

All datives originate low: direct and indirect evidence

Dimitris Michelioudakis (dm419@cam.ac.uk), University of Cambridge

1. This paper aims to connect three interrelated issues regarding the syntax of dative arguments, namely, (a) the variability of their positioning, (b) their visibility to Agree/Move and (c) the agreement restrictions they induce. The central claim is that all dative arguments, as possibly all non-core arguments (except external arguments) are first-merged within the maximal projection of Root much like direct objects, rather than in Specs of special (applicative etc.) heads. The first merged positions of internal arguments can be compatible with a strict universal thematic hierarchy, possibly Baker's (1988, 1997) Uniform Theta-Assignment Hypothesis, i.e. a hierarchy such as agent/cause > experiencer > theme/patient > goal/location/path. All variation with respect to (a-c), then, stems from the interplay of the thematic position and the precise nature of the Case feature of the non-core argument.

2. Hellenistic Greek (HG) seems to offer direct empirical evidence about datives originating low and crucially about how the above issues may correlate; first, all datives are arguably spelt-out in their first-merged positions and there is no evidence for applicatives: (i) anaphoric binding by DO into IO is possible but not vice-versa (1), (ii) passivisation of DO is completely unproblematic, while indirect passives are impossible at this stage (but see Anagnostopoulou & Sevdali 2010 for indirect passives in Classical Greek), (iii) nominalised ditransitives with dative DPs are allowed (2) –cf. the incompatibility of nominalisation with zero-derivational morphemes such as Appl, see Anagnostopoulou 2003. Second, raising/Agree across datives is perfectly grammatical (3) and, finally, there are no (strong) PCC effects (see A(dger) & H(arbour) 2007 for PCC with dative DPs) (4).

(1) *po:s oun he: theos [...] tous agnooumenous edeiksen alle:lois lekso:*
how so the goddess [...] the missing showed.3S each-other.DAT tell.1S.FUT

‘So now I’ll tell you how the goddess revealed the two missing heroes to each other’

(2) *hopo:s aidios he: tou elaiou dosis to:i gymnasio:i diamine:i*
so-that permanent the the.GEN oil.GEN supply the.DAT gymnasium.DAT remain.SUBJ

‘(an order) that the supply of oil to the gymnasium remains everlasting’ (IG V.1 1208; SEG 13.258)

(3) *pro dokoumen men gar auto:i haptesthai ekeino:n*
pro.1P seem.1P therefore him.DAT touch.INF those.GEN

‘we therefore seem to him to be touching those’ (Themistius, *Arist. de anima*, 5,3.75.8)

(4) *Thale:s me to:i medeunti Neileo: de:mou dido:si* (Hellenistic Greek)

Thales me.acc.cl the watching-over (god).dat Nileos.gen state.gen gives

‘Thales devoted me to the god that protects the people of Nileos’ (*Callim.* Th 52)

The way these properties cluster together may be attributed to the presence of a fully LF-interpretable (i.e. completely theta-related) Case feature on dative DPs, which renders them inactive for Agree/Move (which also implies that given (4), the strong PCC requires ‘dative’ DPs/pronouns with active Case –see below).

3. The implication of the above is that in a system with low datives, datives must also be unmovable and invisible for Agree, the reason being the fully interpretable nature of their Case feature (the only kind of Case that can ‘survive’ in a position inaccessible to any phi-probes). Although it would be conceivable to have high ‘dative’ DPs with purely inherent Case, empirically this is not supported, at least in Greek: in varieties with ‘shifted’ IOs (i.e. in an A-position c-commanding DO), datives cause minimality effects in non-active environments. Such minimality effects are in part due to configurational reasons (high IOs intervene in direct passives, while low IOs don’t) but this should not be enough if we are to account for the absence of minimality effects in raising/unaccusative contexts in HG (where DAT experiencers do intervene between T and NOM). The simplest assumption would be to relativise minimality to Case features in such cases, i.e. to assume that datives with purely

