

OPAQUE AND TRANSPARENT DATIVES, AND HOW THEY BEHAVE IN PASSIVES

Artemis Alexiadou, Elena Anagnostopoulou & Christina Sevdali

Universität Stuttgart, University of Crete, and University of Ulster

To appear in *The Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 2014.

Alexiadou: Universität Stuttgart, Institute of English Linguistics

Keplerstr. 17, 70174 Stuttgart, Germany

artemis@ifla.uni-stuttgart.de

Phone: +49-711-6858321

Fax: +49-711-68583122

Anagnostopoulou: University of Crete, Department of Philology, Linguistics Division

74100 Rethymno, Greece

elena@phl.uoc.gr

Phone: +30-28310-77277

Fax: +30-2831-77304

Sevdali: University of Ulster, School of Communication/Institute for Research in Social
Sciences

Shore Road Newtownabbey Co. Antrim BT37 0QB, UK

c.sevdali@ulster.ac.uk

Phone: + 44 28 90366402

Abstract

In this paper, we provide evidence based on Case alternations in passives in favor of the view that dative is a mixed Case. Dative, but also other cases, has the property of being either inherent/lexical or structural.

We propose an analysis of datives aiming to account for their mixed status within and across languages. Building on Řezáč's (2008) theory of opacity vs. transparency of theta-related Case to Agree, combined with a (modified) theory of Case alternations in terms of m(orphological)-case (Marantz 1991), we propose that dative arguments are PPs, unlike accusatives which are DPs. Being complements of the phasal head P, dative DPs are invisible to an outside probe, Voice or T, for Agree. Under certain conditions, however, they become visible: either when a phi-probe is present on P probing and transmitting the features of the DP embedded below it or when P incorporates into the Voice-v complex lifting the phasehood of the PP. We argue that the actual distribution of m-cases in actives and passives of languages with alternating datives is determined at the PF component, subject to the case-realization disjunctive hierarchy proposed by Marantz (1991). A dative argument entering Agree qualifies as having 'dependent case' in the sense of Marantz (1991) and not as having "lexically governed case". Finally, we propose that crosslinguistic differences concerning the environments where dative alternations happen (passives vs. middles) depends on the head where the phi-probe entering Agree with dative DPs is located: Voice or v.

Keywords: datives, passive, opacity, transparency, dependent case.

OPAQUE AND TRANSPARENT DATIVES, AND HOW THEY BEHAVE IN PASSIVES

1. Introduction

The goal of this paper is to investigate the conditions under which dative-nominative alternations take place across languages and across constructions and to discuss the implications of this variation for the characterization of dative Case. To this end, we will compare instances of dative-nominative alternations attested in Ancient Greek, Japanese, and Icelandic with dative-nominative alternations in *bekommen/krijgen* passives in Dutch and different varieties of German. We will identify three parameters of variation: (i) The syntactic environments where dative-nominative alternations take place, i.e. whether alternations are limited to ditransitives or they also occur in monotonatives. (ii) The extent to which all dative arguments can become nominatives under passivization. (iii) The extent to which dative-nominative alternations depend on the overall organization of the Voice systems of the languages under discussion. We will argue that this variation provides evidence for the view that dative has the defining property of being either inherent/lexical or structural (see also Harley 1995, Ishizuka 2012 for Japanese, Webelhuth 1995, Fanselow 2000 for German passives, Alexiadou, Anagnostopoulou & Sevdali 2011 for Icelandic dative DOs vs. dative IOs, Anagnostopoulou & Sevdali 2012 for datives (and genitives) in Ancient Greek). As a cross-linguistic comparison of this scale has not been previously undertaken in the literature, our paper contributes to the overall debate on the status of datives,¹ by proposing that there

¹ The proper characterization of dative Case is a long-standing issue. The main reason for this is the diversity in the morpho-syntactic behavior of datives across and within languages. In addition to the mixed approaches, two other views have been expressed in the literature, which, however concentrated on individual constructions in individual languages: (a) In one set of cases, dative has been characterized as inherent or lexical Case which is syntactically inactive/inert (see e.g. Haider 1985, Chomsky 1986, McFadden 2004, McGinnis 2002 Woolford

are three types of languages:

(i) *Uniform languages where dative is never structural Case*, and dative-nominative alternations never take place. Many languages fall under this type, among them e.g. Modern Greek (Anagnostopoulou 2003) and Russian (Pesetsky & Torrego, to appear). We will not exemplify and discuss these languages here.

(ii) *Mixed languages with a ditransitive vs. monotransitive asymmetry*. There are mixed languages where dative qualifies as structural in some environments and as inherent case in others. Descriptively, this split correlates with productivity/regularity vs. idiosyncrasy in the use of dative: the more productive and regular a dative Case is the more likely it is to alternate. In mixed dative languages of this type, inherent datives canonically marking goal, benefactive, affected IOs in ditransitives are alternating while lexical datives idiosyncratically marking DOs in monotransitives are not. Languages belonging to this type are dialects of Dutch and German (and, for different reasons, Icelandic).

(iii) *Mixed languages with no ditransitive vs. monotransitive asymmetry*. Finally, there is a third type of language in which alternations happen both in ditransitives and in monotransitives. Ancient Greek is such a language, and also Japanese as well as certain dialects of German. But even in languages with a generalized dative-nominative alternation in

2006). Inherent dative is associated with a particular set of theta roles, goal, beneficiary, possessor, affected argument, which typically characterize indirect objects (IOs) in ditransitives, see also Primus (1999). Lexical dative appears on direct objects (DOs) of monotransitive verbs and seems to be idiosyncratically determined by the selecting verb (along with other cases). Following Woolford (2006), we take inherent and lexical Cases to be distinct and subject to different licensing conditions: inherent Case is thematically licensed while lexical Case is idiosyncratically determined. (b) The second type of dative, which has attracted a lot of attention in the literature, is instantiated by, so called, quirky datives. Similarly to inherent and lexical datives, quirky datives are associated with a particular set of theta-roles or they are idiosyncratically determined by the selecting verbs. Like inherent and lexical datives, quirky datives do not become nominative in NP-movement environments (passives, unaccusatives). Crucially, though, quirky datives are *syntactically active*, i.e. they are capable of undergoing NP-movement to Spec,TP, qualifying as subjects with respect to all subject-hood diagnostics (in e.g. Icelandic, see Zaenen, Maling and Thráinsson 1985 and many others following them). Other languages that have been argued to have quirky datives include Greek (Anagnostopoulou 1999), Spanish (Masullo 1992), Italian (Belletti & Rizzi 1988), and older stages of English and Romance (Fischer 2008).

both monotransitives and ditransitives, there is evidence that they still possess non-structural datives. In Ancient Greek, the dative or genitive case assigned to certain types of objects of monotransitive verbs does not alternate, and the same holds for Japanese and those dialects of German that, in principle, allow dative-nominative alternations in monotransitives.

Crucially, it never seems to be the case that dative qualifies as structural/alternating in all contexts: it either never alternates (in group (i) languages) or qualifies as a mixed Case (in group (ii) and (iii) languages). We provide an answer to the question of what it means for dative to be a “mixed Case” based on Řezáč’s (2008) theory of opacity vs. transparency of theta-related Case to Agree.² Řezáč (2008) argues on the basis of different patterns of dative agreement in Basque dialects that dative arguments have a mixed status with respect to Agree: in some dialects, datives are not allowed to enter Agree while in others they do so, to varying degrees. In this paper, we offer evidence for the same conclusion from a different empirical domain, namely the variation we find in the patterns of Case alternations across languages and dialects. Following Bittner & Hale (1996), Řezáč (2008), and more recently Caha (2009), we propose that dative DP arguments are always embedded within a PP shell, unlike structural accusatives which are bare DPs. Being complements of P, dative DPs are often invisible to an outside probe, Voice or T, for Agree. Under certain conditions, however, dative DPs become visible. This happens either when P has a phi probe that enters Agree with the DP below it, transmitting the features of the DP outside the PP, as suggested by Řezáč (we do not further explore this possibility here), or when P incorporates into a higher verbal head, thus lifting the phase-hood of P, as proposed in Anagnostopoulou & Sevdali (2012) for Ancient Greek, in essence modifying and updating an old proposal by Baker (1988); see den

² We note, however, that this is a feature also shared with genitives in e.g. Ancient Greek, Icelandic, and also accusative in German.

Dikken (2007), Gallego (2005, 2010), Gallego, and Uriagereka (2006), Alexiadou, Anagnostopoulou & Wurmbrand (2013) for recent discussions on how movement of certain heads extends the phase to the higher projection. P-incorporation will also be an important tool in understanding why some languages (namely German dialects and Dutch) use special auxiliaries when datives become nominatives in passives.

We furthermore argue that the actual distribution of m-cases (dative, accusative, nominative) in actives and passives of languages with alternating datives is determined at the PF component, subject to the case-realization disjunctive hierarchy proposed by Marantz (1991). A dative argument entering Agree qualifies as having ‘dependent case’ in the sense of Marantz (1991) and not as having “lexically governed case”. Not being lexically governed cases, dependent (i.e. structural) datives are not preserved throughout the derivation and become nominative whenever the structural conditions for dependent case are not met.

While in this paper we concentrate on datives, the implications of our analysis are broader. As a similar behavior has been observed for genitives and even accusatives (see e.g. notes 2, 5 and 18 for structural/transparent genitives in Ancient Greek and Icelandic and note 13 for idiosyncratic/opaque accusatives in German), our analysis of datives can extend to these other cases as well, suggesting that the label dative, genitive, and perhaps even accusative is a misnomer, at least for the syntactic component.³ The real difference seems to be between elements that can enter Agree with a probe, DPs, and those that cannot, PPs. Case is then specified at the morphological component, but is irrelevant for the syntactic computation (in the spirit of Marantz 1991).

The paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we discuss alternating datives in

³ Thanks to Edwin Williams (personal communication) for pointing this out to us.

Ancient Greek, Japanese, dialects of German, and Dutch. All these languages work in essentially the same way; the main parameter of variation concerns the environments in which alternations take place, i.e. whether they are limited to ditransitives or they also take place in monotransitives. In section 3, we discuss Icelandic which presents an altogether different pattern of alternations, leading to the conclusion that a further parameter of variation depends on the organization of the verbal syntax of a particular language, expressed in terms of event decomposition: what types of dative arguments alternate (non-themes vs. themes) and in what kind of NP-movement constructions (passives vs. non-passives).⁴ In section 4, we present our analysis, which combines an analysis in the spirit of Řezáč's (2008) Agree theory of opaque vs. transparent datives with Marantz's (1991) m-case approach. We also propose that the difference between German/Dutch/Ancient Greek/Japanese, on the one hand, and Icelandic, on the other, depends on the head where the phi-probe entering Agree with dative DPs is located: Voice or v.

2. Dative-Nominative alternations across languages

2.1 Languages where datives become nominatives in passives in both monotransitives and ditransitives

2.1.1 Ancient Greek

⁴ As in middles in e.g. German dative case is preserved; we will not discuss middle constructions in the other languages in detail. We assume that dative behaves as an inherent case in middles in languages other than Icelandic.

