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ABSTRACT

This dissertation presents an analysis of dative/prepositional argument realization alternations in German which appear with verbs denoting transfer events. The constructions discussed in this study are the dative construction (consisting of the verb, a direct object, and a dative-marked DP), the prepositional constructions (in which the dative-DP is replaced by a PP headed by the prepositions an (on, at), zu (to), and von (of, from)), and the dative construction which appears with particle verbs of transfer. My work represents an attempt to provide a fine-grained analysis of the semantic and syntactic factors that govern the alterations between these constructions.

The results of my investigation challenge the commonly-held view that the prepositional variants always encode an event in which some entity is moved to a goal, a 'caused motion' event, while the dative construction encodes an event in which an animate, typically a human being, undergoes a change in his/her possession, a 'caused possession' event. Following the verb-sensitive approach to the English dative alternation in Rappaport Hovav and Levin (2008), I show that a proper understanding of the argument realization alternations under consideration requires a careful distinction between the meaning lexicalized in the verb and other aspects of meaning determined compositionally. The selection of the various prepositional phrases in German is sensitive to the semantics of the verbs and sometimes also to the joint semantics of the verb and its direct object. I propose a division of transfer verbs participating in dative alternations in German into five classes. Each class shows a specific range of argument realization options, and I show that these options correlate with the semantic properties specific to each class. The classes are: the geben (give)-type class, the verkaufen (sell)-type class, the schicken (send)-type class, the werfen (throw)-type class and the stehlen (steal)-type class. Based on data drawn from copora, I show that the alternations of the first two classes are mainly motivated by syntactic and discourse structure needs. The alternations in the next two verb classes are mainly motivated by a semantic context which lets these verbs associate with either a 'caused possession' or a 'caused motion' event schema. For the last class I propose that the nature of participation (experiencing or non-experiencing) of the third participant (here the deprived person and/or source argument) is relevant for argument realization.
The contrasts between the dative alternations in German and the much-studied English dative alternation provide a better understanding of the alternation in English. In particular, they support the idea that not all verbs which participate in the dative alternation are associated with both caused possession and caused motion events. This thesis also contributes to an understanding of the semantics and selection of prepositions and the function of the dative case in German. Particularly significant is the analysis of the semantics of the prepositions *an* and *von* in German, which have until now been lumped together with the spatial prepositions. I propose that at least in the context of transfer verbs, a non-spatial analysis describes their selection better. In addition, interesting evidence is presented here for a uniform account of the various semantic roles of verb-governed datives, deriving them compositionally from the semantics of the dative and the semantics of the verbs and their context. This thesis supports the ‘old’ but controversial semantic notion about the dative case, namely the ‘experiencer’. Even though it is not the basic semantic feature, it is nonetheless a central semantic association and influences the realization of transfer events to a certain extent. In this sense, my study supports the linguistic tradition of labeling the dative case in German ‘the personal case’.
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ABBREVIATIONS and SYMBOLS

1,2,3  first, second, third person
ACC  accusative
CVB  converb (particle)
DAT  dative
DO(C)  double object (construction)
e  entity
F  feminine
GEN  genitive
M  masculine
NEG  negative marker
NOM  nominative
NP  noun phrase
PP  prepositional phrase
PL  plural
REFL  reflexive
s  situation
SG  singular
T  trace
V(P)  verb (phrase)

*  ungrammatical or infelicitous
%  possible in some dialects
?  bad, but possible
#  grammatical, but not the intended meaning
├  entails
∃  there exists
Chapter 1: Introduction

This dissertation analyzes dative/prepositional argument alternations in German that appear together with verbs denoting transfer events. In these alternations, the third participant (in addition to the agent and the theme argument) is expressed either by a dative marked DP or by a prepositional phrase:

(1)  Er verkaufte dem Kunde das Auto / das Auto an den Kunden. 
He sold the client.DAT the car.ACC / the car.ACC onto (AN)\(^6\) the client 
‘He sold the client the car/ the car to the client.’

(2)  Sie schickte ihrem Freund ein Paket / ein Paket zu ihrem Freund. 
She sent her friend.DAT a package.ACC / a package.ACC to (ZU) her friend 
‘She sent her friend a package/ a package to her friend.’

This dissertation is meant to provide a fine-grained analysis of the rules governing these alternations from both semantic and syntactic motivations alike. My approach adopts a verb-sensitive approach proposed by Rappaport Hovav and Levin (2008) for the English dative alternation, with however important adaptations and additions. The results presented here shed light on the much-studied English dative alternation, but also contribute to an understanding of the semantics and selection of prepositions, and the function of the dative case in German.

\(^6\) In order to prevent confusion between the two prepositions \textit{an} and \textit{zu}, which have a similar morpheme gloss and certainly the same translation in English, I decided to add to the gloss the German preposition.
1.1 Transfer verbs

The English dative alternation is restricted to verbs which can be broadly construed as transfer verbs:

(3) John gave/sent/threw Mary the package / the package to Mary.

In German, on the other hand, alternations between dative case and prepositional constructions are not restricted to transfer verbs, and many more prepositions, in addition to those illustrated in (1) and (2), appear in alternations with the dative case. Wegener (1985) (based, among others, on Matzel (1976)) mentions 12 different prepositions altogether (an ‘at, on’, zu ‘to’, von ‘from’, vor ‘in front of’, für ‘for’, in ‘in’, auf ‘on’, aus ‘out of’, gegen ‘against’, gegenüber ‘opposite of’, bei ‘next to’, mit ‘with’). The two examples of different prepositions presented here also illustrate alternations with nontransfer verbs:

(4) Er hat mir / auf mich Eindruck gemacht.
    He has me.DAT / on me impression made
    ‘He made an impression on me.’

