
Patrick Brandt

Conditions for receiving and perceiving datives

Mittwoch/Wednesday: 15:00

The talk argues that dative arguments that are traditionally classified as affected source/goal, recipient, beneficiary, possessor and experiencer bear a single semantic role 'location'; two licensing conditions for the argument expressions in question are proposed. The constructions the datives (boldfaced) appear in are given in (1), the conditions are given in (2):

- (1) a. Otto gave/stole **Anna** a kiss
 b. The chicken escaped **Anna** (from the shed)
 c. Der Hund fiel **Anna** auf/zu Füßen
 The dog fell Anna-DAT up/to feet
 'The dog struck Anna/the dog fell at Anna's feet'
 d. Der Hund schien **Anna** zu langsam
 The dog seemed Anna-DAT too slow
 'The dog seemed to Anna to be too slow'
- (2) a. The projection of the lexical predicate comprises a theme and a location argument
 b. Interpretation of the predication as a whole involves reference to two dissociated truth intervals

As to (2a), quantificational and (anti) binding patterns as well as the codistribution with location dependent prefixes show that in constructions as given in (1), a location argument is projected internally to the lexical predicate even if this is not visible at surface. Projection of this location argument is crucial since it is 'doubled' by the dative argument; semantically, the dative argument corresponds to a superlocation of the predicate internal location argument.

As to (2b), patterns obtaining in nominalizations, 'small clauses' and 'small infinitives' as well as interactions with the tense system and certain adverbs suggest that dative arguments as in (1a) to (1d) are licensed by a category pertaining to the tense/index system of natural language. It is proposed that the category licensing dative arguments quantifies over a truth interval that is dissociated from what is traditionally called 'event' or 'situation' time; bifurcation of truth intervals thus further conditions dative licensing.

A uniform analysis of eventive predications licensing datives (cf. (1a) to (1c)) and certain comparative predications licensing datives (cf. (1d)) is given. It rests on the motivated assumptions that a) truth intervals may correspond to times as well as to degrees of property instantiation and that b) degrees are (abstract) locations.

Philippa Cook

**The datives that aren't born equal:
 Lexical mapping and some recalcitrant verbs in German**

Mittwoch/Wednesday: 14:00

In ditransitive constructions in German, the order of objects in discourse-neutral contexts (i.e. in the absence of scrambling) is generally assumed to be DAT > ACC, viz. (1a). Under discourse-neutral conditions, the reverse ACC > DAT order in (1b) is considered marked relative to (1a). At

first, it would appear that reference to case alone is sufficient for formulating constraints on order, i.e. dative precedes accusative, (whether handled configurationally or via linear precedence statements).

- | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----|-----------------|-----|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-----------|
| (1) | a. | es | hat | ein Mann | einem Kind | ein Buch | geschenkt |
| | | it | has | a man _{NOM} | a child _{DAT} | a book _{ACC} | given |
| | b. | ^m es | hat | ein Mann | ein Buch | einem Kind | geschenkt |
| | | it | has | a man _{NOM} | a book _{ACC} | a child _{DAT} | given |

Yet a small group of ditransitive verbs is problematic for the formulation of such word order statements since these verbs appear to favour ACC > DAT in discourse-neutral contexts as in (2b) where, in contrast to (1), it is the ACC > DAT linearisation that is considered unmarked:

- | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----|-----------------|-----|----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|------------|
| (2) | a. | ^m es | hat | ein Polizist | einer Gefahr | einen Zeugen | ausgesetzt |
| | | it | has | a policeman _{NOM} | a danger _{DAT} | a witness _{ACC} | exposed |
| | b. | es | hat | ein Polizist | einen Zeugen | einer Gefahr | ausgesetzt |
| | | it | has | a policeman _{NOM} | a witness _{ACC} | a danger _{DAT} | exposed |

