THE SOUTHERN DATIVE PRESENTATIVE MEETS MECHANICAL TURK

JIM WOOD
LAURENCE HORN
RAFFAELLA ZANUTTINI
LUKE LINDEMANN
Yale University

abstract: This article introduces the southern dative presentative, an under-studied construction that varies across speakers of American English. The authors discuss similarities and differences between this construction and the better-studied personal dative construction and compare the Southern dative presentative with similar constructions cross-linguistically. They then present the results of a nationwide acceptability judgment survey administered on Amazon Mechanical Turk. The results show that Southern dative presentatives are alive and well in Southern dialects of American English. In the process, they also illustrate the usefulness of Amazon Mechanical Turk (and similar crowdsourcing platforms) for the study of dialect variation in the domain of syntax.
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A substantial body of work has documented the syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic properties of personal dative constructions in American English (Wolfram and Christian 1976, 121–24; Webelhuth and Dannenberg 2006; Conroy 2007; Horn 2008, 2013; Hutchinson and Armstrong 2014). Some examples are given in (1), where the italicized pronouns are the so-called “personal datives,” which are co-referential with the (underlined) subject:

1. a. We had us a cabin.… [Christian 1991, 11]
   b. I love me some baked beans. [Webelhuth and Dannenberg 2006, 39]
   c. I need me a screwdriver.
   d. He loves him some baseball. [Hutchinson and Armstrong 2014, 179]

In this article, we focus on another construction that exhibits what appears to be a dative pronoun but has received almost no attention in the literature since it was briefly mentioned in 1946, in an American Speech article by Fred Dudley. Dudley’s (1946, 271) two examples are given in (2a) and (2b), an
example from Montgomery and Hall (2004, lvi) is given in (2c), while (2d) and (2e) are examples provided as native speaker judgments by the fourth author of this article:

2. a. Here’s *you* some money.
   b. Kelley, here’s *you* a nice easy one.
   c. Here’s *ye* (singular) a light.
   d. Here’s *you* a piece of pizza.
   e. Here’s *me* a good pair of jeans.

Dudley (1946) views such sentences as related to those containing personal dative pronouns, an intuition shared by speakers who find them acceptable today. We will refer to them with the label SOUTHERN DATIVE PRESENTATIVES, for several reasons that we will mention here and elaborate upon over the course of the article. First, they are attested more robustly in the South of the United States than in other areas. Second, they are instances of presentatives, i.e. clauses that function to bring some entity (or sets of entities, or events) to the attention of the interlocutor(s). Third, they contain a pronoun that would be a dative pronoun in other languages in which presentatives are attested and, as suggested by Dudley, seems to be related to the so-called dative pronoun found in personal dative constructions. Montgomery and Hall (2004) take (2c) to represent an “ethical dative,” and Liberman (2009) speculates along similar lines for a related example, *Here’s you a bowl of soup.*

Our in-progress investigation reveals that Southern dative presentatives are not a species that went extinct, but rather are alive and well as part of the grammar of some (though not all) speakers of Southern American English, let alone American English generally. In this article, we shed light on their properties, comparing and contrasting them with personal datives and (to some extent) with presentatives in other languages. Moreover, we will show that they can be fruitfully investigated using a relatively new methodology, utilizing surveys distributed through Amazon Mechanical Turk. We discuss the reliability of this methodology extensively, showing that it can give us useful information not only about the geographical distribution of a certain construction, but also about other aspects of the grammar of the speakers who accept it—in particular, implicational relations with other types of sentences they are likely to accept or reject. We view this work as the beginning of a thorough investigation of Southern dative presentatives, which in turn is part of the broader research goal of the Yale Grammatical Diversity Project (http://microsyntax.sites.yale.edu/phenomena): to provide a careful description and analysis of the many facets of morphosyntactic variation exhibited by the varieties of English spoken in North America today.
PERSONAL DATIVES, PRESENTATIVES, AND SOUTHERN DATIVE PRESENTATIVES

Personal Datives (PDs), attested largely in Southern and Appalachian varieties of U.S. English, are so-called despite the fact that English has lacked a true dative case since the fourteenth century. The label is motivated by the fact that in other languages, including French (3a), Italian (3b), and Westphalian German (3c), a pronoun with somewhat similar properties in the same position would be marked as dative.³ In examples like (3), such pronouns must be coreferential with the subject.