(5) Die Demonstranten wichen der Polizei / vor der Polizei.
    The demonstrators yielded the police.DAT/ in front of the police
    ‘The demonstrators retreated before the police.’

The dative case and prepositions both express a relationship between the argument they mark and the event (and/or between the argument they mark and another argument of the event). The usefulness of the dative case stems from the fact that it leaves the exact nature of the relation underdetermined, and as a result it is compatible with a wide range of specific meanings determined by the context. Therefore many prepositions alternate with the dative case, where each of the prepositions expresses a much more specific and limited relation. However, this dissertation is not meant to provide an analysis of all the alternations between prepositional constructions and the dative case, but rather focuses on transfer verbs for the following reason: Not only are transfer verbs interesting because they allow a comparison to the much-studied English dative alternation, but also because they represent the core dative verbs which seem to involve most dative-like prepositions. A solution to the puzzle of what
governs dative/prepositional alternations with transfer verbs might pave the way to an analysis of all dative-prepositional constructions.

The intuition that transfer verbs are the core dative verbs comes from the fact that three conceptual domains that are crosslinguistically associated with the dative case overlap in transfer events: possession, experiencer, and location. In particular, the recipient plays a conceptually complex role which can be conceptualized as a human goal, connecting between possession and location or between change of possession and direction. S/he can also be seen as the person experiencing a change in his/her possession, thereby connecting possession and experiencer. The former conceptualization explains the grammatical realization through the use of prepositions, which are usually assumed to denote relations in space, while the latter allows the recipient to be realized as a dative DP. The affinity between an experiencer role and the dative case can be best seen in the appearance of experiencer subjects in German, which are not assigned the default nominative case, but are rather regularly marked dative:

(6) Mir ist kalt.
    Me.DAT is cold
    ‘I am cold.’

(7) Mir ist ein Unglück passiert.
    Me.DAT is a bad-luck happened
    ‘A bad thing happened to me.’

(8) Mir scheint, dass.....
    Me.DAT seems that...
    ‘It seems to me that…’

The central function of the recipient role and its relation to both the concept of possession and of location is also illustrated on the semantic map of the functions of the dative case and related prepositions in European languages (Haspelmath (1999). The roles that appear there represent a universal inventory of ‘dative’ functions for languages that have dative-type encoding (prepositional encoding included). Connected roles (indicated by hyphens) should be read similarly to implicational hierarchies; e.g., it is implausible that a language would include the roles ‘direction’ and ‘benefactive’ without ‘recipient’ in its inventory of dative functions. In this manner, the map shows that the recipient is expected to be the most
common role in dative encodings, as it has the largest number of connectors to other roles, those of the conceptual domains location, experiencer, and possession.\(^7\)

Figure 1: Haspelmath (1999)