Evidently, the standard repertoire of grammatical functions is not helpful in positing linearisation constraints either since the dative is assumed to bear the role of indirect object in both (1) and (2). There is thus no single unmarked position for dative case nor for indirect objects: some are linearised verb-distally (1) and others, including those of e.g. *ausliefern* 'extradite', *entziehen* 'withdraw', *zuführen* 'deliver', seemingly prefer verb-close linearisation (2). One common solution is to treat the verb-close dative as an inherent dative but this merely restates the facts. If a motivated alternative solution emerges, this is clearly to be preferred conceptually. Alternatively, it has been claimed that the preference for ACC > DAT in (2) is an illusion created by a preference for aligning animate arguments before inanimates, but we show such claims to be empirically untenable. In this paper, we take a different approach showing that the differently positioned datives correlate with differences in thematic structure. In particular, the verbs that pattern as in (2) show an alternation under which the dative argument bears a different thematic role in different readings of the verb. This claim is substantiated by contexts allowing only one of the two postulated readings/thematic structures. In such cases, only the order of objects correlating with the contextually forced reading is judged unmarked. Well-known diagnostics such as focus projection and scope ambiguity reinforce this.

In LFG's theory of Lexical Mapping (where thematic roles are mapped via feature decomposition to grammatical functions), differences in thematic structure (may) result in different constellations of grammatical functions. In particular, LFG does not assume an indirect object but, instead, recognises the non-subject functions OBJ, OBJ_{theta} and OBL. Under our account, it is shown that the two kinds of datives actually instantiate discrete grammatical functions. Support for this distribution of grammatical functions is provided by the different behaviour of the two kinds of datives with respect to remnant topicalization and the beneficiary passive – operations we show to be sensitive to the grammatical function hierarchy. The analysis has the advantage of permitting straightforward linearisation constraints based just on grammatical function and the 'recalcitrant' verbs fall into line. We need no stipulations concerning animacy nor category-specific (i.e. PP) positions. Dative asymmetries in topicalisation and beneficiary passive are now actually predicted. On a theoretical level, this proposal has ramifications for the status and role of dative case in German. Further, questions of cross-theoretical relevance arise: How well-motivated is the construct indirect object? Can we identify what it is that dative actually marks in German? Can we dispense with the notion of inherent case?

Jürg Fleischer

Dative and indirect object in German dialects: evidence from relative clauses

Mittwoch/Wednesday: 14:30

This paper is about the status of the (morphological) case dative and of the syntactic role Indirect Object in the dialects of German. The primary evidence is data from relative clauses. For the relative clause, the Accessibility Hierarchy (Keenan & Comrie 1977) and some empirical generalizations associated with it are taken for granted (the following reformulation is a simplified version, containing only four of the original six syntactic roles; SU = Subject, DO = Direct Object, IO = Indirect Object, OBL = Oblique Relation):

(1) SU > DO > IO > OBL

In some German dialects IO in a relative clause is expressed by a formal means also used for OBL, e.g., the relative clause contains a resumptive dative case pronoun. This is shown by (2)b, from a High Alemannic dialect, which is analogous to the (2)c OBL example, but different from the (2)a DO relative clause. In other dialects, however, a relative clause containing a relativized IO displays the same formal means as higher relations, as shown by (3)a-(3)c, from a Low Alemannic dialect: here, the IO relative clause displays the same (i.e., no overt) formal means as the DO example:

- (2) a Gueti Bekanti, won i scho lang nūme gsee ha (DO)
 good acquaintances, REL I (Ø) already long no longer seen have
 ‘good acquaintances that I haven’t met for long’
- b Lüüt, wo me ne nöd cha hälffe (IO)
 people, REL one THEM:DAT not can help
 ‘people to whom you cannot help’
- c De Soon, wo d Mueter gschpaart hät für en (OBL)
 the son, REL the mother saved has FOR HIM
 ‘the son for which his mother has made savings’
- (3) a Alli wu-n-em hab wellá machá (DO)
 all, REL I (Ø) him have wanted make
 ‘all (things) I wanted to make for him’
- b zwe soonigi, wu-mr nid därf gläubá (IO)
 two such, REL one (Ø) not must believe
 ‘two such people to whom you mustn’t believe’
- c D Aschandii, wu dr Fílm handled vu-n-ená (OBL)
 the Ashanti, REL the film tells ABOUT THEM
 ‘the Ashanti which the film is about’

In the paper, some empirical generalizations from a representative sample of German dialects are made within a framework of functional typology. It will be shown that from the four syntactic relations displayed by (1), the IO is the least stable. The question has to be posed whether there is any causal connection between this fact and the decline of morphological dative case in some German dialects.