3. a. Je me bois une petite tasse de café.
   I refl.dat drink a small cup of coffee
   lit. 'I drink (to) me a little cup of coffee.'

b. Gianni si beve un caffè.
   Gianni refl.dat drinks a coffee
   lit. 'Gianni drinks him(self) a coffee.'
   [Campanini and Schäfer 2011]

c. Ich trinke mir jetzt einen Kaffee.
   I drink refl.dat now a coffee
   lit. 'I drink (to) me now a coffee'

PDs have attracted increasing attention in the syntactic literature recently (see Hutchinson and Armstrong 2014 for a recent proposal and a review of related work).⁴ The sentences in (4) exemplify what we call Southern dative presentatives (SDPs):

4. a. Here’s you a piece of pizza.

b. Where’s me a screwdriver?

Unlike PDs, SDPs and their syntactic properties have, to our knowledge, remained unexamined, except for brief mentions in Dudley (1946), Montgomery and Hall (2004), Liberman (2009), and Horn (2014). From a theoretical perspective, these constructions are interesting in light of a growing body of work focusing on the syntactic and semantic properties of noncore or “extra” arguments (Pylkkänen 2002, 2008; Cuervo 2003; McFadden 2004; Hole 2005; McIntyre 2006; Schäfer 2008; Lambert 2010; Haddad 2011; Bosse, Bruening, and Yamada 2012; Wood and Marantz 2015). From a dialectological perspective, there has been no discussion prior to the present study of the current status of SDPs, who uses them, or where they are used.
Our preliminary research, based on Internet searches and in-depth conversations with several native speakers, supports the connection between PDs and SDPs suggested by Dudley (1946), since there seem to be several similarities between the two constructions. For example, in both SDPs and PDs, the dative is a weak pronoun that cannot be stressed, modified, or coordinated (Cardinaletti and Starke 1999). In both cases, the pronoun is immediately adjacent to the verbal form, whether it is a lexical verb as in PDs or the copula in SDPs. In neither case is the dative an argument selected by the verb. Moreover, the two constructions can be functionally quite similar. Consider the attested example in (5), where the SDP in bold was the title of a (now inaccessible) blog post. In that post, the author went on to express the same idea with the italicized PD:

5. Where’s me a digital camera? […] After seeing the cool crab in a stream that idig posted, I wish I had me a digital camera to show off some of my cool finds.

Finally, there is at least a tentative geographical match between the reported isogloss for PDs and the region in which SDPs are principally attested, more on which will be said below.

However, there are important differences between PDs and SDPs as well. First, while the PD pronoun must be coreferential with the subject, the SDP pronoun is not coreferential with any (overt) argument, and is, for many speakers at least, restricted to the speaker (me), hearer (you), or both (us); some speakers, however, do appear to accept third-person pronouns, as Greg Johnson first pointed out to us. Second, PDs have been argued to have no effect on the truth-conditional meaning of a sentence (Horn 2008, 2013), while SDPs seem to affect such meaning at least sometimes. For example, John needs him a new car is truth-conditionally identical to John needs a new car, while Here’s you a piece of pizza may express a distinct proposition from Here’s a piece of pizza. The former guarantees that the pizza is for the hearer, while no such guarantee is made in the latter. Third, as an anonymous reviewer points out, an alternative version of the SDP construction is typically available using a benefactive prepositional phrase, as in Here’s a piece of pizza for you. In contrast, a PD sentence such as I need me a screwdriver cannot be paraphrased by a sentence with a prepositional phrase, as in I need a screwdriver for me. Fourth, unlike personal datives, the SDP cannot occur in embedded, negated, or yes-no question environments, as in (6):

6. a. *I’m pleased that here’s you a new printer.
   b. *Here isn’t you a new printer.
   c. *Is here you a new printer?
The constraints illustrated in (6) are likely related to the “here-and-now” nature of the SDP construction—the fact that it is a presentative construction—and hold for sentences like (6) even if the dative is removed. We will round out our description of the SDP by turning to the general properties of presentative constructions.

As implied by the terminology that we choose, SDPs fall into a class of constructions known as presentative constructions cross-linguistically (see, e.g., Petit 2011; Julia, forthcoming). Typological evidence turns up a wide range of presentative (or presentational) constructions that function to direct attention to an element within the immediate speech situation (see Hill 2014, 157, 164–66). Such presentatives

a. May require direct evidence from the senses within the utterance context;
b. Often feature a deictic adverb (here), demonstrative (this), or verb (behold);
c. Cannot be negated or questioned and (usually) cannot be embedded;
d. May co-occur with either a nominative or accusative theme (Ecce homo/hominem); and
e. Often imply the presence of an interlocutor; this “presentee” may overtly appear as dative, and is generally restricted to a speech act participant (first or second person).

The last point is of particular interest because it situates American English SDPs within the broader cross-linguistic context of related syntactic constructions. We will thus proceed to a brief survey of instantiations of presentatives that allow dative arguments in other languages and thus correspond more closely to SDPs.

