

## On datives between P and Appl

Nora Boneh & Léa Nash

HUJI / Paris 8, UMR 7023

**BACKGROUND AND CLAIM.** Dative arguments present a challenge to argument realization models for two intertwined reasons: (i) the third argument of ditransitive constructions is not uniformly marked cross-linguistically, warranting two underlying structures, representational or derivational; (ii) in many languages, here we will focus on Russian, the third argument of ditransitive constructions (*send*), an optional argument of transitive constructions (*break*), and an obligatory inner argument of intransitive constructions (*surrender*) are identically marked, blurring a clear division between selected and non-selected arguments within one language or cross-linguistically. Russian is an interesting case, as a large number of canonical ditransitive verbs (cf. Gropen *et al.*'s 89 classifications) appearing with morphologically marked dative arguments present a semantic and syntactic ambiguity:

(1) Ivan poslal/vernul Maše pis'mo i. 'Ivan sent/returned a letter to Masha.'

Ivan sent/returned Masha.DAT letter.ACC ii. 'Ivan sent out/returned a letter for/instead of Masha.'

Based on the behavior of Russian dative arguments in eventive constructions, we propose the following view of ditransitive constructions and dative case: there are two underlying structures featuring dative marked DPs (cf. Miyagawa & Tsujioka 04). In one, the dative DP serves as the building block of the event-skeleton of caused-motion predicates (cf. Larson 88 a.o.): it is part of a PP headed by a null preposition (cf. den Dikken 06), which semantically encodes the reference point on a (un)bounded complex or simplex path scale (Hay et al. 99, Beavers 11) and forms a complex predicate with V, sharing the figure/theme argument (2a). In the other, the dative DP is not part of any specific scalar structure, and is introduced by an applicative head (cf. Bruening 10 et seq.) freely added to VPs with any of the possible scalar structures: extent, path, property (Hay et al. 99).

(2) a. [<sub>v</sub>P DP<sub>agent</sub> v [VP DP<sub>ACC</sub> V [PP P<sub>∅</sub> P<sub>DAT</sub>]]]

b. [<sub>v</sub>P DP<sub>agent</sub> v [AppIP P<sub>DAT</sub> Appl [VP ... V DP<sub>ACC</sub> / DP<sub>ACC</sub> V (PP)...]]]

We assume that the morphological identity of the two datives is due to the similar coding of P and Appl (cf. Wood & Marantz 15), where both heads are null and introduce an animate DP. These differ as to the directionality of selection (cf. Wood 13) with non-trivial repercussions on the event structure. While *the lower null head* merges with an animate complement and is selected by V, like a traditional directional P (cf. Svenonius 06, Gehrke 08), *the higher null head* merges with a scale-denoting VP including the object DP, and introduces in its specifier an animate DP. We will show that this higher null head, Appl, can only be added to VPs that further expand via an additional external argument introducing head. In this sense, only high datives are sensitive to the structural presence of Agent and Theme in eventive predicates and hence count as a *third* argument. The reason underlying this restriction on high datives is to be sought in the parallelism between Appl and the licenser of external arguments, be it v or Voice. We sustain, following Wood & Marantz (15), that argument introducers obtain their properties (as Appl or v/Voice) in the syntactic context and not through intrinsic lexical meaning. Two types of evidence are adduced to strengthen our claims: (A) the syntactic height of dative argument attachment correlates systematically with meaning differences, and (B) high datives can only occur with bi-argument predicates, while low datives can also be found in *intransitive* structures, where either Agent *or* Theme is syntactically realized.

**A. HEIGHT OF ATTACHMENT AFFECTS INTERPRETATION.** Many ditransitive verbs present systematic symmetric binding patterns, showing meaning differences as those exemplified in (1). The DAT can be interpreted as a beneficiary when it is the binder, but this reading is unavailable with ACC as a binder (cf. translations of 3-4).

(3) sud'ba poslala (a) etix soldat drug drugu / (b) drug drugu etix soldat  
fate sent these soldiers.ACC each other.DAT / each other.DAT these soldiers.ACC  
'Fate sent the soldiers to each other.'

(4) sud'ba poslala (a) etim soldatam drug druga / (b) drug druga etim soldatam  
fate sent these soldiers.DAT each other.ACC / each other.ACC these soldiers.DAT  
'Fate sent these soldiers each other/Fate sent these soldiers for each other (to some destination).'

Note that binding patterns are not altered by scrambling, triggered in the (b) examples by discourse operations such as foregrounding of the focused anaphor or right dislocation of the focused binder. Thus VP-internal scrambling does not feed A-binding and counts as an A-bar operation (contra Bailyn 10 et seq.). This view of scrambling and binding patterns correlated with interpretation is strengthened when considering nominalizations. Bene-/maleficiary arguments, which we claim to be introduced by Appl (2b), are not customarily attested, (5), (Kayne 84, Bruening 10).