Martin Haspelmath

**Ditransitive constructions in the world's languages:
Alignment types, alignment splits, and inverse patterns**

Mittwoch/Wednesday: 15:30

In this talk I report on an ongoing cross-linguistic study of ditransitive constructions, based on over 200 languages. By “ditransitive constructions”, I mean constructions of three-place verbs taking an agent, a theme and a (macro-) recipient (including addressee and benefactive) argument. I start with Dryer's (1986) observation that the grammatical behavior of recipient and theme is in many ways analogous to the behavior of (macro-)agent and (macro-)patient in monotransitive constructions, and I pursue the analogy further.

The basic alignment types are defined by the argument-marking patterns, i.e. case-marking and indexing (“agreement”) patterns (word order is largely ignored). Corresponding to the basic monotransitive types (accusative, neutral, ergative), there are three ditransitive types: indirective (treating theme like patient), neutral (treating both theme and recipient like patient), and secúndative (treating recipient like patient). A further logically possible type (neither theme nor recipient treated like patient) is unattested. All types are found both in case-marking and indexation, but case-marking heavily favors indirective alignment, whereas indexation favors secúndative alignment. I will discuss explanations for the correlations, and I will show a world map of the different patterns, demonstrating that their geographical distribution is far from random. (This is based on a map forthcoming in the *World Atlas of Language Structures*, Dryer et al. (to appear).)

Like monotransitive constructions, ditransitive constructions sometimes show animacy-based alignment splits. For instance, in Yimas and French first and second person pronouns show neutral alignment, whereas third person NPs show indirective alignment. Even more common are alignment splits depending on lexical classes of verbs, but other types of split which are attested in monotransitives (conditioned by tense/aspect or subordination) do not seem to occur. Again, I ask whether explanations proposed for monotransitive alignment splits can be extended to ditransitive alignment.

Finally, I discuss a common type of ditransitive inverse pattern, where the “direct” construction, used when the recipient is higher than the theme on the person hierarchy (e.g. ‘(give) him to me’), cannot be used in the “inverse” situation, i.e. when the theme is higher than the recipient (e.g. ‘(give) me to him’), so that a different construction must be resorted to. Here too, explanatory models offered to account for monotransitive inverse patterns will be found useful for understanding the typological generalizations.

References

- Dryer, Matthew S. 1986. "Primary objects, secondary objects, and antidative." *Language* 62: 808-845.
 Matthew S. Dryer & Martin Haspelmath & David Gil & Bernard Comrie (eds.) (to appear) *World Atlas of Language Structures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jóhannes Gísli Jónsson

Making sense of dative objects in Icelandic

Alternate

There are many clear indications that dative objects in Icelandic are semantically regular to a large extent. Native speakers assign dative case to objects of many novel verbs in the language (Barðdal 2001) and the use of dative case is spreading within certain verb classes at the expense of accusative (Maling 2002). Many verbs display a semantically predictable alternation between accusative and dative (e.g. *þvo barninu* ‘wash the child-DAT’ vs. *þvo bílinn* ‘wash the car-ACC’ and *skjóta kúlunni* ‘shoot the bullet-DAT’ vs. *skjóta fuglinn* ‘shoot the bird-ACC’). Moreover, the sheer number of verbs taking dative objects (at least 750 according to Maling 2002) makes it highly unlikely that dative case on objects is largely idiosyncratic. If that was the case, the language learner would face a truly arduous task. In fact, a study by Sigurðardóttir (2002) shows that Icelandic children acquire dative objects relatively early and without much difficulty.