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pred. possessor</th>
<th>ext. possessor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| \_
| direction          | recipient/     |
| \_                | benefactive    |
| addressee         | \_             |
| \_                | judicantis     |
| experiencer       |                |
```

An appropriate analysis of the three conceptual domains of possession, location, and experiencer has presented a challenge to many linguists, forcing them to confront a variety of issues. The attempt to develop an appropriate analysis of dative alternations for transfer verbs has also led me to interesting and challenging questions and a deeper understanding of the factors behind argument realization.

In the following sections I will introduce my theoretical framework for argument realization. I will then outline how this framework shaped the understanding of the English dative alternation. I begin with the English dative alternation because it has been extensively studied, while the German dative-related alternations have received much less attention. Therefore, many of the important questions which have arisen with respect to the English dative alternation can provide appropriate background for the analysis of the German alternations. Finally I will present the German data, my approach, and an introduction to my findings.

\(^7\) German only very marginally (in some dialects) encodes the role of predicative possessor with the dative. Similarly, a purely locative function, such as ‘direction’, is arguably vanishing from actual speech, though still found in literary German with a non-productive and limited number of verbs.
1.2 Verb meaning, argument realization, and argument alternations

The study of verbal argument structure has been of great interest to linguists because of the recognizable relations between the semantics of the verb and the patterns of syntactic realization of the arguments of the verb. The insight that certain semantic properties of the participants of an event encoded in the verb cooccur with certain syntactic functions has led to various theories of argument realization. The assumption widely-held by recent lexical semanticists is that the meaning of the verb consists of two parts, the individual meaning of the verb and the association of this individual meaning with a cross-verbal and even cross-linguistic set of event types. These event types can be represented by syntactic configurations (Hale and Keyser (2002), Cuervo (2003)), patterns of primitive predicates, (e.g., Pinker (1989), Jackendoff (1983), (1990), Wunderlich (2000)), types of constructions (Goldberg (1995)), or event templates or schemata (Rappaport Hovav and Levin (1998)). Much of what I write can be translated into any of these frameworks. However, since, as I show, the facts of German motivate a ‘verb-sensitive’ approach, I adopt Levin’s (2008) framework which has been developed to explicate a ‘verb-sensitive’ approach. An open set of verb roots (Pesetsky 1995, p.70) is associated with a limited set of event schemata in the following manner: on the one hand, the root contains the entailed lexical meaning of a verb, which may be quite complex, as in verbs such as *waltz* or *mold*, which contain specific information about the order of the steps, or refer to a complicated procedure. Among these entailments, which make every verb unique, are certain basic components which make it possible to associate the root with an event schema. The event schema, then, is realized morphosyntactically in a language-specific way, according to the morphosyntactic resources of the respective language.

---

8 These components are most likely part of a limited set. Rappaport Hovav and Levin (2010) show, for example, how a manner and a result component exclude each other as true root components.
A special challenge to any theory of argument realization is the fact that many verbs show more than one option for the realization of their arguments. A well-known example is the so-called dative alternation in English, in which a verb may have (a) a double object construction or (b) an object + oblique construction. (Henceforth the DOC/DO-variant and the to-construction/to-variant)

(9) a. Bill gave/threw Tom the ball b. Bill gave/threw the ball to Tom

The linguistic motivation for an argument alternation can be along either of the following two lines (terms adopted from Sadler & Spencer (1998), based on Ackerman (1990)):

(i) **morphosemantic**: driven by the need to appropriately express different semantic contents syntactically
(ii) **morphosyntactic**: driven by different syntactic needs, or by pragmatic or phonological needs that affect the syntax of the construction.

Within the framework of the event schemata the two motivations for argument alternations are accounted for as follows: first, by allowing a verbal root to associate with more than one event schema. This would lead to a morphosemantic alternation, even though the syntactic realization may be the same because of the specific morphosyntactic resources of a language. Second, one event schema can have more than one syntactic realization if the resources bear a

---

The definition of *mold* is taken from *The New Oxford Dictionary* (1998), the event structure from Rappaport Hovav (2010, (12)).
broader range, and this renders the alternation morphosyntactically motivated. Thus, for any given verb, two options are available for analysis: a single meaning with two options for realization, or multiple meanings, where each realization reflects the relevant part of the underlying semantics. It should be pointed out that most analyses of argument alternations have been uniformly multiple meaning or single meaning, irrespective of the individual verb which takes part in the alternation.

Figure 3: single meaning and multiple meanings options for verbs:

The possibility that a verb allows association with two event schemata, and that one or both event schemata have more than one syntactic realization is of course included, and actually proposed for throw-type verbs by Rappaport Hovav and Levin (2008), see the next subsection.

1.3 The English dative alternation and its various approaches

The two event schemata that have been proposed as relevant to analyses of the dative alternation are the caused possession and the caused motion schema (terms taken from Goldberg (1995)). English transfer verbs which participate in the dative alternation prototypically denote a situation in which the referent of the theme argument is transferred to a recipient. This action can be either semantically interpreted as an event in which an agent acts on a theme, causing a state in which the theme stands in a possession relation to a possessor, or as an event in which the agent causes the theme to move to a goal, possibly an abstract possessional field (according to the ‘Localist Hypothesis’ Gruber (1965), Jackendoff (1972), (1983)):
Caused possession: \( x \) causes \( y \) to have \( z \)
Caused motion: \( x \) causes \( z \) to be at \( y \)  (Levin (2008, p. 285)