In Ancient Greek, datives alternate with nominatives in both passives of ditransitives and in monotransitives (see Conti 1998 for extensive discussion of monotransitives; see Anagnostopoulou & Sevdali 2010, 2012 where the data presented below come from):⁵

Monotransitives:

- (1) a. Athe:naioi epibouleousin he:min Active
 Athenians.NOM betray.3 SG.PRES.ACT us.DAT
 ‘The Athenians are betraying us’
- b. He:meis hup’ Athe:naio:n epibouleometha Passive
 We.NOM by Athenians.GEN betray.1 PL.PRES.PASS

When a ditransitive verb takes an accusative and a dative object, both cases can turn into nominative under passivization. This is shown in (2) below:

Active of a ditransitive with an accusative and a dative:

- (2) a. Epitrepo: te:n phulake:n toisi
 Entrust.1SG.PRES.ACT the guard.ACC they.DAT
 ‘I entrust the guard to them’

⁵ As discussed in Anagnostopoulou & Sevdali (2012), a similar state of affairs is observed with genitives. Note that it can also be shown that both the dative and the accusative argument are allowed to become nominative with one and the same verb (Anagnostopoulou & Sevdali 2012). Compare (i) where the accusative alternates with nominative and the dative argument retains its case to example (2d) where the dative alternates with nominative and the accusative retains its case. Both examples contain the same verb *epitasso* ‘assign’.

i. Ho stratos epitachthe:s ekastosi
 The fleet.NOM assign.PASS.PARCL each.DAT.PL
 ‘The fleet (that was) assigned to each’ (Herodotus, *Historiae*: 95, 1)

*Passive of a ditransitive with an **accusative** and a **dative**:*

- b. *Toisi* *epetrpto* *he: phulake:*
They.DAT *entrust.3SG.PRES.PASS* *the guard.NOM*
‘The guard is entrusted to them’ (Herodotus, *Historia VII*, 10)

*Active of a ditransitive with an accusative and a **dative**:*

- c. *Allo* *ti* *meizon* *humin* *epitaksousin*
Something *else.ACC* *bigger.ACC* *you.DAT* *order.3PL.PRES.ACT*
‘They will order you to do something else bigger/greater’

*Passive of a ditransitive with an accusative and a **dative**:*

- d. *Allo ti* *meizon* *humeis* *epitachthe:sesthe*
Something else.ACC *bigger.ACC* *you.NOM* *order.2 PL.PRES.PASS*
‘You will be ordered to do something else, bigger.’
(Thucydides, *Historia I*: 140,5)

As pointed out by Conti (1998), not all Ancient Greek verbs selecting for dative objects form passives showing DAT-NOM alternations. There are aspectual and thematic restrictions: (i) stative and experiencer-subject verbs generally disallow the passive. (ii) Verbs selecting for comitative and locative dative objects (e.g. *eiko*: ‘distance oneself, avoid’,

dialegomai 'discuss') and ablative genitive objects do not form passives. The latter type of restriction suggests that dative and genitive in Ancient Greek has a mixed status, sometimes being structural and sometimes lexical/inherent.⁶

2.1.2 Japanese

In Japanese datives can encode a variety of thematic roles, see also Sadakane & Koizumi (1995). Importantly, Ishizuka (2012: 82) and Iwasaki (2002) report that in Japanese, the direct object of a substantial number of verbs is realized not as an accusative DP but as a dative DP, and these dative DPs can be raised to the nominative position in the passive. We illustrate this with *ni*-directional obliques, but Ishizuka shows that *kara*-source obliques can also become nominatives:⁷

⁶ See Conti (1998: 32-38) for a detailed discussion of these restrictions. According to Conti, conditions (i) and (ii) are not identical. The aspectual restrictions (i) show that the formation of passives displaying DAT-NOM and GEN-NOM alternations is dependent upon the subject controlling the action denoted by the verb. We take this characterization to describe an agentivity restriction. The thematic restrictions in (ii) are taken by Conti to derive from what could be called “an affectedness restriction”. Crucially, in the latter set of cases, the problem is not agentivity but rather whether or not the object has prototypical object properties as an undergoer or an affected argument. In Ancient Greek, datives and genitives could alternate with nominatives when they denoted animate or inanimate entities affected by the actions expressed by the verbs, while they did not alternate when they were not so affected. A further sub-case falling under the thematic restrictions (ii) concerns the relationship between the subject and the object. When the object was understood as a participant co-acting with the subject (as is the case of comitatives), then it did not alternate. In sum, according to Conti (1998: 38), alternating dative and genitive objects were “durch die Verbhandlung betroffen” (‘affected by the verb-action’) and “außerhalb der Sphäre des Subjekts” (‘outside the sphere of the subject’).

The editor asks whether the verbs falling under restrictions (i) and (ii) do not passivize at all or whether they do passivize, but without displaying DAT-NOM and GEN-NOM alternations. The answer to this question is not straightforward. Ancient Greek mainly possessed a Medio-passive Voice (see Anagnostopoulou & Sevdali 2012 for discussion and references) which had many more functions beyond that of a passive. According to Conti, the Medio-passive formed with the verbs in question rarely had a passive interpretation. And in the few cases when Medio-passive could be interpreted as a passive, the NOM argument surfacing as a syntactic subject did not have the same interpretation as the corresponding DAT or GEN object of the active.

⁷ We would like to thank an anonymous reviewer for his input concerning Japanese. As pointed out by this anonymous reviewer, it is interesting that comitatives and locatives are unable to alternate with nominatives in both Ancient Greek and Japanese (see below for Japanese). Ishizuka actually labels passives as in (3) ‘pseudo-passive’. The anonymous reviewer suggests that these cases could be analyzed as involving raising of the DP with a stranded but deleted P, essentially similar to so-called pseudo-passives in English, e.g. *This bed was slept in*. In section 4, we generalize this intuition to all cases of dative-nominative alternations discussed in the present paper. Thanks to Ellen Woolford (personal communication) for also raising the issue of similarity between our

Monotransitive

- (3) a. Naomiga Kenni kisu(-o) sita.
Naomi.NOM Ken.DAT kiss.(ACC) do.PST Active
‘Naomi kissed Ken.’
- b. Kenga Naomini kisu(-o) s-are-ta.
Ken.NOM Naomi.DAT kiss.(ACC) do.PASS.PST Passive
‘Ken was kissed by Naomi’

The *dative goal/recipient/addressee* argument of ditransitives can become nominative in passives (Larson 1988; Baker 1988; Hoffman 1991; Ura 1996; Miyagawa 1997; see Fukuda, to appear, Ishizuka 2012 for recent discussions and references):

Ditransitives

- (4) a. Naomiga Kenni labuletaao watasita. *Active*
Naomi.NOM Ken.DAT love.letter.ACC hand.PAST
‘Naomi handed Ken a love letter.’
- b. Kenga Naomini labuletaao watasareta. *Passive*
Ken.NOM Naomi.DAT love.letter.ACC hand.PASS.PAST
‘Ken was handed a love letter by Naomi.’ Ishizuka (2012: 81f.)

dative-nominative alternations, and pseudo-passivization in English.

As in Ancient Greek, not all datives can become nominatives; locative, comitative and benefactive *ni*-Ps, and instrumental and directional *de*-Ps do not alternate (in both ditransitives and monotransitives):

- (5) a. Hahaoyaga Naomi huku katta. *Active*
mother.NOM Naomi.DAT clothes.ACC buy.PST
 ‘Mother bought Naomi the dress.’
- b. ??Naomiga hahaoyani huku kawareta. *Passive*
Naomi.NOM mother.DAT clothes.ACC buy.PASS.PST
 Int. ‘Naomi was bought the dress by her mother.’

Ishizuka takes this distribution to suggest either i) that dative PPs come in **two** different categories, Case and full-fledged ones, and only the complement of the former can undergo passivization, or ii) that this behavior relates to the structural height of P-attachment, and only low PPs can alternate.

2.1.3 Luxemburg German

Lenz (2011) reports that in Luxemburg German, datives can become nominatives in passives of both monotransitives and ditransitives. In this dialect, the dative cannot be ‘promoted’ to subject in passives formed with the auxiliary ‘*werden*’, but only with the auxiliary *kréien* ‘*kriegen*’ (*get*).⁸

⁸ We are aware of the fact that, in the literature on Standard German, the status of this passive has been debated, an issue we will come back to in the next section (see Wegener 1985; Reis 1985; Fanselow 1987; Webelhuth and Ackerman 1994, Zifonun & al. 1997). However, as Lenz argues, the status of this passive is uncontroversial in

Monotransitives

(6) De Mann kritt gedroot

The man gets threatened

Other dialects that allow the passive with monotransitives are those of the West Middle area (Rhine-Franconian/Mosel dialects) (see Lenz 2011; Leirbukt 1997 for discussion; Lenz 2013 states that the core area of this passive is the area of West German regiolects):

(7) Sie bekommt geholfen

(Leirbukt 1997)

She gets helped

Ditransitives

(8) Hie kritt eng Planz geschenkt

He gets a plant given

2.2 Languages where datives become nominatives in passives of ditransitives only: Standard German and Dutch

Ditransitive predicates in German have four distinct realizations that differ in the morphological marking of the direct and indirect object as well as the “unmarked linearization” of the two

Luxembourg German. In section 2.3., we will address the status of this passive in German and Dutch.

objects (Lenerz 1977; Höhle 1982; Fanselow 1991, 2000; Haider 1993; Sternefeld 2006). The four patterns are schematically represented in (9) and exemplified in (10) (with data from Beermann 2001):

(9) *German argument linearization and morphological case in ditransitives*

- | | | | |
|----|-------------|----|-------------|
| a. | NOM>DAT>ACC | c. | NOM>ACC>ACC |
| b. | NOM>ACC>DAT | d. | NOM>ACC>GEN |

(10) a. Sie hat dem Mann das Buch geschenkt

She.NOM has the man.DAT the book.ACC given

‘She has given the man the book’

b. Er hat den Patienten der Operation unterzogen

He.NOM has the patient.ACC the operation.DAT submitted

‘He has submitted the patient to the operation’

c. Sie hat die Schüler das Lied gelehrt

She.NOM has the students.ACC the song.ACC taught

‘She has taught the students the song’

d. Man hat den Mann des Verbrechens beschuldigt

One.NOM has the man.ACC the crime.GEN accused

‘One has accused him of the crime’

Dative and accusative case marking is associated with different grammatical functions in (9)/(10) (see e.g. Fanselow 2000, Beermann 2001; Müller 1995: 412 fn 3; Sternefeld 2006).

Morphological dative marks IOs in (9a)/(10a) and what has been argued to be oblique arguments in (9b)/(10b). Morphological accusative canonically marks DOs, but it may also exceptionally mark IOs, as in (9c)/(10c).⁹

The distribution of morphological cases in German is subject to the following generalizations:

(i) In monotransitives, the regular case for objects is accusative. All direct objects that measure out the event, i.e. where progress through the event is materialized in increments of the direct object, (Tenny 1987) are marked with accusative (possibly a universal property; Arad 1998: 73; Svenonius 2002: 14). Similarly, objects of causative change of state verbs are always accusative and themes of motion also bear accusative. Dative is assigned to a set of objects that could be characterized as “non-prototypical” direct objects: objects of monotransitives that are typically human/animate, partially or not affected, not measurers, never objects of causative change of state/ motion verbs (Maling 2001).

(ii) Ditransitives are divided into two major categories, *regular* and *irregular ditransitives*. In the former, the regular case for the theme is accusative and the regular case for the goal, possessor, benefactive/ malefactive and affected arguments is dative. The regular order among the two objects is DAT > ACC, i.e. IO > DO. With irregular ditransitives, we find the patterns ACC > DAT (with e.g. *aussetzen* ‘expose’), ACC > ACC (with the verb *lehren* ‘teach’) and ACC > GEN (with e.g. *anklagen* ‘accuse’).

Dutch is like English in not having a morphological distinction between dative and

⁹ An anonymous reviewer suggests that the difference between (10a) and (10b) could be derived from theories of argument realization that include a semantic constraint on animacy. We will follow Cook (2006) and others here who argue that these facts point to two different types of dative. This is in line with much current research which shows that there are several types of base structures suitable for different classes of ditransitive verbs (Marantz 1993, Anagnostopoulou 2001, 2003, 2005c; Pyllkkänen 2002; Cuervo 2003, among others).

accusative case. Even in pronouns, such a distinction is not clear synchronically. Interestingly, though, Dutch passives of ditransitives behave like German and not like English passives (see Anagnostopoulou 2003 for discussion and references). This means that even though one can never see an overt dative DP in Dutch, unlike German, it can be concluded that IO arguments behave like dative arguments in German on the basis of their syntactic behavior (see fn 10 below for discussion of the theoretical repercussions of this).