(5) \*razrušenie domov vragam  
destruction houses.GEN enemies.DAT *intended*: '(the) destruction of the houses for/on the enemy'  
Yet, datives can appear in nominalizations, with a path reading only, (6). As expected, only GEN(=theme)>DAT pattern is attested in such cases, (7), and scrambling, freely available in nominalizations, does not undo binding patterns (8):

(6) otpravenie / vozvrašćenie posylki Nina  
sending / returning package.GEN Nina.DAT 'sending/returning of the package to Nina.'  
*Unavailable reading*: the sending/returning of the package for Nina, cf. (1).

(7) otpravenie / vozvrašćenie { lubimyx drug drugu / \*lubimym drug druga }  
sending / returning lovers.GEN each other.DAT / lovers.DAT each.other.GEN  
'the sending/returning of lovers to each other'

(8) otpravenie / vozvrašćenie { drug drugu etix lubimyx / \*drug druga etim lubimym }

Additional evidence for the ambiguity of (1) comes from configurations where DAT co-occurs with a path PP. Ex. (9) only allows the beneficiary reading for the dative and the DAT>ACC binding pattern.

(9) Ja ne otpravlju { etim oficeram drug druga / \*etix oficerov drug drugu } na opasnuju operaciju  
I not will.send these officers.DAT e.o.ACC / these officers.ACC e.o.DAT on dangerous operation  
'I will not send these officers to a dangerous operation for each other's benefit.'

Finally, only the binding pattern DAT>ACC and a bene-/maleficiary reading for the dative is available when it occurs with predicates expressing property scales (i.e. change of state verbs):

(10) Ja rasmešil / nakormil { mal'čikam drug druga / \*mal'čikov drug drugu }  
I made-laugh / fed boys.DAT each other.ACC / boys.ACC each other.DAT  
'I made the boys laugh for each other.' 'I fed the boys for each other.'

**B. NUMBER OF ARGUMENTS AFFECTS DATIVE HEIGHT.** Two additional pieces of evidence which tie path readings of datives with their low structural source come from syntactic environments involving reduced argument realizations: (i) VPs lacking an external argument such as unaccusatives (11), and (ii) VPs lacking the internal argument, such as monovalent agentive predicates with *-sja* (12).

(i) Unaccusatives pattern like nominalizations in allowing only low datives with path reading and disallowing high datives with a beneficiary interpretation in change of state unaccusatives.

(11) a. vskipelo moloko (\*Nine) b. ček vernulsja Nina  
boiled milk.NOM (Nina.DAT) cheque.NOM returned Nina.DAT  
*Intended*: 'The milk boiled on/for Nina.' *Only reading*: 'The cheque came back to Nina.'

Following Wood & Marantz (15), we maintain that if an argument introducing head (here, Appl) selects a VP with unsaturated external argument it must license *that* argument in the absence of the higher head of the same type. To wit, high applicatives with a bene-/maleficiary interpretation are attested with passives and middles, where the external argument is not syntactically absent.

(ii) A number of Russian agentive verbs with *-sja* take a dative argument, necessarily interpreted as a goal.

(12) a. *sdat'sja vragu* (surrender enemy.DAT); b. *poddat'sja soblaznu* (surrender temptation.DAT);  
c. *otrkyt'sja psixologu* (confess [lit. open up] psychologist.DAT); d. *protivit'sja soldatu* (resist soldier.DAT); e. *podchiniat'sja vlasti* (obey power.DAT)

We show that these verbs are akin to Icelandic "fake" figure reflexive *-st* predicates (Wood 14), where a V selects the path PP and the VP combines with an external Agent argument, also understood as the figure with respect to the PP. The affix *-st/-sja* is taken to function as an expletive that semantically conveys the figure-hood of the agent but does not count as a true internal argument. Predicates in (12) are to be contrasted with a restricted number of *-sja* agentive reflexives where *-sja* does have an argument status co-indexed with the agent, such as *pomyt'sja* (wash oneself), *narjadit'sja* (dress up oneself). Unlike the latter, whose meaning is strictly compositional, predicates in (12) often have an idiosyncratic meaning (e.g. (12c)) and sometimes lack a corresponding transitive predicate (e.g. (12d) is not derived from \**protivit'*). As predicted, when syntactically bi-argumental *-sja* predicates occur with optional datives (13), only the beneficiary reading is available, strengthening the correlation between the number of projected arguments and the structural source of the dative argument.

(13) Nina narjadila-s' detiam Santoj  
Nina dressed-self children.DAT Santa.INSTR 'Nina dressed herself as Santa for children'

**CONSEQUENCES: POSSESSION.** Dative arguments are generally understood as possessors, regardless their hierarchy (e.g. Levin 08). Our take is that possession doesn't have a unique structural source (cf. Boneh & Sichel 10). A low dative is interpreted as a possessor due to a transfer construal structurally represented by V-P complex predicate, and a high dative is interpreted as a possessor without a transfer construal (cf. Beavers 11) as this interpretation represents a subclass of bene-/maleficiary readings.