine, being a very faire one, for every lince wayed ane ounce, to be delivered to Jarnac, and so to receive as much.
   1547-1553 Edward VI: The Diary of Edward VI (from HC)

  b. He delyuers ðis curror þe letters.
     C1400 Mandev. (Roxb.) XXV, 119 (from Visser §689, p.626)

  c. …who had his pardon delyvered him on the tower.
     Old English Dictionary (from Visser §689, p. 626)

  d. Yet scarce to contribute Each Orb a glimpse of Light.\(^{11}\)
     1667 Milton, P. L. VIII, 155 (from Visser §689, p. 626)

This observation demonstrates that in the past, the limitations on the structure selection of double object verbs were not so strict. On the other hand, following the polysemy approaches, one could assume that the selection of DOC with these verbs was intentional and aimed to emphasize the successful transfer of possession. However, Rappaport Hovav and Levin (2008, p. 147) show that the selection of DOC with motion verbs does not prejudge success in the possession change (e.g., *Levis sent/shipped Sam a bicycle, but it never arrived* (RH&L’s example (42))).\(^{12}\) Now, given that the inherent meaning of motion verbs lexicalizes movement and the trigger for this movement is a transfer of possession, it will be assumed here that the speaker’s motivation for DOC selection in (5) above was the desire to express a successful change of possession. However, more research on the contexts in which Latinate caused motion verbs occur in DOC in late ME and early ModE is needed in order to offer strong evidence for the posited statement.

The structure selection of Latinate verbs became more regular in the ModE period and since the aim of this paper is to show that already in late ME and early ModE POC could realize a caused possession alongside a caused motion meaning, let us analyze the semantic roles of the indirect objects of the verbs being investigated. As was mentioned in section 3, *give* and *give-\(^{11}\) Notice the order of arguments [DO IO] without a preposition preceding the IO in (5d). One of the reasons of the object variation in OE, as well as in ModE, has been heaviness of objects (for OE and ME see Pintzuk and Kroch (1989) and for ModE Wasow (1997), among others).

\(^{12}\) It is only an interesting possibility to be considered. However, since it is no way crucial to my analysis, and also I have no strong empirical support, I assume that it should be left for the future analysis.
type verbs take only recipients, while motion verbs can select recipients or spatial goals. It seems intriguing to find out which objects were preferred by Latinate verbs in the history of English. The observation of the IO selection will be particularly vital to a discussion concerning the inherent meaning lexicalized by Latinate verbs in the late ME and early ModE periods.

The historical analysis of the complements of P with *address, administer, convey, contribute, deliver, recommend, restore* and *submit* confirms that change of possession verbs select recipients; see Table 1 below and for some examples, see (6) below.

**Table 1**: Complements of P with the selected Latinate verbs in late ME and early ModE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VERB</th>
<th>RECIPIENT/POSSESSOR</th>
<th>SPATIAL GOAL</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>address</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>convey</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contribute</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deliver</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recommend</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>restore</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>submit</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>surrender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(6)   a. … which he perceiving, lays hold of all Opportunities to *address* himself *to her* by way of Love…

Anonymous: Penny Merriments (E3)

b. …or to take One of the said Two before mentioned Oaths soe to bee given and *administred* to *them* respectively by the said Justice or Justices of the Peace…

Anonymous: Statutes VII (E3)

c. All those thynges that have the habyte of parfyght cognycyon may move themself and *convey* themself *to theyr ende*

Anonymous: In Die Innocencium (M4)

d. And after the saide obligacion withe condicion so made sealed and delivered unto the saide customer, thenne the saide customer shall *delivre* a sufficient cocket *unto the partye owner*…

Anonymous: Statutes III (E1)
e. ...and _referr_ hem to _dyuers religions_ whiche lyue vnder Seynt Austyn reule...

Capgrave, John: Capgrave's Sermon (M4)

f. ...the seid william Aleyn aper to the writ aforeside. that thanne be your discrecion _restore_ the seid Suppliaunt to the seid londis..

Anonymous: Petitions (M4), London

We can elicit from the data in Table 1 that _submit_ and _deliver_ restricted their indirect object selection only to recipients, which confirms that they lexicalized only caused possession meaning. Apart from that, _address_ also selected only recipients. Since _address_ selects animate goals, this result does not come as a surprise. On the other hand, _administer_ selected recipients in the majority of structures, but it also showed some structures with spatial goals. In section 3, _administer_ was classified as a verb involving movement and the analysis in the Table 1 supports this observation.