According to Broekhuis and Cornips (B&C 1994, 2012), Standard Dutch mostly has goal ditransitives, as in ((11); B&C's (34a); see their list of verbs in (33), and references therein for a more complete list based on an extensive corpus research):

- (11) Jan bezorgde Marie/ haar het pakje
Jan delivered Marie/her the package
'Jan brought Mary the package'

There is an extremely small set of verbs licensing benefactive ditransitives in Standard Dutch, prototypically the verb *inschenken*, as in (8) (B&C's (42a)):

- (12) Jan schenkt Els een kop koffie in
Jan pours Els a cup coffee PRT
'Jan pours Els a cup of coffee'

Furthermore, IOs can be sources (13; B&C's 39a) and inalienable possessors in a construction where the body part is expressed by a locational PP (14; B&C's 43a):

- (13) Jan pakte Marie/haar het book af
Jan took Marie/her the book PRT
 'Jan took the book from Marie'
- (14) Marie zet hem het kind op de knie
Mary puts him the child on the knee
 'Mary is putting the child on his knee'

In German and Dutch, datives cannot become subjects of passives when the auxiliary is *worden/worden*. These only permit 'direct passives', as in (17), where the DO surfaces as the subject:¹⁰

- (15) *Er wurde die Blumen geschenkt
He.NOM was the flowers.ACC given
 'He was given the flowers'

¹⁰ As discussed in detail in Anagnostopoulou (2003: 42-48, 215-220), building on an observation by den Dikken (1995), in Dutch *worden*-passives, the higher IO must undergo scrambling in order for the DO to move to the subject position, for locality reasons: movement of the intervener to the scrambling site facilitates movement of the lower argument across it. Scrambling in Dutch is employed as a strategy of obviating intervention effects, similarly to clitic doubling of the IO in Modern Greek DO-passives.

An anonymous reviewer asks whether the relationship between abstract and morphological case in Dutch has any consequences for the analysis proposed in this paper. Our reply is that a language like Dutch is predicted to exist from an analysis of passivization along the lines suggested in this paper. Even though Dutch datives do not bear overt morphology, they can be concluded to be PPs on the basis of the fact that they alternate with nominative only when the auxiliary is *krijgen* (analyzed as the lexicalization of Voice-v-P in section 4.4.2). This provides evidence that the syntax is blind to the morphology and that it is the categorial status of an argument (DP vs. PP) which determines whether it will be opaque or transparent for Agree.

(16) *Hij wird het eten bezorgd (door mij)

He was the food delivered (by me)

'He was delivered the food by me'

(17) a. Die Blumen wurden ihm geschenkt

The flowers.NOM were him.DAT given

'The flowers were given to him'

b. Het eten werd hem bezorgd (door mij)

The food was him delivered (by me)

'The food was delivered to him by me'

Datives can become subjects in passives when the passive is formed with the auxiliaries *bekommen/krijgen* (Dutch data from Everaert 1990: 127 and Broekhuis and Cornips 1994: 176):

(18) Er bekam die Blumen geschenkt

He.NOM got the flowers.ACC given

'He was given the flowers'

(19) Hij kreeg de boeken op zijn kantoor bezorgd

He got the books at his office given

'He got the books delivered at his office'

In Dutch, as Broekhuis & Cornips (1994) argue, *krijgen*-passives are very productive with verbs of transmission and communication, provided that they denote actual transmission of

the theme to the goal/beneficiary/inalienable possessor, with the mode of transmission specified. In German, the *bekommen* passive is possible also with so-called free datives (possessors, beneficiaries), which, as Steinbach & Vogel (1998) argue in detail, behave like sub-categorized datives in a number of other respects:¹¹

(20) Der Vermieter kriegt das Zimmer geputzt

The landlord gets the room cleaned

The room is cleaned for the landlord

From this perspective then, dative in German and Dutch must be structural Case, at least in the environments where *bekommen/krijgen*-passivization is possible (see Webelhuth 1995 for discussion).

Dutch as well as Standard German allow the *krijgen/bekommen*-passive with ditransitive predicates only. Monotransitives only allow *werden*-passivization, where dative objects retain their case and are not allowed to become nominative, as shown by the contrast between (21b) and (21c) (Lenz 2011). When monotransitive verbs assign accusative case, this becomes nominative in *werden*-passives:

(21) a. Maria half ihm.

Maria helped him.DAT

‘Maria helped him.’

¹¹ If, as seems entirely plausible, free datives behave similarly to “high applicatives” in the sense of Pykkänen (2002), then German provides evidence against the claim in Ishizuka (2012) that the (un-)availability of passivization relates to the height of attachment of the oblique argument.

b. Ihm wurde geholfen.

Him.DAT was helped

‘He was helped.’

c. *Er bekam geholfen

He/him.NOM got helped

‘He was killed.’

The above suggests that *bekommen*-passivization is only possible in environments where dative is structural undergoing movement, and in monotransitives dative is lexical Case.

That dative is (or can, in principle, be) *structural Case* in German is supported by the following facts:

(i) As also discussed in Fanselow (2000) and Cook (2006), the *bekommen*-passive is possible and acceptable for all speakers of German only for ditransitive verbs with the basic/unmarked word order DAT > ACC, e.g. ‘schenken’ and not with verbs with the basic/unmarked word order ACC>DAT e.g. ‘unterziehen’ (see also Czepluch 1988, Haider 1993, Molnárfi 1998, McFadden 2004):¹²

¹² Note that verbs like *entnehmen* can surface with two word orders ACC> DAT, and DAT> ACC. Interestingly, only the latter can form a *bekommen*-passive, as Cook (2006) discusses in detail.

- (i) a. * Das Buch bekam ein Zitat entnommen
the book.NOM got a quotation removed
b. Wenn der armer Mensch die inneren Organen entnommen bekommt
when the poor person.NOM the internal organs removed gets
‘when the poor person gets their internal organs removed.’

- (22) a. Der Mann bekam ein Buch geschenkt
The man.NOM got a book.ACC given
 ‘The man was given a book’
- b. *Die Operation bekam den Patienten unterzogen
The operation.NOM got the patient.ACC submitted
- (23) Der Patient wurde einer Operation unterzogen
The patient.NOM was an operation.DAT submitted

This provides evidence that the *bekommen*-passive is sensitive to the distinction between structural vs. non-structural (oblique) dative.

(ii) In the ACC>ACC frame, accusative IOs become subjects in *bekommen*-passives, as shown in (24a) (Beermann 2001). This suggests that *it is the higher argument with structural Case* that becomes subject in *bekommen*-passives. In “regular ditransitives” the highest argument bearing structural Case is the dative IO, and accusative DOs become the subjects of *werden*-passives, as in (25b):

- (24) a. Die Schüler bekommen das Lied gelehrt
The students.NOM get the song.ACC taught
 ‘The students are taught the song’
- b. Ein Buch wurde dem Mann geschenkt
A book.NOM was the man.DAT given
 ‘A book was given to the man’

Note that ACC>ACC ditransitives never allow the DO to become NOM with a *werden*-passive when the IO surfaces with ACC, only when it surfaces with DAT (Florian Schäfer, p.c.):¹³

- (25) Das Lied wurde den Schülern/ *die Schüler gelehrt
*The song.NOM was the students.DAT/*ACC taught*

That dative can be a lexical/inherent case is supported by:

- (i) the ditransitive vs. mono-transitive asymmetry in Standard German and related dialects, and (ii) verb class restrictions. As noted by Bayer, Bader & Meng (2000), in those German dialects which allow *bekommen*-passives with mono-transitive verbs (Luxemburg, German

¹³ An anonymous reviewer questions that (24a) results from the accusative IO-accusative DO structure and proposes that it results from a corresponding underlying dative-accusative structure, the same structure employed in (25). In principle, the dative-accusative construction is possible, but degraded, and subject to dialectal variation:

- (i) ?Der Lehrer lehrt ihr das Lied
The teacher.NOM teaches her.DAT the song.ACC
 'The teachers teaches her the song'

The reviewer further points out that the accusative IO can become the subject of a *werden* passive:

- (ii) ?Die Schüler werden das Lied gelehrt
The students.NOM are the song.ACC taught
 'The students are taught the song'

But note that the active accusative-accusative structure (10c) and the *bekommen*-passive (24a) are fully grammatical, while the *werden*-passive (ii), as well as (i) are degraded. This seems to suggest that the *bekommen*-passive (24a) is the canonical passive for the accusative-accusative structure (10c). The issue certainly requires further investigation. As pointed out by Anagnostopoulou (2001), Modern Greek double accusative constructions formed with verbs like "teach" (ingestives; Levin 1993) give rise to the same contrast as in (25). Interestingly, the same facts are found in English, which lacks morphological dative and accusative case. While theme passivization across an IO DP goal with verbs like 'give' leads to a mild ungrammaticality in some dialects (in others it is completely well-formed; Haddican 2010) and can be overcome if the IO is a weak pronoun, it leads to a much more severe ungrammaticality with verbs like "teach", and the weak pronoun strategy does not rescue the structure. The only option is for the IO to surface as a PP:

- (ii) a. ?*The book was given John/ ? The book was given 'im/ The book was given to John
 b. *The song was taught John/ *The song was taught 'im/ The song was taught to him

We propose that the structure in (25) is the German counterpart of the well formed English PP structure in (iib).

Rhine-Franconian/ Mosel dialects) there are certain verbs with a single dative object that can form a *bekommen*-passive and others that cannot:

- (26) a. Ich half dem Studenten
I helped the student.DAT
- b. Der Student bekam geholfen
 the student.NOM got helped
- (27) a. Ich zürnte dem Studenten
I was-mad-at the student.DAT
- b. *Der Student bekam gezürnt
the student.NOM got been-mad-at

Dative verbs which permit the *bekommen* passive are *beipflichten* ('agree') and *widersprechen* ('object-to'); verbs which don't are *ausweichen* ('avoid'), *dienen* ('serve'), *vertrauen* ('trust'), *unterliegen* ('succumb') and certainly many more.

We take this as evidence that dative objects bear structural Case with the predicates allowing *bekommen*-passives and *lexical* Case with the predicates resisting *bekommen*-passives. For Germanic dialects in general, the question that arises is why there is a special auxiliary used when datives become nominatives in passives.

2.2.3 A digression: are *krijgen/bekommen*-passives true passives in the sense of including an implicit external argument?

As already mentioned, the status of the *bekommen* passive is debated in the literature. Two main views have been expressed:

View I. According to a number of researchers (see Haider 1984, 1985 Vogel & Steinbach 1998, Bayer, Bader & Meng 2000; see also Sternefeld 2006, Müller 2002), these constructions are not true passives. In the literature on Dutch they are therefore called '*semi-passives*' (B&C 1994). Proponents of this view argue that the *bekommen/ krijgen*-passive is not transformationally derived from the active, which entails that the subject in (14) is not an underlying object.

View II. Another view holds that the *bekommen/krijgen*-construction has all the properties conventionally associated with the passive (see Wegener 1985; Reis 1985; Fanselow 1987; Webelhuth and Ackerman 1994, Zifonun & al. 1997 for German; B&C 1994, 2012 for Dutch), and that the surface subject is an externalized IO. If the latter view is correct, then dative in German and Dutch must be structural Case, at least in the environments where *bekommen/krijgen*-passivization is possible (see Webelhuth 1995 for discussion).

The most important argument in favor of the non-transformational analysis is that *bekommen/krijgen*-passives seem to be subject to idiosyncratic restrictions and are not as productive as the *worden/worden* passives. Lack of full productivity is usually associated with lexical rules, supporting the position that *bekommen/ krijgen*-passives are not true passives. However, B&C (1994) and, especially, B&C (2012) convincingly demonstrate that it is not true that *krijgen*-passives are idiosyncratic in Dutch. They argue that *krijgen*-passives are very productive with verbs of transmission and communication, provided that they denote actual transmission of the theme to the goal/beneficiary/inalienable possessor, with the mode of transmission specified. The same argument has been made for German. Lenz (2009) and

Bader & Häussler (2010, 2013) point out that German *bekommen* passives are highly productive with verbs of verbs expressing a concrete transfer of possession to the recipient and communication verbs. Unlike Dutch, these verbs need not have the mode of transmission specified in German (the only exception here is *geben* which does not form a *bekommen*-passive). Bader & Häussler (2010) also identify a difference between German and Dutch concerning non-recipient verbs involving negative transfer (deprivation) and verbs involving a more abstract sort of negative transfer. Both types of verbs form the *bekommen*-passive in German, as illustrated in (28a) and (28b) (for concrete and abstract deprivation, respectively), while they do not form a *krijgen* passive in Dutch.