The prevalent approach today (e.g., Pinker (1989), Pesetsky (1995), Harley (2002), Krifka (2003)) is that the alternates, the DOC and the \textit{to}-construction, reflect the semantic difference of these two event schemata. The use of the preposition \textit{to}, which is also used as the goal preposition in ‘typical’ motion events (often in combination with \textit{in} and \textit{on} (\textit{into}, \textit{onto})) is therefore a direct reflection of the choice of the caused motion schema:

\begin{equation}
(10) \quad \text{Peter drove the car to London / into the garage / onto the parking deck.}
\end{equation}

The DO-variant, then, is the realization of the caused possession schema. Adopting the terminology of Rappaport Hovav and Levin (2008), I will call this approach the \textbf{uniform multiple meaning view}, as it is applied to any DO or \textit{to}-construction no matter by which verb it is headed. Examples of semantic analyses along the lines of this view are, according to Pinker (1989) and Krifka (2003):

\begin{equation}
(11) \quad \text{DOC: } [\text{\textit{EVENT} give [John Mary [\textit{STATEHAVE} Mary the book]]]}
\end{equation}

\textit{To-C}: [\text{\textit{EVENT} give [John the book [\textit{EVENTGO} the book [\textit{PATH to} [\textit{PLACE Mary]]]]]

\begin{equation}
(12) \quad \text{DOC: } \exists e \exists s [\text{AGENT}(e, \text{John}) \land \text{CAUSE}(e, s) \land s: \text{HAVE}(\text{Mary, the car})]
\end{equation}

\textit{To-C}: \exists e \exists e' [\text{AGENT}(e, \text{John}) \land \text{CAUSE}(e, e') \land \text{MOVE}(e') \land \text{THEME}(e', \text{the car}) \land \text{GOAL}(e', \text{Mary})]

Pinker’s analysis influenced syntactic analyses, such as Pesetsky (1995). In Pesetsky’s analysis, both the \textit{to}-variant and the DOC are analyzed as DO + PP constructions; however, the PP in the DOC is headed by a null preposition G. This difference in syntax has semantic consequences; Pesetsky argues for a path reading if the preposition \textit{to} is present, a reading that is not available with the null preposition G. Harley (2002) replaces the null preposition and the preposition \textit{to} with prepositional heads, P_{\text{HAVE}} for denoting the recipient and P_{\text{LOC}} for denoting the goal.

\begin{equation}
(13) \quad \text{DOC: } [\text{\textit{NP} Mary}] \text{GOAL [\textit{PP} G [\textit{the book}] \text{THEME}]}
\end{equation}

\textit{To-C}: [\text{\textit{NP} the book}] \text{THEME [\textit{PP to} [\textit{Mary}] \text{GOAL}]}

8
Support for assigning the variants different event schemata comes from the fact that sometimes the DOC, but not the to-construction, can be used, and vice versa, as pointed out by Green (1974) and Oehrle (1976):

(14) a. Peter gave Lars a headache /*gave a headache to Lars.
b. The teacher sent the students to the principal/ *sent the principal the students.

The difference in grammaticality in example (14) is accounted for as follows: if a verb or an idiom does not lexicalize caused motion, as is the case with give someone a headache, only the DOC is grammatical. The to-construction would imply the interpretation that the headache moved to the recipient, which is infelicitous. On the other hand, if no caused possession is present, as is the case with send the students to the principal, the DOC is ruled out, as the DOC would imply that the principal has the students as a result, which is of course not the intended interpretation.

Examples such as (14) are certainly a problem for the single meaning view, but despite these shortcomings, this approach is still presented here. According to this view, the DOC and the to-construction are seen as paraphrases of each other, following the model presented above, realizations of the same event schema, caused possession. The classic syntactic example of this approach is Larson (1988). Motivated by the Uniform Theta role Assignment Hypothesis (UTAH) (Baker (1988)), which states that equivalent theta roles should be assigned to equivalent syntactic positions, one construction is thus derived from the other, again, independent of the verbal head. The preposition to is claimed to be a case-marker, making no semantic contribution, and can therefore be incorporated; as a consequence, the NP is left without case, and has to move into a case position:

(15) \[ V \cdot \text{give}_i [V_P \text{the book} [V \cdot t_1 [P_P \text{to Mary}]]] \] is transformed into \[ V \cdot \text{give}_i [V_P \text{Mary} [V \cdot [V \cdot t_1 t_2] \text{the book}]] \]

Compatible with the single meaning view is the information structure (and other factors) view (Erteschik-Shir (1979), Arnold et al. (2000), Wasow (2002), Bresnan & Nikitina (2007)). This view states that the two variants are truth-conditionally equivalent, and the factors which determine the two different realizations of the same event schema are shown to be the discourse structure and the phonological weight of one of the constituents, further
definiteness, pronominality, and animacy of the NPs involved. Weight, e.g., can produce structures that do not appear in neutral contexts. The verb begrudge is listed by Levin (1993) as a verb that only appears in the DOC, as in example (16a). Wasow (2002) however, has found it in the to-construction due to the heaviness of the recipient argument:

(16) a. I don't begrudge Helen Fielding her success with Bridget Jones. (www.newstatesman.com/199911290020)  
                 b. But no one could begrudge its splendid facilities to a city which lost 16,000 of Armenia’s 25,000 dead on December 7, 1988, and was half ruined by the earthquake. (Wasow 2002, (16a): Hector Corpus)

The discourse strategy of mentioning given information before new information can also cause one structure to be preferred over the other:

(17) What did John do with his book?  
           He gave the book to Mary. (# He gave Mary the book.)

Even though this view seems to support the single meaning view, it is also compatible with the multiple meaning view. One may argue that the semantic differences are not ignored, but are shown to determine the unmarked choice, which can then be overridden by information structure and NP features. The two constructions are thus often, but not necessarily found as paraphrases.

In contrast to the uniform approaches mentioned above, Rappaport Hovav and Levin (2008) argue for a verb-sensitive view. They show that certain verbs which participate in the dative alternation are associated with the same event schema (the caused possession) in both alternates, while others are associated with different event schemata in each variant. This behavior of dative verbs depends to a large degree on the category of their verb classes. The relevant verb classes of dative verbs which appear in their study are the give-type class, the send-type, and the throw-type class. The verb-sensitive view can be summarized as follows (cf. Rappaport Hovav and Levin (2008))