We begin with French voici/voilà. Historically, this combines the French verb voir ‘to see’ and the proximal or distal deictic adverbs ici and là. The possibility of a (usually second-person) dative presentee is chiefly limited the colloquial register (as in English but not, for example, in Italian), so that attestation is easier on Twitter or in blogs. Literary examples do exist, however:

7. a. —Eh bien, tu pleures?…
   —Oui, oui, c’est de bonheur, c’est de joie!… Mais, toi aussi, te voilà des larmes…
   ‘What, you’re crying?’
   ‘Yes, yes, with happiness, with joy. But you too, there’s you some tears.’
   [Mario Uchard, La buveuse de parles, in La lecture rétrospective: Magazine littéraire bi-mensuel 19 (1895): 323 (http://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=umn.319510007511097;view=1up;seq=331)]

b. Tiens, te voilà un bon café et des tartines, mon pigeon. Mange.
   ‘Hey, here’s you some nice coffee and toast, dear. Eat up.’
   [Jean Anouilh, Antigone, in Nouvelles Pièces Noires (Paris: La Table Ronde, 1946), 150]
Old French presentative particles *ez, as, ast*, derived from Latin *ecce* ‘behold’, could also co-occur with dative presentees, typically in second person. The examples in (8) are translated into Modern French and (by us) into English:

8. a. **As vus** Rollant sur sun cheval pasmet, [“Anglo-Norman”]
   Voilà Roland sur son cheval pâmé, [Modern French]
   ‘There is Roland swooned upon his horse’
   

   b. **Ast vos** Satan qui l’un séduit. [“Anglo-Norman”]
   Voilà que Satan se mit à tenter l’un d’entre eux. [Modern French]
   ‘There you have Satan tempting one of [the three monks]’
   
   [*(Benedeit, Le Voyage de saint Brendan, 10th century* (Cotton MS Vespasian B.X, British Library, London), line 310; Modern French translation by Ian Short and Brian Merrilees (Paris: H. Champion, 2006), 64)]

Also deriving from Latin *ecce* (together with the demonstrative pronoun *illum*) is Modern Italian *eccoti* (see Cuzzolin 1998, De Cesare 2011), which allows first- and second- (but not third-) person dative presentees:

9. **Eccoti** una bella cioccolata calda.
   ‘Here’s you a nice hot chocolate’

Other languages exhibiting dative presentatives include Latin itself and languages from the Baltic and Slavic families. In Russian and Serbian/Croatian, unlike French, it is the proximal (*vot, evo*) and not the distal (*von, eto*) that has generalized:

10. a. Latin *ecce; em, ēn*, demonstrative pronouns:
    
    ‘Here’s your man’, lit. ‘Here’s you the man’

    b. Latvian *lūk, raũ, re, še:*
    **Še tev brūnumi.** [Petit 2011, 21; see also Petit 2010]
    ‘Here’s you a miracle’

    c. Lithuanian *štai, te;* Old Lith. *aũskat, Šiskat, tâškat:*
    **Tė tau mano berą zirgą.** [dialectal Lithuanian; Petit 2011, 21]
    ‘Here’s you my bay horse’
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Dative presentative constructions can also be found outside Indo-European, as in the following Turkish example (provided by Faruk Akkus):

10. f. İste sana bir dilim kek.
   ‘Here’s you a slice of cake.’

One of the oldest recorded presentatives, Hebrew היננה (hinne(h))—usually glossed as ‘Lo!’, ‘Behold!’ or ‘Lo and behold!’—allowed dative presentees in Biblical times and still does: …היננה (Hinne leka…) ‘here’s you…’ (Sadka 2001; Miller-Naudé and van der Merwe 2011).

The presence of a dative pronoun in presentatives attested in the varieties of English discussed here is therefore not surprising, given these cross-linguistic observations. We see that deictic locatives (here, there), verbs (e.g., behold), and demonstratives, both with and without dative presentees, are widely attested in presentative constructions across languages. What is surprising, however, is the possibility of wh-elements co-occurring with a dative pronoun, exemplified in (4b) above and in (11):

11. a. Where’s me a screwdriver?
    b. Where’s us a good place to eat around here?
    c. Where’s you a quiet place to study?

This pattern is not found readily (if at all) outside these English varieties, which makes it of particular interest to the typologist as well as the syntactician.

SURVEYS WITH A NEW TOOL: AMAZON MECHANICAL TURK

To assess the status of SDPs in current American English, we constructed a series of surveys and administered them on the Internet through Amazon Mechanical Turk. Surveys allow us find out whether speakers find certain sentences unacceptable, and we can test the element under investigation precisely in a range of contexts, perfectly capturing the distribution of a particular grammatical phenomenon.
Our goal was not only to assess the distribution of one particular sentence or sentence type, but also to get a first sense of its productivity. To this end, we included in our survey a series of SDP sentences, manipulating the choice of locative element (here’s versus where’s) and the choice of pronoun (me, you, and us). Our primary test sentences are shown in (12).