- (28) a. ?dass der Mann das Buch gestohlen bekam.
 that the man the book stolen got
- b. dass der Mann eine Auskunft verweigert bekam.
 that the man a piece of information denied got

If View II is correct, then these passives should be sensitive to diagnostics that provide evidence for the presence of an implicit external argument. In the literature, a number of well-known tests have been proposed to this effect, such as the licensing of (i) agentive *by*-phrases, (ii) control into purpose clauses, and (iii) agentive adverbs. We applied these tests to the Dutch and German *krijgen/bekommen*-passives. Our general result is that the situation in Dutch is clearer than in German.¹⁴ Dutch *krijgen*-passives qualify as true passives w.r.t. all of

¹⁴ In order to determine the status of the *krijgen/bekommen* passives, we created a questionnaire, which we asked 7 speakers of Dutch and 8 speakers of German to evaluate from different dialectal areas. We consider the results representative for a larger group of speakers.

the above tests. For German *bekommen*-passives we arrive at a rather mixed picture. Specifically:

a) *Agentive by-phrases*. In Dutch, *door*-phrases are used with the regular passive, while *van*-phrases are ruled out (with the exception of Dutch Limburg and Belgian/Flemish Dutch where *van* is used alongside with *door* (Jeroen van Craenenbroeck, personal communication)).

- (29) Het boek werd hem door/*van Peter toegestuurd
The book was to him by Peter sent
‘The book was sent to him by Peter’

Both in Standard and Heerlen Dutch *door*- and *van*-phrases are somewhat marked with the *krijgen*-passive, but the majority of our informants prefer *door*:

- (30) Jan kreeg het boek gisteren ?door/ /#van Peter doorgestuurd
Jan gets the book gisteren by Peter sent
‘Jan was sent the book by Peter yesterday’

In German passives, *von*-phrases introduce agents, and *durch*-phrases introduce causers/forces, and causing events (31) (see Alexiadou, Anagnostopoulou & Schäfer 2006 for discussion and references):

- (31) Die Vase wurde von Peter/ durch den Erdstoß zerbrochen

The vase was by Peter / through-the earth tremor broken

'The vase was broken by Peter/ the earthquake'

All our informants accept *von*-phrases in the *bekommen*-passive, as shown in (32); see also Leirbukt (1997) for a detailed survey:

- (32) Peter kriegte das Paket von der Mutter geschickt
Peter got the parcel by the mother sent

b) *Control into purpose clauses*. In both Standard and Heerlen Dutch, control into purpose clauses is possible:

- (33) Zij kreeg de prijs overhandigd om haar vriendje te irriteren.
She got the prize awarded for her boyfriend to irritate
'She was awarded the prize to annoy her boyfriend.'

On the other hand, German speakers vary in how they judge the German counterparts of (33). For one group of speakers, they are marginal or ungrammatical, for another, they are perfectly fine:

- (34) %Der Junge kriegt das Paket zugeschickt um die Eltern zu ärgern
The boy gets the parcel sent in order the parents to annoy

c) *Agentive adverbs*. All our Dutch informants accept agentive adverbs modifying an implicit external argument:

(35) Zij kreeg opzettelijk het verkeerde boek toegestuurd.

She was deliberately the wrong book sent

‘She was deliberately sent the wrong book’

German speakers show the same split as with control into purpose clauses. One group of speakers judges the German counterpart of (35) as marginal or ungrammatical. Another group of speakers finds (36) to be well-formed:

(36) %Der Junge kriegte absichtlich das falsche Paket zugeschickt

the boy got deliberately the wrong parcel sent

In conclusion, while it is clear that the Dutch *krijgen*-passive contains an implicit external argument, the situation for German is less transparent. All speakers agree on the *by*-phrase test, while there are two grammars concerning control into purpose clauses and agentive adverbs. As in principle the *by*-phrase could be licensed as a lexical argument of the verb *kriegen/bekommen* (as pointed out by an anonymous reviewer), the picture on German might not seem conclusive. Here we will treat the *bekommen*-passive as a real passive and *bekommen/kriegen* as a true auxiliary, see also Zifonun & al. (1997), Bader & Häussler (2013). We believe that the complexity observed is related to the stage of the

grammaticalization of the auxiliary *bekommen*.¹⁵ Building on an idea expressed in Bader & Häussler (2013), we observe that if *bekommen* were not a real passive auxiliary, it would only be compatible with verbs that share the main meaning of the verb *bekommen*, so that a unification of the two thematic structures, of the type proposed in Haider (2001), would be possible. Crucially, the embedded verb would have to obey Bader & Häussler's *recipient constraint* (V can be combined with *bekommen* if V assigns the recipient role to its dative object). However, as these authors show on the basis of corpora and experimental studies, *bekommen* can be combined with lexical verbs that do not share the lexical meaning of the main verb *bekommen*. This suggests that *bekommen* in the *bekommen*-passive has been grammaticalized to a passive auxiliary. Depending on the dialect, some traces of its lexical history are still active and prevent unlimited combinations.

3. Languages where datives become nominatives in middles: Icelandic

So far, we have discussed a set of languages, namely German, Dutch, Ancient Greek and Japanese, that show essentially the same pattern: dative Case alternates in passives. In German and Dutch, this happens in *bekommen/ krijgen*--passives. We have seen that Low German and Upper German dialects show a monotransitive vs. ditransitive asymmetry.¹⁶ Dative alternations take place in ditransitives and not in monotransitives. We attributed this to the mixed status of dative: inherent/lexical in monotransitives, structural in ditransitives. Luxemburg German, German dialects of the West-Middle area, Japanese and Ancient Greek

¹⁵ We thank the anonymous reviewer for his/her comments concerning the issue of grammaticalization.

¹⁶ For Dutch things are less clear. The language can either be taken to lack a dative Case in monotransitives (recall that Dutch lacks a morphological distinction between dative and accusative Case) or it can be taken to show a monotransitive vs. ditransitive asymmetry in passives.

have been shown not to display a monotransitive vs. ditransitive asymmetry. We attributed this to the uniform status of dative in both contexts: always structural. We also pointed out, however, that even in Japanese and Ancient Greek, there are non-alternating datives in monotransitives, which should be treated as inherent/lexical Cases. These systems of alternations share a number of important properties:

(37) *The German, Dutch, Japanese, Ancient Greek pattern*

- a. Dative (and also genitive in Ancient Greek) alternations happen in passives.
- b. Dative is assigned (and, when possible, alternates with nominative) to DOs of monotransitives that are typically human/animate, partially or not affected, not measurers, never objects of causative motion verbs.
- c. The dative (or also genitive in Ancient Greek) that alternates with nominative in ditransitives is the case of the IO.

Icelandic presents a different pattern of a dative-nominative alternation:

- (38) a. Dative alternations never happen in passives.¹⁷ They occur in -*st* middles (and certain anticausatives and adjectival passives).
- b. The dative alternating with nominative in ditransitives is the case of the DO, never of the IO.¹⁸

¹⁷ As Zaenen & Maling (1990: 145f.) note, the same applies to idiosyncratic accusative as well as genitive case which are never absorbed in passives.

¹⁸ Again the same is observed with genitives: only DO genitives can become nominatives in Icelandic. Recall that in our discussion on Ancient Greek, we pointed out that also in this language genitives can alternate with nominatives in passives. See e.g. Thráinsson (2007: 290) and Wood (2012) for details and examples.

In what follows, we discuss the main differences between Icelandic and the pattern examined so far in some more detail.

Difference a: Middles. A systematic DAT-NOM alternation is found with middle Voice verbs ending in *-st*, as shown in (39b). These verbs often have an anticausative meaning, and are referred to as ‘middles’ in the literature on Icelandic.¹⁹

- (39) a. *Ég* *týndi* *úrínu*
 I.NOM *lost* *the watch.DAT*
 ‘I lost the watch’
- b. *Úrið* *týndi-st*
 The watch.NOM *lost.MID*
 ‘The watch got lost’

An important difference between the middle and the periphrastic passive in Icelandic is that the former does not imply agency while the latter does (see Sigurðsson 1989 for detailed

¹⁹ Here we use the term anticausative to refer to intransitive variants of verbs undergoing the causative alternation (see Alexiadou, Anagnostopoulou & Schäfer 2006).

Note that dative also alternates in the adjectival/stative passive, which, once again, is incompatible with agentivity in Icelandic. In the stative passive in (i), which does not license a by-phrase, the DO surfaces with nominative. Note that (i) is clearly an adjectival passive corresponding to English adjectival passives with *un-*prefixation (Wasow 1977; Levin & Rappaport 1986 and much subsequent literature):

- (i) a. *Hann* *var* *boðinn* (*af *Maríu*)
 He.NOM *was* *invited.m.sg.NOM* *by Mary*
 ‘He was invited’
- b. *Hann* *var* *óboðinn* (*af *Maríu*)
 He.NOM *was* *uninvited.m.sg.NOM* *by Mary*
 ‘He was uninvited’

discussion). Middles do not license *by*-phrases (40c), while periphrastic passives do (40b) (Sigurðsson 1989: 268; Svenonius 2006):

- (40) a. Lögreglan drap hundinn
 The police.NOM killed the dog.ACC
 ‘The police killed the dog’
- b. Hundurinn var drepinn (af lögreglunni)
 The dog.NOM was killed by the police
 ‘The dog was killed by the police’
- c. Hundurinn drapst (*af lögreglunni)
 The dog.NOM killed.MID by the police
 ‘The dog got killed’

Difference b: Sigurðsson (1989) points out that only direct object theme datives alternate in ditransitives. The dative case of benefactive/goal indirect objects does not alternate (Jónsson 2000 provides a list of some verbs that can do this). This holds for the *-st* verbs, where dative indirect objects (IOs) stay dative, even under *-st*. For ditransitive verbs that take two dative objects, only the DO dative becomes nominative, the IO remains dative (41-41):

- (41) a. Jón gaf mér þetta tækifæri.
 John.NOM gave me.DAT this opportunity.ACC
 ‘John gave me this opportunity.’ (Sigurðsson 1989:270)
- b. *Mér gaf-st þetta tækifæri (*viljandi).*

*Me.DAT gave.MID this opportunity.NOM (*willingly)*

'I happened to get this opportunity.' (Sigurðsson 1989:270)

(42) a. þeir úthlutuðu okkur velli til 12:00

they.NOM allocated us.DAT field.DAT until 12:00

'They allocated a field to us until 12:00'

b. Okkur úthlutaðist völlum til 12:00

us.DAT allocated-st field.NOM until 12:00

We got allocated a field until 12:00 Sigurðsson & Wood (2012)

The cross-linguistic picture can be summarized as in (43):

(43) **Summary: dative-nominative alternations**

	DAT-NOM in monotransitives only	DAT-NOM in ditransitives only	Only some DAT alternate
Ancient Greek	No	No	Yes
Japanese	No	No	Yes
Standard German	No	Yes	Yes
Lux. German	No	No	Yes
Dutch	unclear ²⁰	Yes	Yes
Icelandic	No	No	Yes

²⁰ Given that Dutch lacks morphological dative case, it seems unclear whether it has any monotransitive verbs assigning dative to their single object. Presumably not. But see, Broekhuis & Cornips (1994). If they are right, then Dutch is like German. As in our analysis, case realization does not play a role in the syntactic computation, this situation does not seem to raise any particular concerns.

4. TOWARDS AN ANALYSIS

4.1. *Desiderata*

A comprehensive and complete account for the cross-linguistic distribution of dative-nominative alternations necessitates a theory of dative Case that can ultimately accommodate the following facts:

Fact 1: Dative Case is in principle *flexible*. In some languages it doesn't alternate. In other languages it does. In this respect, it differs from Accusative, which always alternates. Significantly, even in languages where dative case alternates, it does not always do so. There are instances of datives that qualify as inherent/lexical, i.e. non-alternating.