Still, it has proven very difficult to pinpoint exactly how dative case on objects is determined in Icelandic, especially with monotransitive verbs (on double object verbs, see Jónsson 2000). This can be seen quite clearly in Maling’s (2002) important survey of verbs taking dative objects in Icelandic, e.g. in her discussion of verbs of helping. As she points out, such verbs generally govern dative case on the object (e.g. *bjarga* ‘save’, *hjálpa* ‘help’, *hjúkra* ‘nurse’, *liðsinna* ‘assist’, *líkna* ‘care for’, *sinna* ‘attend to’ and *þjóna* ‘serve’) but some verbs take accusative objects even if they have a similar meaning (e.g. *aðstoða* ‘assist’, *lækna* ‘cure’ and *styrkja* ‘support’). The implication is that there is only a strong tendency for verbs of helping to assign dative case to their objects, but no absolute rule.

Since this is obviously unsatisfactory from a theoretical perspective, it is imperative in cases like this to look beyond superficial similarities and seek deeper semantic (or even morphological) explanations. Indeed, a closer inspection reveals that the verb *lækna* ‘cure’ denotes a change of state and thus differs crucially from the dative verbs listed above, including *hjúkra* ‘nurse’. The accusative case assigned by *styrkja* ‘support’ is not surprising either since *styrkja* denotes a change of state in its basic sense (which is ‘strengthen’). In case of *aðstoða*, it seems plausible to assume that the prefix *-að* is responsible for the accusative object (cf. pairs like *gæta að e-u* ‘look out for sth-DAT’ vs. *aðgæta e-ð* ‘look out for sth-ACC’).

I believe that a true understanding of how dative objects work in Icelandic can only be achieved by carefully examining the aspectual properties of transitive verbs in the spirit of Svenonius (2002). As he illustrates, a lexical decomposition analysis of the event structure can explain why some motion verbs take accusative objects even if most verbs of motion govern dative case (e.g. all verbs of ballistic motion). In my talk, I will discuss various classes of verbs taking dative objects to show how to account for many “minimal” case pairs provided by Maling (2002) with an eye at refining and extending the analysis of Svenonius (2002).

Jelena Krivokapić

Putting things into perspective - the function of the dative

Mittwoch/Wednesday: 17:00

I provide a formally explicit analysis of the semantic contribution of the dative in Serbo-Croat for a construction which has received little attention in the literature. The construction is exemplified by (1), where the dative phrase appears in addition to the subject of predication; compare with (2):

- (1) Tanja je Marku lepa
 Tanja.NOM be.3sg Marko.DAT pretty.f.sg.NOM
 Tanja is pretty to Marko.
- (2) Tanja je lepa
 Tanja.NOM be.3sg pretty.f.sg.NOM
 Tanja is pretty

In Serbo-Croat, the dative DP is possible with all adjectives which can appear in predicative position as in (2). The sentence in (1) means that from *Marko's* point of view, *Tanja* is pretty. Sentence (2) makes a more general claim about *Tanja's* prettiness, the speaker assumes that she is pretty by generally accepted standards.

I implement my proposal within the framework of Kennedy's (1999) theory of the semantics of adjectives. Assuming an ontology of degrees, Kennedy treats adjectives as denoting functions from objects to degrees, where the set of degrees is a linearly ordered set. The idea is that an adjective orders objects along a scale of degrees depending on how much of the property expressed by the adjective they have. One of the degrees on the scale is the standard value. For example, for the adjective *tall* there is a particular standard value, say 1.80m for a human male, and anyone who is 1.80m or above is considered tall.

In order to determine the truth of a sentence like (2), the mapping of objects to degrees is also relevant. Mapping of objects to degrees is universal for adjectives like *tall* but much less so for adjectives like *pretty*: while different people will not disagree on whether John is taller than Peter, they might disagree as to who is prettier.

Both in (1) and in (2) there is a particular degree which acts as the standard value. Both sentences also have a certain mapping of objects to degrees on the scale of the adjective. I argue that the difference between the sentences (1) and (2) is in what determines the standard value and in what determines how objects are mapped onto the scale of the adjective. This difference is accounted for by generating the dative DP in Spec,DegP. I suggest that there the dative DP performs two distinct operations: it determines the mapping of objects onto the degrees on the scale of the adjective and it sets the standard value. So (1) means that *Tanja* is pretty from the point of view of the dative phrase: it is the dative phrase which determines how objects are mapped onto the scale, and it is the dative phrase that determines which degree is the standard value. So the dative relativizes the meaning of the adjective to the particular point of view of the referent of the dative phrase.