12. a. Here’s you a piece of pizza.
    b. Here’s me a good pair of jeans.
    c. Here’s us a gas station—pull over!
    d. Where’s me a screwdriver?
    e. Where’s us a good place to eat around here?
    f. Where’s you a quiet place to study?

Our surveys for this investigation consisted of sentences designed to gather acceptability judgments on a variety of constructions, including SDPs in (12). Participants were presented with the test sentences and asked to rate each one on a scale of 1–5, with 1 representing a sentence judged unacceptable in the participant’s own informal speech and 5 representing a sentence that sounds perfectly acceptable (see the appendix for the survey’s instructions and a sample sentence). It is important to recognize that the maps below represent these acceptability judgments, which may or may not reflect participants’ actual language use. Nevertheless, because the results below show clear geographic differences in participants’ acceptability judgments and because survey work based on acceptability judgments has long been used as a means to infer the properties of speakers’ grammars, we see no reason to doubt that the results below reflect genuine differences in the dialects of American English speakers.

Following the guidelines in Cowart (1997), we provided two filler sentences for every test sentence. The filler sentences were of two types: Some of the filler sentences consisted of attested constructions that are unrelated to this study but possibly interesting for future research. For example, we included sentences, such as those in (13), from Johnson (1988, 160) and Kayne (1997, 46):

13. a. Shouldn’t have Pam remembered her name?
    b. Should have the kids left?

We will return to these sentences in the next section.

We also included control sentences that we expected to be grammatical or ungrammatical for everybody, as in (14):

14. a. *John seems that is tired.
    b. Several books were given to John by his teacher.
    c. John hopes to be bitten by mosquitoes more often.
The control sentences were included because we wanted to make sure that we analyzed only surveys completed by participants who understood the task. For example, if a participant judged (14a) as acceptable because the intended meaning is clear, then we would not want to use that participant’s survey, since such a strategy would clearly affect the judgments of the sentences that we were actually interested in. The control sentences were constructed to explicitly detect certain judgment strategies that participants might use. A sentence like (14b) (or 14c) might be rejected because a participant has a prescriptive bias against the use of the passive or because it is not the most natural way to express the relevant thought, in the case of (14b); if so, we would rather not include that participant’s survey in our results. A sentence like (14c) might be rejected because a participant finds it exceedingly unlikely that anyone would ever want to be bitten by mosquitoes. If (14c) was rejected for this reason (or any reason), then we did not include that survey in our results.

Our use of controls to exclude some surveys has the drawback that we almost certainly removed some that would have been perfectly legitimate to include. For example, some participant may have rejected (14c) because he or she prefers the passive participle to be bit, rather than bitten. If so, then the participant understood the task, completed it in good faith, and yet, we would not include his or her results. However, this drawback is balanced by its benefits: we can be reasonably certain that the surveys included were completed by participants who understood the task and provided judgments that we understand. Our experience so far has been that there is still a substantial amount of interesting variation among the people who answer all of our controls in the way that we expected.

The sentences were presented in pseudo-randomized order, such that test sentences were spread evenly throughout, but the precise order of test and filler sentences was different for each respondent. This was done to reduce possible ordering effects (see Schütze 1996; Cornips and Poletto 2005). In particular, our survey was arranged into a series of blocks containing around five sentences. Each block included no more than one sentence of the same type and at least one grammatical control sentence. The blocks were presented in random order, and the sentences within the blocks were presented in random order. This strategy ensured that participants did not see too many examples of the same kind of sentence in a row and that they saw at least one grammatical sentence for every five other sentences.

We administered our survey using Amazon Mechanical Turk (AMT), an online crowdsourcing marketplace for organizations and individuals to connect with freelance workers who provide human intelligence for small tasks that computers are unable to do. Requesters post Human Intelligence Tasks
(HITs), and workers choose the tasks they want to work on. Requesters can then rate the quality of the workers’ work, which provides workers with an incentive to do a good job (so that their ratings stay high) since requesters can choose to include only workers with good previous ratings. Examples of HITs include transcribing blurry numbers from receipt scans and identifying the content of a series of photographs. Previous language-related research has shown the utility of AMT in experimental syntax (Gibson, Piantadosi, and Fedorenko 2011; Sprouse 2011; Erlewine and Kotek, forthcoming), psychology (Johnson and Borden 2012), and semantic dialectology (Karttunen 2014). Our participants were paid $0.88 per survey, regardless of whether their answers were ultimately included in the results. Participants took an average of about 10 minutes to complete the survey.