A caused possession event can be accompanied by motion, as some change of possession verbs lexicalize a change of the spatial location of the theme as a result of a possession change. The indirect objects of _contribute_ and _convey_ above are mainly goals. _Contribute_ seems to involve a possessional path, while _convey_ requires a change of physical location. This claim will be further supported by the tests provided below. In short, the results of this analysis point out that already in late ME and early ModE, POC must have realized the meaning of a caused possession, not accompanied by movement, as data from _deliver_ and _submit_ confirmed that they lexicalized a caused possession meaning. I assume that the context of a caused possession of _address_ or _submit_ was realized in the dative POC.

In order to distinguish the two variants of POC (i.e., POC with a dative preposition and POC with an allative preposition) one can look at the path and ask whether it can be modified with spatial prepositions. Clearly, the path in the case of POC with motion verbs should allow for such a modification.

In ModE, the path of motion verbs can be modified by prepositions such as, e.g., _at_, _towards_, _off_, _out of_, etc. The data from the corpus shows examples of such constructions; see (7).

(7) a. ...Clothes called _Vesses Rayes_ Saillyling Clothes and other Clothes nowe _comonly_ sold at _iiij Mark_ or under be _not_ comprised in this or any of the seid Act but may be _carried_ and _conveyed oute of this Realme into the parties of beyond_...

Anonymous: Statutes III (E1)

b. ...can _convey_ any Wash or other Liquors fitt for Distillation _out of one Back or Vessell into another_...

Anonymous: Statutes VII (E3)

However, we see that only _convey_ occurs with spatial prepositions. No examples of other Latinate caused movement verbs were found in such contexts. Therefore, _convey_ is the only representative example for the claim that motion verbs take POC with an allative preposition, which may be substituted with other spatial prepositions.

Next, we have to verify if any of the analysed verbs can occur with a source phrase _from NP_ (to NP). As was already pointed out in section 3, the main assumption is that caused possession verbs do not occur with a phrase introducing another source, distinct from the
agent. In contrast, this restriction does not apply to motion verbs. Example (3) in section 3 showed the results of the test applied to Latinate verbs in ModE. On the other hand, the corpus data shows the following examples of source phrases with Latinate verbs in ME (‘from NP’ phrases); see (8).

\[(8)\]

a. ...men for felony be used to be conveyed frome the Seyntwarie wherein they abjure unto the port to theym assigned.

Reynes, Robert: Commonplace Book

b. ...any Wash or other Liquors fitt for Distillation may be conveyed from any such Back or Vessell into any Still or Stills or into any other Place...

Anonymous: Statutes VII (E3)

Again, we see that only the motion verb convey was able to take a source phrase. None of the other Latinate caused possession verbs were found with a source phrase in the corpus data. We can glean from this observation that, presumably, since change of possession verbs did not occur with a source phrase, they lexicalized a possession change event with the agent as the only source, hence their POC could not involve an allative preposition, but rather one that marked the recipient with the dative case. This assumption gets additional support from the results of the other tests presented above. On the contrary, convey (in (8) above), being the most frequently occurring representative of motion verbs in HC, takes various modifiers of the path phrase, which proves that this motion verb definitely involved a spatial path. Consequently, it can be claimed that the POC it occurred in was a directional POC.

Unfortunately, the data from the corpus did not provide information for further tests with adverbial modifiers, e.g., all the way, halfway. However limited the data was, it provided support for the major claim of this paper. Let us sum up the main findings of the analysis presented here.

### 6 Concluding remarks

The main part of this paper has examined the inherent meaning of the selected Latinate verbs in the late ME and the early ModE periods. The main aim was to provide evidence for the claim that Latinate verbs fall into two semantic groups: (i) caused possession and (ii) caused motion. This approach provides new data on Latinate verbs and historical English double object constructions.

The analysis in this paper lent two perspectives to the problem of the inherent meaning of Latinate verbs: a modern and historical perspective. Firstly, I analysed the inherent meaning of Latinate verbs in ModE. This analysis was followed by the semantic analysis of the same verbs in the late ME and early ModE periods. In both sections the semantic tests from Rappaport and Hovav (2008) were used to demonstrate the inherent semantic meaning of the verbs.

The analysis of the ModE Latinate verbs inventory laid the foundations for a preliminary division of the verbs into groups. Accordingly, the verbs deliver and submit were classified as caused possession verbs and address, administer, recommend, contribute, restore and surrender as caused motion verbs. The following historical analysis provided rather scant results but strong enough to demonstrate the distant meanings of Latinate verbs. Moreover,
these examples were supportive of the main claim that some Latinate verbs express caused possession, regardless of the fact that in ModE they occur in a construction which seems to be a directional construction.

The data in the historical section still needs to be developed, but even in its present form it is already favourable towards Sówka-Pietraszewska’s (2011) claim that English has developed two variants of POC: (i) a directional POC with an allative preposition and (ii) a dative POC with a dative marking preposition. As a consequence, Latinate verbs can realize their arguments in the respective variant. This observation sheds some new light on the discussion of the structure selection of Latinate verbs.
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