Fact 2: The non-uniqueness of Dat-Nom alternations. In at least Ancient Greek (Anagnostopoulou & Sevdali 2012) but also in Icelandic, genitives alternate with nominative as well (see notes 2 and 18). In fact, Gen-Nom alternations historically took place prior to Dat-Nom alternations in Ancient Greek (Conti 1998). We haven't systematically looked at cross-linguistic variation w.r.t. this factor, and for this reason we do not focus on it in this paper. However, we take this to suggest that our analysis of datives can extend to genitives as well, and perhaps also some accusatives, suggesting that the real difference seems to be between elements that can enter Agree with a probe, DPs and those that cannot, PPs. Case is then realized at the morphological component, but is irrelevant for the syntactic computation (in the spirit of Marantz 1991).

Fact 3: The ditransitive vs. monotransitive/ditransitive difference (and an implicational universal?). Alternating dative is in some languages/dialects limited to ditransitives while in other languages/dialects it also occurs in monotransitives. *We have*

found no language where dative-nominative alternations occur in monotransitives and not in ditransitives.

Fact 4: The auxiliary difference. In (some) periphrastic passives, at least in German and Dutch, different auxiliaries are chosen depending on which Case alternates, dative or accusative.

Fact 5: The passive vs. middle asymmetry. Absorption (in canonical eventive passives) of dative on non-theme arguments vs. absorption (in middles, adjectival passives and anticausatives) of dative on theme arguments.

4.2. Dative Case: opaque or transparent to Agree

Among the facts listed in 4.1, the most important and fundamental fact that needs to be explained is *fact 1*, namely that dative Case is, in principle, flexible, unlike accusative Case. In order to account for this, we will assume, following Řezáč (2008), Bittner & Hale (1996), and Caha (2009), that dative DPs (both lexical/idiosyncratic and inherent/thematic datives in Woolford's 2006 terms; Řezáč calls both "theta-related Cases") are always contained within PPs. PPs are phases (Abels 2003, McGinnis 2001) and, therefore, the ϕ -features of the containing DPs are not visible for Agree to a probe outside the PP, Voice or T. As a result, *Opacity* obtains (cf. Pesetsky 2010, p. 7 for a related recent approach to arguments bearing dative Case as "...bearing an affix of category P", i.e. as being PPs). This is the analysis we will assume for *inherent as well as lexical* datives, i.e. the ones that do not alternate with nominatives, namely that they are opaque PPs not entering Agree (see Řezáč 2008 and Pesetsky 2010 for more discussion of the categorial status of datives as PPs and references).

By contrast, accusatives are DPs and are *always* visible for Agree because DPs are transparent.

Řezáč (2008) argues on the basis of different patterns of dative agreement in Basque dialects that dative DPs *can be visible* for Agree in certain cases. In order to account for this variability, Řezáč proposes that P may itself have a φ -probe which enters Agree with its DP complement. The result of this P-DP φ -Agree relationship is visible Agree from the outside. He proposes that a φ -probe on P entering Agree with the DP selected by P transmits the φ -features of this DP outside the opaque PP domain.²¹ The result is *Agree transparency*. Řezáč's proposal is summarized in (44):

- (44) (Řezáč's (20))
- a. DPs with structural Case are just DPs, with their interpretable φ -features on D(P).
 - b. DPs with theta-related Case are contained within PPs, where P is a phase head.
 - c. The P-head of a PP is susceptible to variation in the *presence* and the *content* of a φ -probe

Řezáč's investigation is also concerned with the issue of *variation in the content* of a φ -probe because there are different patterns of dative agreement across Basque dialects, for more or less φ -feature specifications. We are mainly interested here in the variation in the *presence of*

²¹ As far as we can tell, Řezáč (2008) is not explicit on how exactly this transmission of φ -features takes place as a result of P-DP Agree. In order for this to work, one has to assume that the φ -probe on P is valued by the containing DP and remains active for further Agree with a higher probe, Voice or T. It must be the case then that the φ -features on P are valued but not deleted. This paper does not capitalize on Řezáč's (44c) as a strategy to make dative PPs transparent and hence our analysis does not have to deal with this problem.

a φ -probe (though see (46) below for variation in the *content* of a φ -probe). We propose that what we called *inherent/lexical datives* are PPs headed by a P without a φ -probe (opaque) and what we called *structural datives* are PPs headed by a P with a φ -probe (transparent).

In addition to Řezáč's (44c) which will generally not concern us here (in the present context we assume that it is only relevant for quirky datives, see (46) below), we propose that a major strategy for PPs becoming transparent is when P incorporates into a higher head, the complex Voice-v. Since PPs are phases, the phase-lifting effect of P incorporation follows from the hypothesis that head-movement of certain phase heads extends the phase to the higher projection, as proposed by den Dikken 2007, Gallego 2005, 2010, Gallego, and Uriagereka 2006, Alexiadou, Anagnostopoulou & Wurmbrand 2013, in the spirit of Baker's 1988 Government Transparency Corollary. P-incorporation results in a configuration where the complex verb has a PP complement headed by the trace of the incorporated preposition, exactly as was proposed by Baker (1988 ch. 5) for applicative constructions in Bantu languages. Overt evidence for this analysis comes from Ancient Greek, where monotransitive and ditransitive complex verbs formed with prepositions assigning dative case such as *en-*, *sun-*, *epi-*, *para-*, *hupo-* and the adverb *omou-* obligatorily inherit from the prepositions their dative assigning capacity. Importantly, these dative complements always alternate with nominatives in passives, straightforwardly supporting the proposal that there is a link between P-incorporation and the transparency of datives; see the data in (1) and (2) above which instantiate the phenomenon with the incorporated preposition *epi* (see Anagnostopoulou & Sevdali 2012 for discussion and many more examples).

Let us now illustrate how Case alternations work under this view. Assume a simple system where T and Voice enter Agree with arguments transparent to Agree (i.e. DPs or PPs

with accessible φ -features). In actives, T enters Agree with the external argument (EA in (45) below) and Voice Agrees with the internal argument. In passives, the φ features on passive Voice are inactive, and the object enters Agree with T. As a result, the Object DP/ PP carries Nom.

- (45) a. [TP [~~u~~ φ] [VoiceP EA [i φ] [Voice [~~u~~ φ] [RootP DP/PP[i φ]]]]] *active*
 b. [TP [~~u~~ φ] [VoiceP [RootP DP/PP[i φ]]]] *passive*

Which dative facts summarized in section 4.1. can be accounted for under the analysis proposed so far? We can account for *fact 1*, namely that dative Case is in principle flexible, sometimes entering alternations and sometimes not, unlike structural Accusative which alternates always. Being PPs, dative arguments are not allowed to alternate (inherent/lexical), unless there is a strategy lifting their phasal status and making them transparent: the presence of a phi-probe as in Řezáč's (44c) or P-incorporation, as proposed here on the basis of Ancient Greek. Moreover, this analysis can also be extended to genitives covering *fact 2*, namely that in Ancient Greek, GEN-NOM alternations productively take place in monotransitives and ditransitives, and in Icelandic, GEN-NOM alternations take place in middles of monotransitives, similarly to datives. See Pesetsky (2010) for a treatment of other inherent/ oblique Cases, e.g. instrumental in Russian, identical to the PP analysis of datives.

Variation in the *content* of a φ -probe in a language resorting to (44c) could additionally derive the difference between quirky datives and alternating datives:

- (46) *Quirky vs. structural datives: variation in the content of the φ -probe*

-Quirky datives enter *incomplete Agree* (along the lines proposed by Anagnostopoulou 2003, 2005a for PCC effects; see also Řezáč 2008 and others).

-Alternating datives enter *complete Agree* (behaving exactly like alternating Accusatives).

As is well known, arguments with quirky Case behave as if they are visible for A-movement in all relevant respects (for an overview, see Sigurðsson 2002), and yet they cannot value a ϕ -probe and agree with it in person and number. The same mixed behavior is also shown in *Person Case Constraint (PCC)* environments (see Bonet 1991, Taraldsen 1995, Anagnostopoulou 2003, 2005a, Adger and Harbour 2007, Nevins 2007 among others). On the one hand, quirky datives block person (but not number) agreement between a higher ϕ -probe and a lower accusative or nominative argument, but on the other hand they do not themselves agree with that ϕ -probe. Many recent approaches to quirky datives, building on Taraldsen (1995) and Anagnostopoulou (2003, 2005a), characterize the mixed behavior of quirky datives in terms of the intuition that they enter *incomplete Agree*, behaving as if they were pure third person, with no value for number. This is formalized through the hypothesis that (i) a ϕ -probe can be decomposed into [person] and [number] which may enter Agree separately and (ii) the ϕ -features of quirky datives are only *partially accessible*: quirky datives are visible/active for person Agree but not for number Agree. Since first and second person cannot be interpreted unless [person] is combined with [number] (Taraldsen 1995), the ϕ -probe can only be valued for 3rd person, not for 1st and 2nd person in the relevant configurations. Řezáč (2008: 120, see especially (31)) proposes to derive the defectiveness of

quirky datives from the hypothesis that the P of their PP shell has a probe which is unspecified and undifferentiated in a feature geometrical sense. It can only copy the [RE→local] portion of the feature geometry of the DP, omitting the nodes [individuation] and [participant]. As a result, quirky datives enter *incomplete* Agree: they can only value the ϕ -probe for [person], but not for the further specifications of [participant] and [number]. By contrast, dative PPs in linguistic systems of the type described by Řezáč (2008), i.e. the dialects of Basque where first and second datives trigger person and number agreement on the verb, are proposed to enter *complete* Agree because the probe on P is further specified for [individuation] and [participant] (see Řezáč 2008 for extensive discussion).²² For the relationship between *complete* vs. *incomplete* Agree and Case alternations, see the discussion in the next section (especially the discussion of (49)).

The account outlined so far raises two questions:

- 1) Do we need to postulate a uCase feature in addition to the u/ $i\phi$ features in (44)?
- 2) Which mechanism decides for Nom vs. Dat/Gen vs. Acc morphological realization in actives and non-actives of monotransitives and ditransitives with alternating datives and genitives?

In the next section, we argue that the postulation of a uCase feature is not necessary for the facts we discuss. Φ -Agree combined with a specific type of morphological case approach will

²² By hypothesis, there are two ways in which a dative argument can be transparent to Agree. Either via the process of P-incorporation discussed in the present paper (this is expected to always lead to complete Agree since the phase-hood of the PP is lifted and the embedded DP enters Agree *directly* with v or T) or via Řezáč's (20c), stated as (44c) in our paper (this will either lead to complete Agree or to incomplete Agree depending on the feature specification of P).

prove to be sufficient.

4.3. Case-realization as a matter of PF: transparent dative as dependent case

In order to derive case realization in DAT-NOM alternation environments, we propose to explore the hypothesis that the distribution of morphological cases is determined at PF. The general idea we will pursue is that argument licensing is performed via Agree, and morphological case interprets Agree relations at PF in a particular fashion. We will consider first whether and how the patterns of dative alternations discussed in our paper can be derived in terms of an existing and well-known proposal, namely Marantz's (1991) "dependent case" (cf. Yip, Maling, & Jackendoff 1987), and then we will proceed to a modification of Marantz's "dependent case" that can capture alternating datives (and genitives).

Marantz (1991) argues that the distribution of morphological case is determined at PF, subject to the case realization hierarchy in (47):

(47) case realization disjunctive hierarchy: i) lexically governed case, ii) "dependent" case (accusative and ergative), iii) unmarked case (environment-sensitive), iv) default case

The more specific a case is, it is assigned first taking precedence over the cases lower in the hierarchy. In this system, structural accusative Case is "dependent case" subject to the definition in (48):

(48) Dependent case is assigned by V+I to a position governed by V+I when a

distinct position governed by V+I is:

- a. not "marked" (not part of a chain governed by a lexical case determiner)
- b. distinct from the chain being assigned dependent case

Dependent case assigned up to subject: ergative

Dependent case assigned down to object: accusative

According to (48), dependent accusative is assigned “downwards” to a DP in opposition to a higher DP not bearing lexically governed case (what we called here “inherent” or “lexical”, but also “quirky”; see the discussion below the modified condition (49)).