When there is no dative phrase, as in (2), *pro* is generated in Spec,DegP and it performs the same two operations as the dative. It is interpreted as the universal quantifier (following Epstein (1984), who proposes this for control constructions) and as a result, sentence (2) has the interpretation of a general observation.

This analysis is formally integrated into the semantics of Kennedy's degree morpheme (as defined in Kennedy (1999)).

 Thomas McFadden

A structural view of inherent dative case in German
Mittwoch/Wednesday: 16:30

According to the standard generative account, inherent Case-marked DPs in languages like German are distinguished from normal direct objects in being assigned Case not via the structural configuration in which they occur, but via an idiosyncratic morphological feature on the lexical verb. Thus unlike structural accusative Case, which is subject to Burzio's Generalization, inherent Case is unaffected by passivization, and inherent objects fail to become subjects. However, an account in which inherent objects are solely characterized by special assignment of morphological case has three shortcomings. First, if assigning inherent Case were merely an idiosyncratic lexical feature, it could in principle be randomly distributed across the set of transitive verbs. Yet it has been repeatedly shown there are clear patterns in the semantics of verbs that assign dative to their sole objects, both within and across languages. Attempts to accommodate this by stipulating links between m-cases and $_$ -roles have yielded largely unsatisfactory results. Second, getting the syntactic operation of promotion to subject to depend on m-case runs into serious empirical and theoretical difficulties. In particular, as has been shown in much recent work, m-case is actually independent of the DP-licensing condition – known as syntactic Case – which is responsible for triggering and constraining A-movement. Indeed, in a number of languages like Icelandic, dative-marked arguments can indeed become subjects. Saying that Icelandic case is 'quirky' while German case is 'inherent' is not so much an explanation of this difference as an admission that something deeper than case is at work. Third, the standard story does not properly account for the extensive parallels between inherent datives and indirect objects. In addition to being marked dative and being ineligible as subjects in the normal passive, objects of verbs like *helfen* and IOs of verbs like *geben*, unlike DOs, can become the subject of the so-called recipient passive, cannot control resultative secondary predication, cannot be mapped to the genitive with nominalizations, cannot productively appear in synthetic compounds and cannot undergo topic drop. Crucially, these properties cannot be due to case assignment via a lexical feature. The dative case assigned to German IOs is productive and predictable, thus it would be redundant and misleading to stipulate it in the lexical entry for double object verbs. I therefore propose that we should also reconsider stipulating it in the entry for verbs like *helfen*, and that we should instead look for a better explanation for the parallelism between the objects of the two verb classes. In this vein, I will argue that inherent datives are **structurally** like IOs and unlike DOs, and that it is the structure that is responsible for the morphological, syntactic and semantic patterns noted above. Just as it can be shown that there are two structurally distinct classes of double object verbs in German (DAT-ACC like *kaufen* 'buy (s.o. s.t.)' and ACC-DAT like *aussetzen* 'expose to', so it can be shown that there are two analogous classes of inherent dative verbs. On the one hand, I will argue that verbs like *folgen* 'follow' and *ausweichen* 'evade' are structurally like *aussetzen*, but lacking an overt DO. Specifically, the dative argument in these verb classes is in an underlying PP. This accounts for the fact that verbs like *folgen* take the auxiliary *sein*, since they are actually intransitive verbs of motion with PP complements rather than transitives. On the other hand, I will argue that verbs like *helfen* are structurally like *kaufen*, but again without an overt DO. Direct support for this comes from verbs like *raten* 'advise' and *glauben* 'believe', which can appear as either double object or inherent dative verbs, with the presence or absence of a direct object having no effect on the morphological, syntactic or semantic properties of the dative argument (cf. *'Er glaubt seinem Bruder'* vs. *'Er glaubt seinem Bruder die*

Geschichte'). I will show that, coupled with recent ideas about the syntactic representation of argument structure, the analyses proposed here can account for the semantic patterns in both classes of inherent dative verbs. The proposed theory derives the observed thematic generalizations for the relevant argument types, including the previously problematic fact that they are semantically rough and prone to exceptions.