AMT is especially useful for syntactic dialect research because it provides access to thousands of respondents throughout the United States from a variety of demographic and educational backgrounds. In table 1, we present the demographic information reported by our survey participants; the distribution of participants across demographic categories is consistent with the findings in Ipeirotis’s (2010) study of the demographics of AMT users.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>233 Less than $12,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>140 $12,500–$24,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>89 $25,000–$37,499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender (FTM)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>56 $37,500–$49,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>29 $50,000–$62,499</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some high school</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college, no degree</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate degree</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors degree</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate degree (Masters, Doctorate, etc.)</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>547</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White/caucasian</td>
<td>453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino/Latina</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>547</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We can require that respondents have a good rating on AMT, so that we are sure that participants have enough practice with the general framework. However, while we sometimes did this, we did not always do so, since our control sentences generally ensured quality data. The AMT platform makes it possible to contact participants later if we have questions, which turned out to be useful in several cases. Finally, the results are returned very quickly: we often receive 100–200 survey results within just a few hours.

We plotted our survey data using Geographic Information Systems (GIS) software at Yale, ArcGIS. For the purposes of visualizing the data on these maps, we marked 1 and 2 as negative judgments and 4 and 5 as positive judgments. We did not include judgments of 3 on our maps because, as mentioned above, people answered 3 for a variety of reasons. We are interested primarily in judgments that go in one direction or the other: 1 or 2 if the participant leans toward the marked, ungrammatical, or unacceptable side, and 4 or 5 if the participant leans toward the unmarked, grammatical, or acceptable side. The location of data points is based on the reported birthplace of each respondent (survey questions also included current place of residence and parental birthplaces). We removed surveys that failed our controls, and we generally did not plot on our maps anyone who reported living in their place of birth for less than 8–10 years.

**MAPPING SOUTHERN DATIVE PRESENTATIVES WITH HERE’S**

In this section, we present the geographical and quantitative results of our surveys. Figure 1 shows the geographic distribution of the sentence Here’s you a piece of pizza. This particular sentence has been included on a number of our surveys, resulting in more data on this than any other SDP sentence: a total of 546 participants judged it. The distribution of their responses is presented in figure 2. As we see in this figure, 346 participants rated the sentence negatively (as 1 or 2), and 109 rated it positively (as 4 or 5), while 91 rated it as marginal. When we look at the geographical distribution presented in figure 1, however, we see a clear pattern in the eastern half of the United States. (In general, we do not have enough data to draw strong conclusions about the western half of the United States, although we may note that it was not widely accepted there.) Note that the numbers of points in the map match the respective numbers of respondents; however, not all points are necessarily visible, since there is some overlap. The map reveals that this sentence is widely accepted in the South, and quite generally rejected in the North (although there are, unsurprisingly, exceptions on both sides).
In figure 1 and the other maps, the black borders drawn around the points in the South represent the region in which judgments of the (relevant) sentence are, from a statistical perspective, higher than one would expect based on the overall mean and standard deviation. These borders were computed in ArcGIS 10.2 using the “Hot Spots” function. This function uses the Getis-Ord Gi* statistic to determine if a geospatial clustering of values is statistically significantly higher (or lower) than one would expect if...
the values were distributed randomly across space.\textsuperscript{11} For the purposes of the maps in this article, we concentrate only on the areas where the values cluster at a significantly high level (the “Hot Spots”) and omit the areas where the values cluster at a significantly low level (the “Cold Spots”). It is important to note that the exact location of the outside borders reflects the locations of the data points on the other side of the border, so in areas where we have fewer data points—in particular the areas to the west of these borders—the borders might be different if we had more data points. Nevertheless, the broad outlines of these borders are informative, and in any event they are statistically significant in our data set. As figure 1 shows, the hot spots analysis clearly picks out the cluster of positive ratings in the South.

We see this pattern repeated with the other SDP test sentences, although many of these sentences were not judged by as many people because they were split up across different surveys. The sentence \textit{Here’s me a good pair of jeans}, with a first-person dative, was judged by 297 participants. In figure 3, we see the same basic picture as in figure 2: 183 participants judged this sentence as unacceptable (1 or 2), 62 judged it as acceptable (4 or 5), and 52 judged it as marginal. As we can see in figure 4, these judgments are distributed in a coherent way geographically, where it is widely accepted in the South and widely rejected in the North.

Much the same picture is found with a first-person plural dative, as in \textit{Here’s us a gas station — pull over!} As figure 5 shows, 189 participants rejected the sentence, and 54 accepted it, while 54 judged it as marginal. Figure 6 reveals a geographic distribution for these judgments that is very similar to the previous maps.