In order to account for the distribution of structural dative case in actives and passives of monotransitives and ditransitives, we propose to modify Marantz (1991) in order to allow for the *parametric possibility* of dative (and genitive etc.) qualifying as dependent cases. We propose to link this parameter to the Agree condition (44), which could be seen as a formal licensing condition (like EPP in Marantz’s 1991 paper) appropriately interpreted at PF. A PP that is *transparent to Agree* is not and cannot be lexically governed case as it enters a checking relation with a functional head, and will therefore receive a case determined lower in the hierarchy (dependent or environment sensitive or default). On the other hand, a PP that is *opaque to Agree* bears lexically governed case. This modification leads to a definition along the following lines, taken also into account the decomposition of the VP into Voice (50-51), and v, see e.g. (54) below, and Alexiadou, Anagnostopoulou & Schäfer (2006) for discussion:

(49) Dependent case is assigned by Voice+v+I to a position governed by Voice+v+I when a distinct position governed by Voice+v+I is:

- a. not "marked" (not part of a chain governed by a lexical case determiner)
- b. distinct from the chain being assigned dependent case

Dependent case assigned up to subject: ergative

Dependent case assigned down to object: *any case realized on an argument entering Agree*
(*e.g. accusative, dative, genitive...*)

Note that in the calculation of dependent case assignment at PF, quirky case qualifies as “lexically governed” case, despite entering *partial/incomplete* Agree, as proposed in (46). This means that only dative and genitive PPs entering *complete* Agree will qualify as dependent cases in (49).

We then need a way to determine which one of the dependent cases (accusative, dative, genitive etc.) is realized in each individual construction. This will be dependent on: (a) the DP vs. PP distinction (DP= accusative vs. PP = dative/ genitive) and (b) more specific information provided by the zero Ps and the selecting v/Vs, in order to distinguish dative from genitive realization in languages like Ancient Greek where both dative and genitive Cases alternate qualifying as dependent. DAT and GEN are more specific forms than ACC as their spell out takes into account the closest relevant P and applicative v. Being more specific, dependent dative and genitive block the assignment of dependent accusative, which can be seen as the Elsewhere case assigned to objects whenever the conditions for the more specific

forms do not apply.²³

Let us now see how DAT-NOM alternations work in the modified m-case approach. Starting from monotransitives (in e.g. Ancient Greek, Japanese Luxemburg German; see the next section for Icelandic), 'dative absorption' works as follows. In passives, dependent dative (or genitive) case cannot be assigned 'downwards' since it is not in opposition to a higher position not bearing lexical case. The result is that the single argument is realized with environment sensitive nominative, along the lines suggested in (47)-(49).

Proceeding to ditransitives in languages where both cases, dative/genitive and accusative, alternate (Japanese, Ancient Greek, German *bekommen* and *werden* passives and their Dutch counterparts; see the next section for Icelandic ditransitives), we will assume that Voice enters Agree with *both* the IO and DO either under *Multiple Agree* (as independently proposed by Anagnostopoulou 2003, Anagnostopoulou 2005a and Nevins 2007, 2011 in order to account for Person Case Constraint (PCC) effects in ditransitives; cf. Baker 2011 who also proposes that Voice can agree with both arguments; for *Multiple Agree* see also Hiraiwa 2004) or because it has two ϕ -probes. Thus, the $u\phi$ of Voice in (50) enters Agree with both the DAT and the ACC arguments (we assume that they are contained in an applicative phrase (ApplP), remaining agnostic whether this is a high or a low applicative in the sense of Pylkkänen 2002). The two arguments are assigned dependent case in opposition to a higher argument not bearing lexical case (DAT is assigned in opposition to the higher EA, and ACC in opposition to the higher DAT). In passives, Voice is defective (and non-phasal) in not introducing an EA and not containing a ϕ probe. The two arguments enter Agree with T.²⁴

²³ We thank Heidi Harley for suggesting this to us.

²⁴ Note that in order to deal with Agree in passives, the simplest solution would be to assume Multiple Agree throughout, in T and Voice, and not postulate two ϕ -probes on Voice.

- (50) [TP [~~uφ~~] [VoiceP EA [iφ] [Voice [~~uφ~~] [AppIP IO[iφ] [DO [iφ]]]]]] *active*
- (51) [TP [~~uφ~~] [VoiceP [AppIP IO[iφ] [DO [iφ]]]]] *passive*

In passives, (i) one of the two dependent cases (accusative or dative) cannot be assigned in opposition to a higher position and, therefore, the argument that would bear it surfaces with environment sensitive nominative. (ii) The other argument bears the dependent case (dative/genitive or accusative) that it also bears in the corresponding active sentence, in opposition to the 'higher' nominative argument (the derived subject).²⁵

We still need *an algorithm* to decide which argument will surface with nominative and which one with dependent accusative or dative in (51). The simplest decision mechanism would be locality: The *first* dependent case cannot be assigned, and the higher argument surfaces with nominative. The *second/lower* argument bears dependent case in opposition to the higher ('derived') nominative. Assuming that the underlying order of arguments is IO>DO, as in (50)/(51), this makes NOM>ACC passives of ditransitives to be the simple case: German *bekommen*-passives, Dutch *krijgen*-passives,²⁶ Ancient Greek passives where DAT and GEN become nominative and ACC is retained, Japanese passives where DAT becomes NOM and ACC is retained. NOM>DAT passives of ditransitives are more difficult to handle: something extra needs to be stated for German and Dutch *werden*-passives, Ancient Greek passives where ACC becomes nominative and DAT, GEN are retained, Japanese passives

²⁵ An anonymous reviewer asks why the remaining argument bears the dependent case that it also bears in the corresponding active since two dependent cases are available in principle. As mentioned, it is crucial that the spell out of DAT and GEN takes into account the closest relevant P and applicative v, unlike ACC.

²⁶ An anonymous reviewer objects that this seems counterintuitive. In section 4.4.2, we argue that German *bekommen* passives and Dutch *krijgen* passives should be analyzed in terms of P-incorporation, and this is what makes the construction feel marked, not locality.

where ACC becomes NOM and DAT is retained. This is not a problem specific to the present account, however. It is a more general problem for all theories dealing with locality in languages with so called “symmetric passives”.²⁷ In this paper, we have nothing further to add to these theories.

4.4. Accounting for variation

In this last section, we will tackle the most complex problem posed by the data discussed in this paper. Namely, how to account for the variability in the structural (i.e. transparent) vs. inherent (i.e. opaque) nature of datives within one and the same language and across languages:

Fact 3: The ditransitive vs. ditransitive/monotransitive difference.

Fact 4: The auxiliary difference.

Fact 5: The passive vs. middle asymmetry.

We will point to some issues that need to be taken into consideration w.r.t. to fact 3 and propose an analysis for facts 4 and 5.

4.4.1. Fact 3: The ditransitive vs. monotransitive asymmetry.

²⁷ See Ura (1996); McGinnis (1998); Anagnostopoulou (2003, 2005b); Doggett (2004); Haddican (2010), among others, for some proposals. As also mentioned in fn.10, Anagnostopoulou (2003: 215-220) building on an observation by den Dikken (1995: 207-208) specifically appeals to scrambling of the intervening IO, in order to account for the grammaticality of *worden*-passives in Dutch; other escape strategies are also discussed in the literature cited here and could apply, in principle.

The main theoretical dilemma posed by the ditransitive vs. monotransitive/ ditransitive asymmetry (e.g. Standard German vs. Ancient Greek, Japanese, Luxemburg German) is that different types of languages are predicted by different systems, specifically:

Languages where dative (and genitive) alternate in both monotransitives and ditransitives are the *canonical case* for the theory outlined in the preceding sections (if a language has transparent datives the null hypothesis would be that it has them in both contexts). On the other hand, languages with the monotransitive-ditransitive asymmetry are more problematic. For languages having this asymmetry it would seem that it has to be *stipulated* that dative (and genitive) PP arguments are opaque to Agree in monotransitives (i.e. they lack a ϕ -probe on P) and transparent to Agree (i.e. they have a ϕ -probe on P) in ditransitives.²⁸

In this context, consider what we suspect to be an implicational universal:

(52) *An implicational universal (suspected)*

If a language has a DAT-NOM alternation in monotransitives,
it also has it in ditransitives (but not vice-versa).

We believe that one can make sense of (52) in terms of diachronic change: dative (and genitive) distribution is more systematic and regular in ditransitives (marking the IO) than in monotransitives (marking the DO), where non-accusative cases are more idiosyncratic. As

²⁸ We note here that the *reverse situation* obtains for Harley's (1995) Mechanical Case Parameter (MCP). Standard German and Dutch are the only type of language predicted to exist by the MCP. In this system, datives can be structural only in ditransitives. In monotransitives they must be inherent, not falling under the MCP algorithm. This cannot account for Ancient Greek, Luxemburg German and Japanese.

stressed by Woolford (2006), dative (and genitive) are subject to different licensing conditions in ditransitives than in monotransitives. In many accounts (and in Woolford's), this means that inherent Case is introduced (and licensed) by a functional head (e.g. vAPPL) while lexical Case is introduced and (licensed) by the Verb (or the Root). In both respects, i.e. regularity and functional licensing, DAT/GEN in ditransitives are closer to our current understanding of what a structural Accusative is than DAT/GEN in monotransitives. The language learner will, therefore, (i) first analyze DAT/GEN as structural Cases in ditransitives, (ii) and later regularize this pattern to all DAT/GEN arguments (including those found in monotransitives). This will account for (52) in diachronic terms. What is still needed is a way of building this distinction into a formal synchronic analysis along the lines suggested above, so that the universal in (52) be derived in a principled manner. A promising direction to explore would be to appeal to P-incorporation as a key process in double object constructions and applicatives for independent reasons, along the lines suggested by Larson (1988), Baker (1988), den Dikken (1995), Harley (1995; appropriately interpreted) and much research building on them. It would lead us too far afield to fully address this issue here.²⁹

4.4.2 Fact 4: *The auxiliary difference*

To account for the auxiliary facts, we propose that *bekommen/krijgen* is the 'lexicalization' of a Voice+v+ P complex head, resulting from the incorporation of P into Voice-v. Specifically, we propose an analysis of auxiliary decomposition in the spirit of

²⁹ A further prediction of an approach along these lines would be that dative-nominative alternations in monotransitives start from constructions independently requiring P-incorporation, e.g. pseudopassives. This seems to be correct for Japanese, as we have pointed out.

Kayne (1993); see Taraldsen (2010) for *get*-passives in Norwegian.³⁰

(53) [VoiceP [vP [AppIP PP_{DAT-goal} Appl DP_{ACC-theme}]]]

IO goals bearing dative case are specifiers of a (high or low) applicative head, similarly to IO accusative goals in languages like English: see, in particular, Anagnostopoulou (2003) for arguments that goals bearing dative case are specifiers of applicative heads and Anagnostopoulou (2005c) for arguments that benefactive and goal PPs can be specifiers of vAPPL. When P does not incorporate into Voice-v, the dative is opaque (Modern Greek, Russian). When P incorporates into Voice-v the dative becomes transparent (Ancient Greek, German and Dutch). In German and Dutch, *bekommen/krijgen* is the overt lexicalization of Voice+v+P.³¹ When P incorporates into Voice-v, the complex head is spelled out as *bekommen/krijgen*. When no incorporation takes place, the head is spelled out as *werden*. ACC-ACC predicates that also allow passivization with *bekommen*, see (24) above, involve ACC introduced by P.

4.4.3. Fact 5: The passive vs. middle asymmetry.

³⁰ Taraldsen argues that the auxiliary *få* 'get' in Norwegian 'get-passives' lexicalizes a complex head involving Init (corresponding to our Voice) and a K head:

(i) [Init ..[Appl...[ProcP]]]

The complex head emerges from movement of an applicative oblique KP over Init and then to the nominative position leaving a stranded K. This head Appl makes the argument it introduces the agent of the event denoted by ProcP, corresponding to high applicatives in Pylkkänen (2002).