inherent Case do not even count as defective interveners, defective intervention being the property of active features previously matched and deleted in the course of the derivation. Therefore, shifted IOs also need an active feature in order to qualify as interveners. In languages like English, such an active feature would be the DP's structural Case feature; however, in languages with apparently inherently Case-marked dative DPs, we are forced to postulate some special type of complex inherent, theta-related Case features, which for some reason appear to be syntactically active, i.e. available for (in fact, *in need of*) further (probing and) valuation, and deletion of their unvalued/uninterpretable part (in line with recent approaches to theta-related Case, e.g. Chomsky 2000, Rezac 2008), without necessarily linking such 'quirky' Case features to quirky subjecthood.

4. Another interesting correlation is the one between the strong PCC and the presence of dative alternations; HG, where the strong PCC was not operative, lacked prepositional IOs (in fact PP arguments altogether). Taking into account the distinctive properties of the double object construction (the animacy restriction, as well as any –varying– entailments about the affectedness and the sentience of IO_{DP}), one may derive the PCC precisely from an uninterpretable feature that probes IO_{DP} to guarantee that it can fulfil these requirements; such a feature would correspond to A & H's (2007) [\pm Participant] and the PCC would result from the fact that no DO able to match this feature should intervene between the probe and the 'dative', otherwise the latter's active Case could not get de-activated. This probing feature is carried by a head which is arguably missing in the prepositional/low dative constructions, e.g. Appl. Thus, Appl heads do exist (given also their overt realization in a number of languages), but instead of introducing arguments they simply attract them to their Spec to make them accessible to higher phi-probes, which can match and delete the uninterpretable component of their Case. Further, indirect, evidence for such a configuration (rather than A&H's one), i.e. first-merged theme>dative, comes from the very similar person restrictions on the embedded theme in the presence of a dative transitive causee in Romance 'faire-infinitive' constructions; there, the dative causee is arguably licensed by some equivalent of Appl in the matrix TP (perhaps *fare*), but the (raised) DO intervenes giving rise to the PCC-effects in (5). No account based on ϕ -feature competition in the embedded InfP can be shown to be viable, due to configurational reasons. The same restriction does not apply to 1st/2nd IOs of the embedded infinitival, exactly because these do not (A-)move above the causee, as Kayne (1975) has shown (although they can marginally climb to the matrix verb when they are clitics, i.e. in the same clitic cluster as the causee clitic (6)).

(5) *Gli m' hai fatto lavare / ?*Ti faccio lavare a Maria (Italian)

'You made/let him wash me / I make/let Maria wash you'

(6) Mi gli hai fatto dare un libro / Mi gliel' hai fatto dare a Gianni

'You made/let me give it/a book to him/to John'

5. This leaves open the question of how DO in the double-object construction values its structural Case, if the moved IO-DP intervenes between it and v*. We will assume that Voice is the real phase head, which transmits (via inheritance) its phi-features, along with its Case-assigning capacity, to two v-heads, one above and one below Appl, one for each internal argument. This configuration also allows us to account for the fact that stressed 1st/2nd direct object pronouns are exempted from the PCC: these can be shown to always undergo some (at least short) focus-movement; this circumvents the DO's intervention, which must be thought of as defective, since DO's Case is valued before Appl is merged.

Selected References: ADGER, D & D. HARBOUR. (2007). "The syntax and syncretisms of the person case constraint". *Syntax* 10:2-37. ANAGNOSTOPOULOU, E. (2003). *The Syntax of Ditransitives. Evidence from Clitics*. Berlin-New York: Mouton de Gruyter. CHOMSKY, N. (2000). "Minimalist inquiries: The framework". In *Step by step: Essays on Minimalist syntax in honor of Howard Lasnik*, ed. R. Martin, D. Michaels, and J. Uriagereka, 89-156. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press. KAYNE, R. (1975). *French Syntax. The Transformation Cycle*. Cambridge: Mass.: The MIT Press.