\textbf{Figure 3}

Acceptability Ratings of \textit{Here’s me a good pair of jeans}
AN EXAMPLE OF NONREGIONAL SYNTACTIC VARIATION

We next contrast our results so far with a case of syntactic variation that shows no clear geographic pattern. This is important to make sure that our results really do reflect different judgments of sentences in different parts of the country and are not the consequence of differing judgment strategies or some other byproduct of our methodology. For this reason, we will consider a pair of sentences reported by Johnson (1988) and Kayne (1997) as being...
accepted by some but not all speakers of American English. We will refer to such sentences (as in 15a and 16a) as “double aux(iliary) movement” constructions. Example (15a) is a yes-no question where not only the negative auxiliary shouldn’t moves to the left of the subject, as in the standard (15b), but the perfect auxiliary have moves as well:

15. a. %Shouldn’t have Pam remembered her name?
   b. Shouldn’t Pam have remembered her name?

A similar kind of variation can be found in (16), except that here the modal auxiliary should does not carry the negative marker n’t, and in fact there is no negative marker in the sentences at all:

16. a. %Should have the kids left?
   b. Should the kids have left?

Our results support the conclusion that both (15a) and (16a) are accepted by many American English speakers, but that (15a), with the negative marker, is much more widely accepted than (16a).

Figures 7 and 8 report the acceptability judgments of (15a) and (16a), respectively. They show clearly contrasting patterns. Of the 546 participants who judged (15a), 322 accepted it, and 131 rejected it; of the 395 who judged (16a), 72 accepted it, and 267 rejected it. Figures 9 and 10 below reveal no
coherent geographic pattern underlying this variation; the Hot Spots analysis picked out no statistically significant regions either. While the acceptances are more numerous than the rejections in figure 9 and the rejections are more numerous than the acceptances in figure 10, all regions contain both, and they occur in a fairly even distribution in all areas.

It is worth pointing out, however, that the judgments of these sentences still reflect a certain underlying systematicity, even if it is not a geographic systematicity. Table 2 crosses the judgments of (15a) and the judgments of (16a) for the 394 participants who judged both sentences. In this table, for presentational clarity, we collapse judgments of 1 and 2 into one category (‘accept-
able”) and judgments of 4 and 5 into one category (“unacceptable”) just as we do in the maps (except that here we include marginal judgments).

Table 2 is striking because it reflects a strong tendency toward an implicational relation between the two sentences. Only 7 participants who judged
(16a) as acceptable judged (15a) as unacceptable; contrasting with this, 127 participants who judged (15a) as acceptable judged (16a) as unacceptable. Nearly 80% (57/72) of participants who judged (16a) as acceptable also judged (15a) as acceptable (and over 90% [65/72] judged it as at least marginal). We can conclude that, with only a few exceptions, accepting (16a) strongly implies accepting (15a), but many people accept (15a) without accepting (16a). These results show us that we are not dealing with random answers for a construction that people are uncertain about; rather, we are dealing with genuine, systematic variation that is sensitive to syntactic factors. Therefore, the lack of any coherent geographic distribution at all, let alone one that mirrors the results with SDP sentences, strengthens the claim that the geographic pattern we found with the SDP sentences is meaningful.

### MAPPING SOUTHERN DATIVE PRESENTATIVES WITH WHERE’S

We now turn to the SDP sentences with *where* instead of *here*, followed by a map reflecting the judgments of all SDP sentences combined. Since the same speakers judged all of the *where’s* sentences, we present the judgments together in figure 11. The specific sentences in question are provided in (17):

17. a. Where’s me a screwdriver?  
   b. Where’s us a place to eat around here?  
   c. Where’s you a quiet place to study?

We see the same basic pattern for all three sentences, although (17c) was judged generally worse than the other two: fewer speakers find it acceptable and more find it unacceptable.

Figures 12–14 present the geographic distribution of these judgments. The geographic pattern we found earlier with *here’s* SDP sentences is largely
replicated here, with some interesting exceptions. Figure 12 looks the most similar, with most of the acceptances coming from the South and rejections coming from the North, even though it looks like there are several more acceptances in the North than we have previously seen. In figure 13, we actually see even more acceptances in the North. In figure 14, while we still see a cluster of acceptances in the South, in general the acceptances are fewer and more scattered geographically.
FIGURE 13
Geographic Distributions of Acceptability Ratings
of Where’s us a good place to eat around here?