³¹ An anonymous reviewer asks whether a language lacking the auxiliary *bekommen* also lacks structural dative case. This seems to be correct for languages with the Germanic auxiliary system. In Ancient Greek, passives are formed synthetically (verb stem plus endings), and hence there is no overt lexicalization on an auxiliary; in Ancient Greek, though, there can be overt P-incorporation of prepositions assigning dative in monotransitives and ditransitives, as mentioned in section 4.2. Similar evidence (though less transparent) for P-incorporation also seems to be provided by Japanese (see the discussion in section 2.1.2, especially footnote 7).

Recall the Icelandic pattern. We observed a difference between Icelandic and all other languages w.r.t. to (i) the kinds of arguments that alternate (themes vs. non-themes) and (ii) the NP-movement environments where dative arguments alternate (non-passives vs. passives). To accommodate the distinction between Icelandic and all other languages, we propose to appeal to different properties of their respective Voice systems.

The key insight we will build on comes from Svenonius (2002, 2006), and Sigurðsson (2009, 2011) who argue that alternating dative in Icelandic (i.e. the dative assigned to themes of motion) is assigned by a *head lower than Voice* and, therefore, is not affected when passive Voice is present. The specific way we propose to implement this here is in terms of the basic architecture of verbs argued for in Alexiadou, Anagnostopoulou & Schäfer (2006), Marantz (2005) and others according to which, verbs are syntactically decomposed into a Voice, a *v* and a Root component, as illustrated in (54):

(54) [Voice [*v* [Root]]]

As in Wood (2012), we propose to tie direct object datives to some feature or property of a special type of the little *v* head in (54), v_{DAT} , given that this head is responsible for event semantics. From this perspective, alternating dative in Icelandic (i.e. the dative assigned to themes of motion) is assigned by a *head lower than Voice* and, therefore, is not affected when passive Voice is present.³²

Following Schäfer (2008), Sigurðsson (2011) and Wood (2012), we take *-st* in

³² Schäfer (2008) offers an alternative analysis of the Icelandic alternation. In his system, the causative predicates that mark their objects with dative involve a $\text{Voice}_{\text{DAT}}$ head, which interrupts structural case assignment and has the property of assigning inherent dative to the internal argument in its c-commanding domain. In anticausatives, where no such head is present, the theme argument will surface with nominative.

Icelandic middles to be an exponent of an expletive subject in Voice. This explains why there is never an implicit external argument in these constructions. We will also assume that an impoverishment rule is operative at PF in Icelandic, as proposed in Wood (2012), which deletes the feature leading to dative case assignment at PF in the context of expletive Voice:³³

(55) $v\text{DAT} \rightarrow v / [\text{VoiceP } -st \text{ Voice } ___]$

This rule is most immediately compatible with post-syntactic m-case approaches towards Case distribution like the one adopted here. When dative case cannot be assigned to direct objects due to the impoverishment rule in (55), then nominative is employed as the ‘Elsewhere’ case assigned when nothing else is available to assign case. The rule in (55) will not have any effect on dative assigned by the applicative head in ditransitives (and some monotransitives) or on dative assigned by P.

Turning, finally, to Icelandic ditransitives, we saw that, crucially, DAT-NOM alternations never happen with IOs. This is explained as follows.³⁴ IO dative is quirky, i.e. partially transparent entering incomplete Agree (see Anagnostopoulou 2003 2005a; Řezáč 2008), and is always preserved (see Wood 2012 for a recent discussion).

5. Summary

In this paper, we provided evidence based on Care alternations in passives in favor of the view that dative is a mixed Case. Dative, but also other cases, has the property of being either

³³ In Schäfer’s (2008) system, *-st* middles involve an expletive Voice head that cannot assign inherent case.

³⁴ In terms of EPP-driven movement in passives, Icelandic is order preserving: the higher dative becomes the subject and the lower nominative theme is an object (see Holmberg & Platzack 1995; Collins & Thráinsson 1996 among others for a discussion of EPP driven movement in Icelandic passives from the point of view of locality.

inherent/lexical or structural. Cross-linguistically, we find three types of languages:

(i) Uniform languages where dative is never structural Case, and dative-nominative alternations never take place.

(ii) Mixed languages where dative qualifies as structural in ditransitives and as inherent case monotonatives.

(iii) Mixed languages in which alternations take place in both ditransitives and monotonatives but cannot take place with certain types of dative (and genitive) arguments.

We proposed an analysis of datives aiming to account for their mixed status within and across languages. Building on Řezáč's (2008) theory of opacity vs. transparency of theta-related Case to Agree, combined with a (modified) theory of Case alternations in terms of m(orphological)-case (Marantz 1991), we proposed that dative arguments are PPs, unlike accusatives which are DPs. Being complements of the phasal head P, dative DPs are invisible to an outside probe, Voice or T, for Agree. Under certain conditions, however, they become visible: either when a phi-probe is present on P probing and transmitting the features of the DP embedded below it or when P incorporates into the Voice-v complex lifting the phasehood of the PP. Dative auxiliaries like "bekommen" and "krijgen" are lexicalizations of the Voice-v-P complex. We furthermore argued that the actual distribution of m-cases (dative, accusative, nominative) in actives and passives of languages with alternating datives is determined at the PF component, subject to the case-realization disjunctive hierarchy proposed by Marantz (1991). A dative argument entering Agree qualifies as having 'dependent case' in the sense of Marantz (1991) and not as having "lexically governed case". Finally, we proposed that the difference between German/Dutch/Ancient Greek/Japanese, on the one hand, and Icelandic, on the other, concerning the environments where dative

alternations happen (passives vs. middles) depends on the head where the phi-probe entering Agree with dative DPs is located: Voice or v.

Acknowledgements Earlier versions of this paper have been presented at the GGS 2010 (FU Berlin), the 25th Comparative Germanic Workshop (University of Tromsø), NELS 41 (University of Pennsylvania), and the Workshop on the Interaction of syntactic primitives (DGfS 2013, University of Potsdam). We would like to thank these audiences for their comments and suggestions. We would also like to thank Heidi Harley, Winfried Lechner, Terje Lohndal, Gereon Müller, Stefan Müller, Florian Schäfer, Edwin Williams, Ellen Woolford and Jim Wood for very helpful discussions. We are also very grateful to four anonymous JCGL reviewers and the editor for their insightful comments and suggestions. Alexiadou's research was supported by a Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft grant to the project B6 'Underspecification in Voice systems and the syntax-morphology interface' of the Collaborative Research Center 732 'Incremental Specification in Context' at the Universität Stuttgart.

References

- Abels, Klaus. 2003. Successive cyclicity, anti-locality, and adposition stranding. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Connecticut.
- Adams, Douglas Q. 1971. Passives and problems in Classical Greek and Modern English. Working papers in Linguistics, Ohio State University 10: 1-7.
- Adger, David, and Daniel Harbour. 2007. Syntax and syncretisms of the person-case constraint. *Syntax* 10: 2-37.
- Alexiadou, Artemis, Elena Anagnostopoulou, and Florian Schäfer. 2006. Properties of anticausatives cross-linguistically. In *Phases of interpretation*, ed. Mara Fascarelli, 187-212. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Alexiadou, Artemis, Elena Anagnostopoulou, and Christina Sevdali. 2011. Patterns of dative-nominative alternations. To appear in the *Proceedings of North Eastern Linguistic Society 41* (University of Pennsylvania). MA: GLSA.

- Alexiadou, Artemis, Elena Anagnostopoulou, and Susi Wurmbrand. 2013. Movement vs. long distance Agree in raising: disappearing phases and feature valuation To appear in the Proceedings of North Eastern Linguistic Society 43. MA: GLSA.
- Anagnostopoulou, Elena. 1999. On Experiencers. In *Studies in Greek Syntax*, ed. Artemis Alexiadou, Geoffrey Horrocks and Melita Stavrou, 67-93. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Anagnostopoulou, Elena. 2001. Two classes of double object verbs: the role of zero-morphology. In *Progress in Grammar*, ed. Marc van Oostendorp and Elena Anagnostopoulou, 1-27. Roquade, Amsterdam/Utrecht/Delft. Meertens Institute Electronic Publications in Linguistics (MIEPiL).
- Anagnostopoulou, Elena. 2003. *The syntax of ditransitives: evidence from clitics*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Anagnostopoulou, Elena. 2005a. Strong and weak person restrictions: a feature checking analysis. In *Clitic and affix combinations*, ed. Lorie Heggie and Francisco Ordoñez, 199-235. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Anagnostopoulou, Elena. 2005b. Holmberg's Generalization and Cyclic Linearization: Remarks on Fox and Pesetsky. *Theoretical Linguistics* 31: 95-110.
- Anagnostopoulou, Elena. 2005c. Cross-linguistic and cross-categorial distribution of datives. In *Advances in Greek Generative Syntax*, ed. Melita Stavrou and Arhonto Terzi, 61-126. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Anagnostopoulou, Elena, and Christina Sevdali. 2010. Remarks on passivization, dative and Voice in Ancient Greek. Paper presented at the Syntax Workshop, University of Ulster, February 2010.

- Anagnostopoulou, Elena, and Christina Sevdali. 2012. Case alternations in Ancient Greek passives and the typology of Case. Ms. Universities of Crete and Ulster.
- Anderson, Stephen. 1990. The grammar of Icelandic verbs in -st. In *Modern Icelandic Syntax*, ed. Annie Zaenen and Joan Maling, 235-273. New York: Academic Press.
- Andrews, Avery. 1982. The representation of case in modern Icelandic. In *The mental representation of grammatical relations*, ed. Joan Bresnan, 426-403. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Arad, Maya. 1998. VP-structure and the syntax-lexicon interface, PhD dissertation, University College London.
- Bader, Markus, and Jana Häussler. 2010. Grammaticality and usage. Ms. University of Konstanz.
- Bader, Markus, and Jana Häussler. 2013. How much bekommen is there in the German bekommen passive. In *Non-canonical passives*, ed. Artemis Alexiadou and Florian Schäfer, 115-140. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Baker, Mark, C. 1988 *Incorporation: a theory of grammatical function changing*. Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press.
- Baker, Mark, C. 2011. When agreement is for number and gender but not person. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 29: 875-915.
- Bayer, Josef, Markus Bader, and Michael Meng. 2000. Morphological underspecification meets oblique Case: syntactic and processing effects in German. Ms. University of Konstanz.
- Beermann, Dorothee. 2001. Verb semantics and ditransitivity. In *Progress in Grammar*, ed. Marc van Oostendorp and Elena Anagnostopoulou. Roquade, Amsterdam/Utrecht/Delft.

Meertens Institute Electronic Publications in Linguistics (MIEPiL).