The preposition *to* is analyzed as playing an ambiguous role between marking a recipient and marking a spatial goal. *Give*-type verbs are not associated with a spatial path, and therefore here *to* always marks a recipient. The alternation in the case of these verbs is only governed by information structure factors (and also by other factors, such as phonological weight) as shown above.

It should be highlighted that a verb-sensitive view helps explain the variation in the behavior of ditransitive verbs crosslinguistically (cf. Levin (2008)). Croft *et al.* (2001) have found that ditransitives form the following implicational hierarchy with respect to their realization of DOCs and oblique construction:

(19) Ditransitivity Hierarchy: give > send > throw

If not all verbs of a language can form either DOCs or oblique constructions respectively, those verbs in a language which can form DOCs will be associated with the right end of the hierarchy, while those which can realize a theme-recipient situation with an oblique construction will belong to the left end.

This point can be illustrated with data from Hebrew. Francez (2006) shows that the distribution of the Hebrew dative case marker *le*- and the preposition *el* (disambiguated in their pronominal form) support the verb-sensitive view: a *give*-type verb cannot appear with *el*, which signals a directional goal reading, whereas a *send*-type verb can be construed with both:

(20) dani natan la / * eleha et ha-tapu’ax.
        Dani gave EL.3.F.SG / EL.3.F.SG ACC the-apple
        ‘Dani gave her the apple.’
In Hebrew, it is *natan* (*give*) that disallows the prepositional construction, rather than *falax* (*send*), which appears farther down the ditransitivity hierarchy.

This dissertation will show that the verb-sensitive view is also the promising approach to the analysis of German dative alternations. In the following subsections, I will introduce the relevant data and issues to be discussed here.

### 1.4 Dative/prepositional argument alternations in German

As introduced above, German has alternations similar to the dative alternation in English. In the ditransitive construction, the two postverbal arguments are realized as two NPs. In the unmarked word order the recipient-denoting NP is first, and is marked by the dative case, and then the theme-denoting NP appears, marked by the accusative case. In the prepositional construction, the recipient-denoting constituent is realized as a prepositional phrase which follows the theme argument in the unmarked word order. Thus, the verb *verkaufen* (*sell*) appears in the following alternation:

(22)  

a. Oliver verkauft dem Kunden ein Buch.  
Oliver sells the client.DAT a book.ACC  
‘Oli is selling the client a book.’

b. Oliver verkauft ein Buch an den Kunden.  
Oliver sells a book.ACC onto(AN) the client  
‘Oli is selling a book to the client.’

This seems to resemble the dative alternation, and has often been analyzed by analogy to English, namely as a morphosemantic alternation motivated by either a possessive (the DAT-ACC construction) or a locative semantic environment (the prepositional construction) (Wunderlich (2005), Meinunger (2006), see below), i.e., realizations of the caused possession on the one hand and the caused motion event schemata on the other.
However, it is not always straightforward to determine the German correlates to each English variant because the two languages differ in their morphosyntactic resources. In particular, direct arguments can be distinguished by case morphology. Furthermore, German allows scrambling, and the range of prepositions that alternate with the dative argument is larger, even in the restricted domain of transfer verbs. The result is that the range of the German dative alternation includes eight different alternates when the verb *send* is used:

(23)  
   a. Dem Kunden (DAT) ein Paket (ACC) schicken  
   The client.DAT a package.ACC send  
   ‘send a package to the client’  
   b. Ein Paket (ACC) dem Kunden (DAT) schicken  
   c. Ein Paket (ACC) an den Kunden (PP an) schicken  
   d. An den Kunden (PP an) ein Paket (ACC) schicken  
   e. Ein Paket (ACC) zu dem Kunden (PP zu) schicken  
   f. Zu dem Kunden (PP zu) ein Paket (ACC) schicken  
   g. Dem Kunden (DAT) ein Paket (ACC) zuschicken (particle verb zu-)  
   h. Ein Paket (ACC) dem Kunden (DAT) zuschicken (particle verb zu-)

Furthermore, different verbs participate in different alternations. Thus, the verb *geben* (give) allows only alternations (a) and (b), *verkaufen* (sell) allows (a) to (d), and *werfen* (throw), used in a ditransitive frame with an additional recipient argument, can only be constructed as in (e) to (h). In fact, *werfen* is not considered a dative verb at all, but, as if filling a semantic gap, the particle construction ‘zuwerfen’ (‘to-throw’) completes the pattern. The following table shows that the distribution of the German dative and prepositional variants is quite regular, depending on the verb classes – perhaps not surprisingly similar to the verb classes of dative verbs in English (Levin (1993)). The main difference is that the English *give*-type class is divided into two classes in German: the *geben* (give) and the *verkaufen* (sell)-type classes. To save space, the scrambled variants ((b), (d), (f) and (h) above) are not listed, given that any grammatical variant is also grammatical in its scrambled version.

Table 1 (following page):
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb class</th>
<th>Alternation</th>
<th>dative variant</th>
<th>an-variant</th>
<th>zu-variant</th>
<th>particle-zu-variant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Geben (give)-type class</strong></td>
<td>Similarly schenken (give generously), lassen und überlassen (leave s.th. to s.o.), reichen (pass), widmen (dedicate).</td>
<td>dative variant: DPDAT DPACC V</td>
<td>an-variant</td>
<td>zu-variant</td>
<td>particle-zu-variant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1a. Oli gab Peter das Buch</td>
<td>Oli gave Peter.DAT the book.ACC</td>
<td>(‘Oli gave Peter the book’)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1b. *Oli gab das Buch an Peter</td>
<td>*Oli gave the book.ACC onto Peter</td>
<td>(*’Oli gave the book to (AN) Peter’)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1c. *Oli gab das Buch zu Peter</td>
<td>*Oli gave the book.ACC to Peter</td>
<td>(*’Oli gave the book to (ZU) Peter’)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1d. *Oli gab Peter das Buch zu</td>
<td>*Oli gave Peter.DAT the book.ACC to-</td>
<td>(‘Oli gave (to-gave) Peter the book’)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2a. Oli verkaufte Peter das Buch</td>
<td>Oli sold Peter.DAT the book.ACC</td>
<td>(‘Oli sold Peter the book’)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2b. Oli verkaufte das Buch an Peter</td>
<td>Oli sold the book.ACC onto Peter</td>
<td>(‘Oli sold the book to (AN)Peter’)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2c. *Oli verkaufte das Buch zu Peter</td>
<td>*Oli sold the book.ACC to</td>
<td>(*’Oli sold the book to (ZU) Peter’)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2d. *Oli verkaufte Peter das Buch zu</td>