FIGURE 14
Geographic Distributions of Acceptability Ratings
of Where’s you a quiet place to study?
There are, then, basically two kinds of exceptions here: a somewhat wider than expected geographic distribution of acceptances in figure 13 and a more scattered distribution than expected in figure 14. Turning first to figure 13, we investigated further and found that a number of participants who accepted (17b) accepted no other SDP sentence. We contacted several of them by e-mail and asked them why they thought that might be the case. The most common answer was that the participant misread us as is and was therefore judging the sentence as if it were Where is a good place to eat around here? (also assuming a failure to notice the -s on where’s). Another participant mentioned that because the sentence mentions food, it reminded her of people she knew who used SDP sentences, and that caused her to judge the sentence as acceptable. We mention these points because it is not always clear exactly what participants are parsing or what criteria they are using when they provide acceptability judgments. This should be kept in mind both when preparing surveys and when interpreting the results.

As for the more scattered distribution in figure 14, we can only speculate the cause at this point. The most likely explanation relates to the interaction between syntax and pragmatics. Speaker judgments (including those of the fourth author) and attested examples reveal that most instances of where’s SDP sentences are not informational yes-no questions, but function as rhetorical questions or statements. For example, we based (17a) on an attested sentence found online, Where’s me a digital camera? The sentence was the title of a blog post, extracted above in (5). It is clear from the context that the author is not asking where he or she can find a digital camera, but expressing the wish to have a digital camera. Our consultants indicate that a sentence like (17a) is more natural when uttered by a speaker in the act of looking for a screwdriver rather than as an actual request. Given this, it may be that sentences with second-person datives do not fit the typical rhetorical context of where’s SDP sentences; the latter occur when a speaker is expressing a wish or intention, making the benefactive reading of the dative more compatible with a first-person pronoun (whether singular or plural). Despite these remarks, however, we have been so far unable to manipulate the pragmatic context to make a second-person pronoun fully natural, so it may be that some speakers have grammaticalized the restriction. Our data do not permit us to resolve this issue.

Despite the somewhat more marked status of the where’s SDP sentences, we do see evidence that they fit into the overall system of SDP sentences (and do not constitute a fully separate phenomenon). First of all, there seems to be a strong implicational relationship between accepting a where’s SDP sentence and accepting a here’s SDP sentence. For example, in one survey that systematically tested this, 102 (out of 297) participants accepted at least one
of the *where’s* sentences. Of these participants, 71\% (72/102) also accepted at least one of the *here’s* sentences, and 94\% (86/102) judged at least one *here’s* sentence as marginal. Similarly, in that survey, 94 participants accepted at least one of the *here’s* sentences. Of these participants, 77\% (72/94) also accepted at least one of the *where’s* sentences, and 95\% (89/94) judged at least one *where’s* sentence as marginal.

The connection between *here’s* and *where’s* SDPs can be illustrated further when we combine all of the SDP sentences discussed so far in the following way (see figure 15). Thirty participants rated all six of the SDP sentences at the core of our investigation, given in (12) above, as at least marginal,\(^{12}\) while 252 participants rated all SDP sentences as unacceptable (1 or 2)—judging not a single one of them to be even marginal. As this map shows, the two groups of people are in nearly complementary distribution (at least on the eastern half of the United States). The acceptances cluster in the South and along the Appalachian Mountains, while rejections are found only rarely in that region. Rejections are, however, virtually ubiquitous outside of that region.

These aggregate results show that SDP sentences are a geographically restricted feature of American English.\(^{13}\) This includes both the *here’s* and *where’s* type, and with both first- and second-person pronouns. Moreover, this cannot be just a consequence of our methodology, because we have shown other examples of systematic syntactic variation that are not subject to geographic constraints.

**Figure 15**

Geographic Distribution of Acceptability Ratings of All SDP Sentences Combined
QUESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

This article represents only a first step, and we have a number of open questions which we plan to pursue in future work—and on which we invite commentary from interested readers. These include (but are not limited to) the following:

a. Is contraction generally required or preferred (e.g., *Here's you a printer* vs. *Here is you a printer*)?

b. Is agreement possible (or preferred) with plural noun phrases (e.g., *Where's/Where are you some forks and knives*)?

c. Are third-person examples possible or always ruled out (e.g., *Here's him/her a clean shirt*)?

d. Are definite themes (direct objects) possible or always ruled out (e.g., *Here's you the cordless phone; Where's me the car keys*)?

e. How robust is the generalization that SDP speakers constitute a proper subset of speakers who accept personal datives?

f. Do African American speakers outside the South tend to accept SDPs (as with negative concord, negative inversion, and certain phonological dialect traits)? In general, is there variation along other demographic dimensions?

g. Do SDPs with *there's* function similarly or identically to those marked with *here's* and/or *where's*?