Andrew McIntyre

The German dative: Decomposition with HAVE vs. the animacy myth

Mittwoch/Wednesday: 17:30

German has two types of datives: high datives (base-merged between agents and themes), and low datives (lower than themes). (1) is said to show that the contrast is epiphenomenal to a stipulation ordering animates before inanimates, but a wider data set shows that what is crucial is not animacy but whether the dative can *have* the accusative. Hence, the datives in the German for *give a song a name, assign a noun a gender* are high (since songs/nouns *have* names/genders) while the datives glossing the *to*-PPs in *liken linguists to priests, expose children to danger* are low, seeing they do not *have* the direct objects. English indirect objects correspond to high datives in this respect.

- (1) a. sie entzogen der Mutter das Sorgerecht [High dative]
 they withdrew the mother^{dat} the custody^{acc} ('they withdrew the mother's custody')
- b. sie entzogen das Kind der Gefahr [Low dative]
 they withdrew the child^{acc} the danger^{dat} ('they saved the child from the danger')

Conceptual parallels between high datives and subjects of *have* extend to 'free' datives like (2). These are often seen as mere possessors of a c-commanded entity, but this idea runs aground with some beneficiary datives. I propose that the dative in such cases relates to the event in the same way as the subject of so-called 'expericencer' *have* does, cf. the lower gloss in (2). I note some constraints which apply equally to free datives and English 'expericencer' *have*.

- (2) weil einem Mann ein Sohn weggelaufen/gestorben ist
 since a man^{dat} a son^{nom} away.run/died is
 'since a man had a son run away/die'

To capture the parallels between high datives and *have*-subjects, I treat high datives (and English indirect objects) as specifiers of a head I call V^{dative} which is semantically identical to *have*. V^{dative} takes either DP or VP complements. It cannot select the agentive-licensing shell. The net result is that high datives are always lower than agents and higher than themes. V^{dat} inherently assigns dative to its specifier. We thus predict pre-nominative datives like (2) (which are arguably shortchanged by theories treating dative as a linker of intermediate arguments).

High dative sentences have agentless paraphrases with allegedly 'passive' uses of *bekommen* 'get', cf. (1a) and (3). The 'passive' theory of these paraphrases is often used in affirming the existence of structural dative in German, but I dispute the passive analysis. The English gloss in (3) shows that *get* can generate the same sentences, although English has no DP from which the subject of *get* could have been promoted (**they withdrew her the custody*). Time permitting, I suggest that a theory which pays heed to the fact that *bekommen/get* are

inchoatives of *have* coupled with a theory of the aspectual semantics of resultative/passive participles is able to generate these sentences without any need for the mechanisms which have been proposed for converting dative to nominative.

- (3) die Mutter bekam das Sorgerecht entzogen
'the mother got her custody rights withdrawn'.

Low datives are seen as an instance of semantic case residual use of a formerly broader goal semantics of the dative. There are three main uses, two of which have correspondents in the semantics of English *to* and one of which is a PP-internal dative assigned by an incorporated preposition. See under www.uni-leipzig.de/~angling/mcintyre for the manuscript corresponding to the talk.

Heide Wegener

**Lexikalische und strukturelle Dative im Deutschen,
produktive und unproduktive Muster**

Mittwoch/Wednesday: 18:00

Im Vortrag soll untersucht werden, welche der verschiedenen Konstruktionstypen mit einem Dativ produktiv sind und welche nicht. Im Anschluss daran soll geprüft werden, ob die (Nicht)Produktivität bestimmter Muster Evidenz für die Annahme liefert, dass syntaktische Grundfunktion des Dativs die Erhöhung der Valenz unter Wahrung struktureller Restriktionen ist.