<td>*Oli sold Peter.DAT the book.ACC to-</td>
<td>(*’Oli sold (to-sold) Peter the book’)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3a. Oli schickte Peter den Brief</td>
<td>Oli sent Peter.DAT the letter.ACC</td>
<td>(‘Oli sent Peter the letter’)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3b. Oli schickte den Brief an Peter</td>
<td>Oli sent the letter.ACC onto Peter</td>
<td>(‘Oli sent the letter to (AN) Peter’)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3c. Oli schickte den Brief zu Peter</td>
<td>Oli sent the letter.ACC to Peter.DAT</td>
<td>(‘Oli sent the letter to (ZU) Peter’)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3d. Oli schickte Peter den Brief zu</td>
<td>Oli sent Peter.DAT the letter.ACC to-</td>
<td>(‘Oli sent (to-sent) Peter the letter’)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4a. #Oli warf Peter den Ball</td>
<td>Oli threw Peter.DAT the ball.ACC</td>
<td>(only in benefactive reading: Oli threw the ball for Peter)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4b. #??Oli warf den Ball an Peter</td>
<td>Oli threw the ball.ACC onto Peter</td>
<td>(only in non-recipient meaning: Oli threw the ball onto Peter (but it bounced back)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4c. Oli warf den Ball zu Peter</td>
<td>Oli threw the ball.ACC to Peter</td>
<td>(‘Oli threw the ball to (ZU) Peter)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4d. Oli warf Peter den Ball zu</td>
<td>Oli threw Peter.DAT the ball.ACC to-</td>
<td>(‘Oli threw (to-throw) Peter the ball’)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Particle-variant: DPDAT DPACC zu-V
These patterns of the distribution of the various alternates support a verb-sensitive approach to the analysis of German transfer verbs. However, current analyses of German dative-related alternations known to me seem to ignore—or fail to realize—these patterns. In the following subsection I will briefly review the approaches.

1.4.1 Analyses of dative-related argument alternations in German

Wunderlich (2005) proposes—crosslinguistically—two ditransitive verbs classes, involving the two primitive predicates POSS and LOC:

\[\text{ACT}(x) \land \text{BECOME POSS}(y,z)\]  
\[y\text{ is a recipient — a medial argument}\]

\[\text{ACT}(x) \land \text{BECOME LOC}(z,\text{AT}(y))\]  
\[y\text{ is a goal — the lowest argument}\]

Verbs may be compatible with both classes, such as \textit{schicken} (send) in German, and the two constructions, the DAT-ACC and the PP-construction are thus realizations of one or the other event schema. See the following example from Wunderlich (2005, (83)), which he labels “change of possession & location verbs”. The (a) sentence would involve a POSS predicate in its decomposition, denoting a caused possession event, whereas the (b) sentence involves a LOC predicate, denoting caused motion.

\[\begin{align*}
\text{(25) a. Anna schickte dem Verleger die Photos.} \\
\text{Anna sent the.DAT publisher the.ACC photos} \\
\text{‘Anna sent the publisher the photos.’}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{b. Anna schickte die Photos an den Verleger/ in die Bibliothek/auf den Speicher.} \\
\text{Anna sent the.ACC photos onto(AN) the publisher/ into the library/onto the store.} \\
\text{‘Anna sent the photos to the publisher/to the library/to the store.’}
\end{align*}\]

Notice that Wunderlich, like most other modern researchers, does not distinguish between the different prepositions that can be used, but instead invariably analyzes the prepositional construction as a realization of the BECOME LOC construction. He admits, however, that the difference in meaning is often negligible, as change of location events often co-occur with change of possession events. The difference merely amounts to the hierarchical order of arguments. The theme argument and third argument (recipient or goal respectively) appear in reverse order following the two semantic representations.
Wunderlich’s approach seems to be appropriate for verbs as *schicken*, as they may really denote both a change of possession and a change of location event when the goal is a recipient. However, he overlooks the fact that the German prepositional variants he mentions only occur in the class of *send*-type verbs, but not in the *give*-type or *sell*-type class. *Geben* (*give*)-type verbs do not alternate with any prepositional variant, and *verkaufen* (*sell*)-type verbs only have a grammatical *an*-variant, but no *zu*-variant. As discussed above, this phenomenon requires an adequate analysis.

Meinunger (2006, section 5) also assumes that two different meanings, a possession and a location meaning, underlie the ditransitive construction and the prepositional constructions in German. Still, he adopts Wunderlich’s decomposition, and derives the POSS-predicate (see (24)) from the locative construction, the underlying decomposition for both constructions being

\[(26) \quad [x \text{ CAUSE } [. . . \text{ BE } [y [\text{ IN/ AT/ ON } z]]]] (\text{Meinunger (25)})\]

Following Kayne (1993) he assumes that the possession reading is the result of preposition incorporation into the primitive predicate BE. Meinunger distinguishes between ditransitive verbs which have a locative reading and therefore allow the prepositional construction, such as *schicken* (*send*) and *bringen* (*bring*) and verbs that do not, such as *schenken* (*give free of charge*), and other non-transfer verbs that do not have a typical possession reading at all, such as *empfehlen* (*recommend*) and *zutrauen* (*have confidence in s.o. to do s.th.*). He claims that (all) these verbs have neither a locational nor a necessary possessional reading, but admits that his theory does not cover the analysis of these verbs. Like Wunderlich, his examples for a mere location vs. a ‘conscious possessor’ interpretation of the non-accusative argument, here ‘my aunt’, are with the verbs *schicken* and *bringen*, both verbs that undoubtedly have these two interpretations:

\[(27) \quad \text{...weil ich das Fahrrad zu meiner Tante geschickt habe.} \quad \text{(Meinunger (30))}\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{since I.NOM the bicycle.ACC to (ZU) my aunt sent have} \\
\text{‘since I sent the bicycle to my aunt’}
\end{align*}
\]
(28) ...weil ich meiner Tante das Fahrrad geschickt habe.

since I.NOM my aunt.DAT the bicycle.ACC sent have

'since I sent my aunt my bicycle' (Meinunger (32))

Crucially, however, Meinunger has nothing to say about other prepositions and other verbs such as verkaufen or vermieten (rent), which do not seem to have a locational interpretation either, but allow prepositional constructions, in German the an-variant. His semantic formulations also remain vague, as I do not see why e.g. schenken or geben (give (generously)) should not have a locational ‘reading’; they may very well refer to such an event, which would then allow a prepositional-locational construction.