For now, we have shown that Southern presentative datives are very much a part of North American English dialects, especially those dialects spoken in the South. They are found with both *here's* and *where's* and with first-and second-person singular and plural datives. Moreover, we find a strong intra-speaker correlation between the *here's* and *where's* sentences: speakers who accept sentences with *where's* are particularly likely to accept the *here's* sentences. We have situated this construction within the landscape of personal dative constructions and related constructions cross-linguistically. Finally, we have demonstrated the usefulness of online crowdsourcing platforms in syntactic dialect research. While we leave a number of questions open, we expect that future research utilizing these platforms will further clarify the questions outlined above, along with many other questions concerning syntactic variation more generally.
APPENDIX
Survey Instructions and Sample Sentence

Informal, casual language can be different in different places. The goal of this survey is to find out about your language, and the language spoken where you live and where you grew up.

*We are not interested in what is correct or proper English.*

We are instead interested in what you consider to be an acceptable sentence in informal contexts. You will be presented with a sentence, or with a context plus a sentence. You will then judge the acceptability of that sentence on a scale of 1–5, with 1 being unacceptable and 5 being acceptable.

It may help to read each sentence aloud before giving your judgment.

Here’s you a piece of pizza.

- 1 - totally unacceptable sentence, even in informal settings
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 - totally acceptable
- □ Any comments?

NOTES

We are grateful to Goldie Ann McQuaid and two anonymous *American Speech* reviewers for helpful comments on this article. Aspects of this work have been presented at the American Dialect Society meeting in Portland, Oregon (2015); the Formal Ways of Analyzing Variation 2 Workshop in Reykjavik, Iceland (2015); Formal Approaches to Morphosyntactic Variation in University of the Basque Country (2015); University of Paris 8 (2015); University of Pennsylvania (2015); and Stanford University (2015). We would like to thank the audiences at those presentations for their comments and suggestions. We gratefully acknowledge that this research was supported by the National Science Foundation under award BCS-1423872.

1. Throughout this article, we note specifically the source of attested examples. Examples without such notes are constructed by us.
2. There are occasional discussions to be found on *Language Log* (Liberman 2009) and other blogs (e.g., Bonnice 2010).
3. Supporting the similarities between the two constructions, note that the syntactic structure proposed for Italian (3b) in Campanini and Schäfer (2011) is nearly identical to the structure proposed on completely independent grounds for English personal datives in Hutchinson and Armstrong (2014). For more on the Westphalian “ingestive” personal dative, see the forum discussion at [http://goo.gl/NxzB4e](http://goo.gl/NxzB4e).

We wish to emphasize that this description is preliminary, and needs to be investigated more closely in future research. An anonymous reviewer informs us that coordination is possible in sentences such as Now, here’s you and me our minivan! In fact, Horn (2013, 172) already observed that some personal dative speakers accept sentences like Shei bought heri and Kim some ice cream, so it may be that coordination is possible for some speakers in both constructions. Since the status of coordination is not crucial for anything we say below, we set the issue aside for future research.

The variant with where’s would seem to be a kind of presentative question, but as we will discuss below, even this seems to have special discourse functions.

Over time, the distal has become unmarked, so that English here’s will typically correspond to voilà rather than voici. For more on the grammar and history of voici/voilà, see Tranel (1973), Morin (1985), Bouchard (1988), Bergen and Plauché (2005), Oppermann-Marsaux (2006), and Porhiel (2012).

Tiens, the imperative of tenir ‘hold’, is another presentative marker roughly corresponding to the Here! or Here you go! accompanying offers or directing attention.

We should also mention that we did not remove any surveys if the speaker answered 3 (on a scale of 1–5) for a control sentence, because our pilot studies revealed that people answer 3 for a variety of reasons, including being uncertain about their judgment. If a speaker answered 3 for numerous controls, however, we removed the survey, but this was quite rare.

In the 7–9-year range, we included the survey on the map only if it was clear from the participant’s current location that he or she did not move very far, so that plotting his or her survey on the map would not lead to a misleading geographical picture.

For our analyses, we constructed Voronoi polygons around each participant, and computed the Hot Spots on those polygons. We then extracted only the Hot Spot polygons and dissolved the borders between them, resulting in the borders presented in the maps here. See Grieve, Speelman, and Geeraerts (2011, 13–15) for a related use of the Gi* statistic. See also the ArcGIS documentation for Hot Spot Analysis at http://resources.arcgis.com/en/help/main/10.2/index.html#/005p00000011000000. 

It was necessary for us to include sentences rated marginal because, for whatever reason, most participants found at least one of these sentences to be marginal. So restricting the data to participants who found all sentences good turned out not to be meaningful.

By “restricted,” we do not mean to imply that that SDP sentences are never accepted outside of the relevant geographical areas; indeed, the maps above show that some speakers outside of these areas are willing to accept some of
the sentences. What we mean is that they are accepted more widely, and at a statistically reliably higher rate, in the areas highlighted in the maps above. That is, geographical region matters for the acceptance of SDP sentences.
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