- Belletti, Adriana, and Luigi Rizzi. 1988. Psych-verbs and theta-theory. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 6: 293-352.
- Bittner, Moris, and Keneth Hale. 1996. The structural determination of Case and Agreement. *Linguistic Inquiry* 27: 1-68.
- Bonet, Eulalia. 1991. Morphology after syntax: Pronominal clitics in Romance. Ph.D. dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Broekhuis, Hans, and Leonie Cornips. 1994. Undative constructions. *Linguistics* 32: 173-189
- Broekhuis, Hans, and Leonie Cornips. 2012. The verb krijgen 'to get' as an undative verb. *Linguistics* 50: 1205-1250.
- Caha, Pavel. 2009. The nanosyntax of Case. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Tromsø.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1986. *Knowledge of language: Its nature, origin, and use*. New York: Praeger.
- Conti, Luis J. 1998. Zum Passiv von griechischen Verben mit Genitiv bzw. Dativ als zweitem Komplement. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 58: 13-50.
- Collins, Chris, and Höskuldur Thrainsson. 1996. VP-Internal Structure and Object Shift in Icelandic. *Linguistic Inquiry* 27: 391- 444.
- Cook, Philippa. 2006. The datives that aren't born equal: beneficiaries and the dative passive. In *Datives and other cases*, ed. Daniel Hole, André Meinunger and Werner Abraham, 141-84. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Cuervo, Maria Cristina. 2003. Datives at large. Ph.D. dissertation: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

- Czepluch, Hartmut. 1988. Kasusmorphologie und Kasusrelationen. *Linguistische Berichte* 116: 275-310.
- Dikken, Marcel den. 1995. *Particles: on the syntax of verb-particle, triadic and causative constructions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Doggett, Teal Bissell. 2004. *All things being unequal: Locality in Movement*. Ph.D. dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Embick, David. 2004. On the structure of resultative participles in English. *Linguistic Inquiry* 35: 355-392.
- Everaert, Martin. 1990. NP-movement 'across' secondary objects. In *Grammar in Progress*, ed. Joan Mascaró and Marina Nespór, 125-136. Dordrecht: Foris Publications,.
- Fanselow, Gisbert. 1987. *Konfigunktionalität*. Tübingen: Narr Verlag.
- Fanselow, Gisbert. 1991. *Minimale Syntax*. Groninger Arbeiten zur Germanistischen Linguistik 32.
- Fanselow, Gisbert. 2000. Optimal Exceptions In (eds.), *The Lexicon in Focus*, ed. Barbara Stiebels and Dieter Wunderlich, 173-209. Berlin, Ackademie Verlag.
- Feldman, Harry. 1978. Passivizing on datives in Greek. *Linguistic Inquiry* 9: 499-502.
- Fischer, Susann. 2008. *Word-order change as a source of grammaticalisation: a comparative historical study of quirky subjects and stylistic fronting in Romance (Catalan, French, Spanish) and Germanic (English, Icelandic)*. Habilitationsschrift, Universität Stuttgart.
- Fukuda, Shin. To appear. Object case and event type: Accusative-dative object case alternation in Japanese. In *Proceedings of the 33rd Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society (BLS33)*, 1 – 12.

- Haddican, William. 2010. Theme-goal ditransitives and theme passives in British English dialects. *Lingua* 120: 2424-2443.
- Haider, Hubert. 1984. Mona Lisa lächelt stumm - Über das sogenannte deutsche 'Rezipientenpassiv'. *Linguistische Berichte* 89: 32-42.
- Haider, Hubert. 1985. The Case of German. In *Studies in German Grammar*, ed. Jindrich Toman, 65-101. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
- Haider, Hubert. 1993. *Deutsche Syntax generativ*. Tübingen: Narr Verlag.
- Haider, Hubert. 2001. Heads and selection. In *Semi-lexical categories: the function of content words and the content of function words*, ed. Norbert Corver and Henk van Riemsdijk, 67-96. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Harley, Heidi. 1995. *Subjects, events and licensing*, Ph.D. dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Hiraiwa, Ken. 2004. *Dimensions of symmetry in syntax: agreement and clausal architecture*. Ph.D. dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Hoffman, Mika Christine. 1991. *The dyntax of argument-dstructure-changing morphology*. Ph.D. dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Höhle, Tilman. 1982. Explikationen für normale Betonung und normale Wortstellung. In *Satzglieder im Deutschehn*, ed. Werner Abraham, 75-153. Tübingen: Narr Verlag.
- Holmberg, Anders, and Christer Platzack. 1995. *The role of inflection in Scandinavian syntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ishizuka, Tomoko. 2012. *The passive in Japanese: a cartographic minimalist approach*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Iwasaki, Shoichi. 2002. *Japanese*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

- Jónsson, Jóhannes Gísli. 2000. Case and double objects in Icelandic. University of Leeds Working Papers in Linguistics and Phonetics 8: 71–94.
- Kracht, Marcus. 2002. On the semantics of locatives. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 25: 157 - 232.
- Kratzer, Angelika. 1996. Severing the External Argument from its Verb. In *Phrase Structure and the Lexicon*, ed. Johan Rooryck and Laurie Zaring 109-137. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Larson, Richard K. 1988 On the Double Object Construction. *Linguistic Inquiry* 19: 335 – 392.
- Lavidas, Nikolaos. 2007. Μεταβολές στη μεταβατικότητα του ρήματος της Ελληνικής. [Changes in transitivity of the Greek verb]. Ph.D. dissertation: University of Athens.
- Leirbukt, Oddleif. 1997. Untersuchungen zum 'bekommen'-Passiv im heutigen Deutsch. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Lenerz, Jürgen. 1977. Zur Abfolge nominaler Satzglieder im Deutschen. Tübingen: Narr Verlag.
- Lenz, Alexandra. 2009. On the perspectivization of a recipient role - crosslinguistic results from a speech production experiment. In *Passive in Germanic languages*, ed. Marc Fryd, 125-144. Groninger Arbeiten zur germanistischen Linguistik.
- Lenz, Alexandra. 2011. Zum kréien-Passiv und seinen "Konkurrenten" im schriftlichen und mündlichen Luxemburgischen. In *Aktuelle Forschungen zur linguistischen Luxemburgistik*, ed. Peter Gilles and Melanie Wagner. *Jahrbuch Mikroglottika*.
- Lenz, Alexandra. 2013. Three “competing” auxiliaries of a non-canonical passive: On the German get-passive and its auxiliaries. In *Non-canonical passives*, ed. Artemis Alexiadou and Florian Schäfer, 63-94. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

- Levin, Beth, and Malka Rappaport. 1986. The formation of adjectival passives. *Linguistic Inquiry* 17: 623-661.
- Maling, Joan. 2001. Dative: the heterogeneity of the mapping among morphological case, grammatical functions, and thematic roles. *Lingua* 111: 419-464.
- Maling, Joan. 2002. Verbs with dative objects in Icelandic, *Islenskt mal* 24: 31-105.
- Marantz, Alec. 1991. Case and licensing. *Proceedings of Escol*, 234-253.
- Marantz, Alec. 1993. Implications of asymmetries in double object constructions. In *Theoretical aspects of Bantu grammar*, ed. Sam Mchombo, 113-150. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Marantz, Alec. 2005. Objects out of the lexicon: objects as event. Handout presented at the University of Vienna.
- Masullo, Pascual J. 1993. Two Types of Quirky Subjects: Spanish vs. Icelandic. *Proceedings of NELS* 23: 303-317.
- McGinnis, Martha. 1998. *Locality in A-Movement*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- McGinnis, Martha. 2001. Variation in the phase structure of applicatives. *Linguistic Variation Yearbook* 1: 105-146.
- McGinnis, Martha. 2002. Locality and inert Case. In *Proceedings of NELS* 28, 267-281.. GLSA, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- McFadden, Thomas. 2004. *The Position of Morphological Case in the Derivation: a study on the syntax-morphology interface*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.
- Miyagawa, Shigeru. 1997. Against optional scrambling. *Linguistic Inquiry* 28: 1-25.

- Molnárfi, Laszlo. 1998. Kasusstrukturalität und struktureller Kasus - zur Lage des Dativs im heutigen Deutsch. *Linguistische Berichte* 176: 535-580.
- Moltmann, Friederike. 1990. Scrambling in German and the specificity effect. Ms. MIT.
- Müller, Gereon. 1995. *A-bar Syntax. A study in movement types*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Müller, Gereon. 2001. Harmonic Alignment and the Hierarchy of Pronouns in German. In *Pronouns – Grammar and Representation*, ed. Horst J. Simon and Heike Wiese, 205-232. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Müller, Stefan. 2002. *Complex predicates: verbal complexes, resultative constructions, and particle verbs in German*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Nevins, Andrew. 2007. The representation of third person and its consequences for person-case effects. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 25: 273-313.
- Nevins, Andrew. 2011. Multiple agree with clitics : person complementarity vs. omnivorous number. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 29: 939-971.
- Pesetsky, David. 2010. Russian case morphology and the syntactic categories. Ms. MIT.
- Pesetsky, David, and Esther Torrego. To appear. Pedagogical chapter on Case Theory. Draft of a chapter for the *Oxford Handbook of Linguistic Minimalism*.
- Pinker, Stephen. 1989. *Learnability and cognition: The acquisition of argument structure*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Pylkkänen, Liina. 2002. *Introducing Arguments*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Ramchand, Gillian. 2008. *Verbs and the lexicon: a first phase syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Řezáč, Milan. 2008. Phi-Agree and Theta-Related Case. In *Phi Theor: Phi-features across*

- modules and interfaces, ed. Daniel Harbour, David Adger and Susana Bejar, 83-130. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Reis, Marga. 1985. Mona Lisa kriegt zuviel. *Linguistische Berichte* 96: 140-155.
- Sadakane, Kumi, and Masatochi Koizumi. 1995. On the nature of the dative particle *ni* in Japanese. *Linguistics* 33: 5-33.
- Schäfer, Florian. 2008. The syntax of (Anti-)Causatives. External arguments in change-of-state contexts. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Sigurðsson, Háldor Á. 1989. Verbal syntax and case in Icelandic. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Lund.
- Sigurðsson, Háldor Á. 2002. To be an oblique subject : Russian versus Icelandic. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 20: 691-724.
- Sigurðsson, Háldor Á. 2009. The no Case generalization. In *Advances in Comparative Germanic Syntax*, ed. Artemis Alexiadou, Jorge Hankamer, Thomas McFadden, Justin Nuger and Florian Schäfer, 249-280. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Sigurðsson, Háldor Á. 2011. On the New Passive. *Syntax* 14: 148–178.
- Sigurðsson, Einar Freyr, and Jim Wood. 2012. Case alternations in Icelandic get-passives. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 35, pp 269-312 doi:10.1017/S0332586513000048.
- Sternefeld, Wolfgang. 2006. *Syntax, Band II*. Tübingen: Stauffenburg Verlag.
- Svenonius, Peter. 2002. Icelandic case and the structure of events. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 5: 197–225.
- Svenonius, Peter. 2005. Case alternations in Icelandic Passives. Manuscript: University of Trømsø.
- Taraldsen, Tarald. 1995. On Agreement and Nominative Objects in Icelandic. In *Studies in*

- Comparative Germanic Syntax, ed. Hubert Haider, Susan Olsen and Sten Vikner, 307-327. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Taraldsen, Tarald. 2010. Unintentionality out of Control. In *Argument Structure and Syntactic Relations: A cross-linguistic perspective*, ed. Maia Duguine, Susana Huidobro and Nerea Madariaga, 283–302. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Thrainsson, Höskuldur. 2007. *The syntax of Icelandic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tenny, Carol. 1987. *Grammaticalized aspect and affectedness*. Ph.D. dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Ura, Hiroyuki. 1996. *Multiple feature-checking: A theory of grammatical function Splitting*. Ph.D. dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Vogel, Ralf, and Markus Steinbach. 1998. The Dative - An Oblique Case. *Linguistische Berichte* 173: 65-90.
- Wasow, Tomas. 1977. Transformations and the Lexicon. In *Formal Syntax*, ed. Paul W. Culicover, Tomas Wasow and Joan Bresnan, 327-360. New York: Academic Press.
- Webelhuth, Gert. 1995. X-bar Theory and Case Theory. In *Government & Binding Theory and the Minimalist Program*, ed. Gert Webelhuth, 15-95. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Publishers.
- Webelhuth, Gert, and Farrell Ackerman. 1994. German Idioms: An Empirical Approach. *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences* 24: 455-472.
- Wegener, Heide. 1985. *Der Dativ im heutigen Deutsch*. Tübingen: Narr Verlag.
- Wood, Jim. 2012. *Icelandic morphosyntax and argument structure*. Ph.D. dissertation, New York University.

- Woolford, Ellen. 2006. Lexical case, inherent case, and argument structure. *Linguistic Inquiry* 37: 111-130.
- Yip, Moira, Joan Maling, and Ray Jackendoff. 1987. Case in tiers. *Language* 63: 217-250.
- Zaenen, Annie and Joan Maling. 1990. Unaccusative, passive and quirky case. In *Modern Icelandic Syntax*, ed. Annie Zaenen and Joan Maling, 137-152. New York: Academic Pres.,.
- Zaenen, Annie, Joan Maling, and Höskuldur Thráinsson. 1985. Case and Grammatical Functions: The Icelandic Passive. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 3: 441-483.
- Zifonun, Gisela, Ludger Hoffmann, and Bruno Strecker 1997. *Grammatik der deutschen Sprache*. 3 Bände, XXIX/2569 S. - Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.