The approach which assumes a distinction between the dative variant and prepositional variants with respect to referring to either a possessional or a locational meaning can be traced back to linguistic descriptions by traditional German linguists, who usually assigned the dative variant a ‘personal’ reading and the prepositional variants a spatial or objective interpretation (Wilmanns (1909, p. 660), Erben (1972, p.147)\(^{10}\). Possession, involving a human and mentally-involved recipient, seems to fit the personal construction, while a spatial goal fits the locative. However, the literature clearly indicates that this ‘uniform multiple meaning approach’ does not cover all dative/ prepositional alternations. When different prepositions are focused upon, the differences stand out. Matzel (1976, pp.177-178) considers the dative and zu-variant as bearing different meanings, while the dative and an-variant are identical in all cases in which they alternate, including verkaufen (sell) and schicken (send). Wegener (1985, pp. 224-231) shows successfully that the dative construction and the prepositional variants with zu and für differ in their semantics because they do (the dative variant) or do not (the prepositional variants) require animate arguments, which has consequences for their semantic range and the mental involvement of the participant: the zu-variant, but not the dative variant, is grammatical in a pure spatial goal reading, i.e., one indicated by an additional phrase zu mir, aber ich war nicht zu Hause (to me, but I was not home); the dative variant, but not the für-variant, indicates that the denotee is conscious, a state which allows additional phrases that negate consciousness, such as für ihn, aber er war sich nicht davon bewusst (for him, but he was not aware of it), or even inanimate complements in the für-variant, such as das ist nicht gut für den Motor (this is not good for

\(^{10}\) See chapter 5.1.2 for details.
the engine). However, her discussion of *an* remains more intuitive. The person denoted by the dative DP should be more a participant in a ‘transaction’, while the person denoted by the *an*-PP more a goal of a ‘transport’, even though she admits that concerning the animacy requirement for the third argument there are hardly any differences between a dative DP and an *an*-phrase. She concludes that the preposition *an* is the most dative-like preposition available in German (p.227). These descriptions of dative/prepositional alternations could be the basis of a more differentiated approach to the alternation, however, interestingly, I have not found modern accounts that take the semantic differences of the prepositions into consideration.

The only modern approach to the dative alternation which does not necessarily consider PP- constructions to be locational seems to be Wagner (2003). He compares the German dative alternation to English and marginally to Dutch. He points out the difference between true goals and non-goal recipients, which depends on the individual semantics of the verbs and is first and foremost independent of the morphosyntactic realization. Taking morphosyntactic resources and the im/possibility of scrambling into account, he questions the multiple meaning position at least of the English and Dutch DOC/ PP- alternations. His results very much resemble the results of the verb-sensitive approach as in Rappaport Hovav and Levin (2008). In particular, he analyzes information structure influences on scrambling of *geben* (give-type verbs, *aussetzen* (expose)-type verbs (some dative verbs, arguable a non-productive class (cf. McIntyre (2006)), with ACC-DAT base order) and *senden* (send)-type verbs. His results can be illustrated as follows: (PC=prepositional construction)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Argument realization options</th>
<th>Unmarked order</th>
<th>Driven by information structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Geben</em> give</td>
<td>DAT-ACC, ACC-DAT, *PC</td>
<td>DAT-ACC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Senden</em> send</td>
<td>DAT-ACC, ACC-DAT, PC</td>
<td>DAT-ACC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

He compares these options to the English option for the DOC or *to*-construction, and concludes that the difference between the two languages may be purely morphological:
German ACC-DAT base order resembles to-constructions with true goals, in which no DOC is possible (expose), DAT-ACC base order resembles DOCs, and the to-construction, now denoting non-goal recipients, provides an inversion of theme and recipient if needed by information structure. However, Wagner, similarly to Meinunger, analyzes the geben (give)-type class and the senden (send)-type class, which truly seem to differ in that one has a non-goal recipient (the geben-class) and the other a pure goal argument (the senden/schicken-class). The distinction non-goal recipient vs. spatial goal corresponds nicely with the absence vs. presence of the PP-construction option. It is unclear whether Wagner would have arrived at a verb-sensitive approach rather than a multiple meaning approach to the German alternations as well, if he had included German verkaufen (sell)-type verbs in his discussion. Furthermore, the role of the prepositional construction (an argument realization option for senden (send)-type verbs, and also, as I have shown, for verkaufen (sell)-type verbs) in information structure constraints remains unclear. According to one of my web searches the DAT-ACC word order of alternating ditransitive verbs tends to alternate with the prepositional an-variant and not with the ACC-DAT, as stated by Wagner with respect to send-type verbs, if the information structure requires the reversed order of arguments:

(29) Schon 1894 füllte Joseph Biedenharn, [...] die fertige Limonade in Krüge um und verkaufte diese Behälter dann an Feldarbeiter. Er verkaufte den beiden die Lizenz zum Coca Cola Abfüllen für einen Dollar.

[…] sold these containers.ACC onto (AN) field workers. He sold the both.DAT the license to-the Coca Cola bottling.ACC for one dollar.

‘Already in 1894, Joseph Biedenharn […] filled the ready lemonade into jars, and sold these containers to field workers. He sold the two of them the license to bottle Coca Cola for one dollar.’

(http://www.lerntippsammlung.de/Coca-Cola.html)

Chapter 5 will show that this generalization supports the analysis of the an-variant as a semantically identical construction to the DAT-ACC for both schicken/ senden-type and verkaufen-type verbs, very much similar to the to-construction which may denote caused possession for the English verbs that participate in the dative alternation.

In the following section, I will introduce my analysis of the German dative alternations.
1.5 The verb-sensitive approach to German dative-related alternations

I will show in this dissertation that a uniform approach to German dative alternations, according to which all the prepositional constructions of all verbs are associated with the caused motion schema, is not the right analysis for German. I challenge the approaches where all prepositions are treated uniformly. In contrast, my findings support the verb-sensitive approach of Rappaport Hovav and Levin (2008) introduced in section 1.3. As discussed above, they show that in English, the give-type class (which includes German verkaufen (sell)-type verbs) is only associated with the caused possession schema, even in its prepositional variant, while the realizations of send and throw-type classes are ambiguous between the two schemata. I will show in this dissertation that German behaves similarly.

Table 2, which includes the semantic components claimed to be relevant for the realization options of German dative verbs, gives a rough overview. The crucial property is whether a verb is a possessive verb and/or a spatial motion verb. However, it can be seen that the distinctions made by Rappaport Hovav and Levin (2008) are not sufficient for German, because they do not distinguish between geben (give)-type verbs and verkaufen (sell)-type verbs. In German, the argument realization of possessive verbs is in addition sensitive to the kind of possessional change entailed: verbs that entail caused transfer of possession (the verkaufen-type verbs) or only caused possession (the geben-type verbs).

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb class and alternation</th>
<th>Lexical semantic components relevant for the licensing of the various alternations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Geben-type class</strong></td>
<td>caused possession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a. Oli gab Peter das Buch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b. *Oli gab das Buch an Peter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c. *Oli gab das Buch zu Peter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1d. *Oli gab Peter das Buch zu</td>
<td>‘Oli gave the book to Peter’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarly schenken (give as a present), lassen and überlassen (leave s.th. to s.o.).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Verkaufen-type class</strong></td>
<td>transfer of possession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a. Oli verkaufte Peter das Buch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b. Oli verkaufte das Buch an Peter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c. *Oli verkaufte das Buch zu Peter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2d. *Oli verkaufte Peter das Buch zu</td>
<td>‘Oli sold the book to Peter’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarly überweisen (transfer money), vermieten (rent), vererben (bequeath), ab-übergeben, weiterleiten (forward, give over)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Central to my analysis is the observation that lumping the German prepositional variants together, as is done by e.g. Wunderlich (2005), impedes appropriate analysis. I will distinguish between what licenses the dative and what components license each preposition, and therefore the alternation will first and foremost follow from the respective lexical semantics of the lexical items involved. In particular, the preposition an will be distinguished from the clearly spatial preposition zu. Even though in other environments the prepositions an and zu undoubtedly both have spatial uses, the existence of these prepositions in a variant to a dative construction does not necessarily point to a spatial component of meaning. The verkaufen (sell)-type class, which licenses an, differs from the geben (give)-type class, which does not license an with respect to a change of location component, but instead with respect to a loss of possession component on the part of the agent; often even a responsibility for a release of ownership. Chapter 2 will discuss this difference in detail. Verkaufen (sell)-type verbs, for example, require an intentional agent, usually animate, in both variants, while the external arguments of geben (give)-type verbs can be inanimates, such as natural forces or facts. Note the difference in grammaticality in the following minimal pair schenken (give generously, a give-type verb), and verschenken (give away, a sell-type verb):

(30) a. Peter (ver)schenkte Oli seine Briefmarkensammlung.
   Peter gave Oli.DAT his stamp-collection.ACC
   ‘Peter gave Oli his stamp collection.’

b. Das Schicksal/ sein einzigartiges Talent (*ver)schenkte Oli ein langes Leben.
   The fate/ his unique talent gave(-*away) Oli.DAT a long life.ACC
   ‘Fate/ his unique talent gave Oli a long life.’
The un/grammaticality of an is therefore transparently sensitive to whether the event is a true transfer of possession event from agent to recipient, or whether the event is mere caused possession with a non-existent or underspecified prior possessor. As will be shown in detail below, the absence or presence of spatial motion does not play a role in distinguishing geben (give)-type verbs and verkaufen (sell)-type verbs in their dative variant from verkaufen (sell)-type verbs in their prepositional variant. For example, both variants are ungrammatical with the particle hin (hither), which would point to a spatial motion component (see (32a) and (b)). The un/grammaticality with hin further shows that schicken (send)-type verbs are ambiguous between a caused possession and a caused motion schema (including abstract spatial spaces such as cyberspace in emailen (email)) (32c), while werfen (throw)-type verbs clearly entail spatial change; a PP headed with an here can be combined with hin (32d).

(31)  
a. Oli gab seinem Vater das Auto *hin.
Oli gave his father.DAT the car.ACC hither
‘Oli gave the car hither to his father.’

Oli sold his father.DAT/ onto (AN) his father the car hither
‘Oli sold the car hither to his father.’

Oli sent the package.ACC his father.DAT hither/ onto (AN) his father hither/to (ZU) his father hither
‘Oli sent the package hither to his father.’

d. Oli warf den Ball Peter hin / zu Peter hin / an die Decke hin.
Oli threw the ball.ACC Peter.DAT hither / to(ZU) Peter hither / at the ceiling hither
‘Oli threw the ball hither to Peter/ hither at the ceiling.’

A further observation is connected to the distinction between the dative variant and the an-variant is, one which adds another aspect to Rappaport Hovav and Levin’s sensitivity regarding the verb. In the case of some verbs that participate in the dative/an alternation, the
analysis involves sensitivity not only with respect to the verb, but also with respect to the joint semantics of the verb and its ‘first’ object, the theme argument, realized as the accusative object in German. The observation that the alternation may be sensitive both to the semantics of the verb and to its composition with its arguments comes from Wegener (1985), who claims that the dative object in German is in most cases an argument of the ‘verb complex’, the verb and its first object form, and not an argument of the verb alone. A possible exception is the verb *geben*.

Note the following contrast of VPs headed by the same verb, but differing in their accusative object:

(32)  
\[\begin{align*}
a. \text{Die Frau gewährte dem Mann} & / \text{*an den Mann } Eintritt. \\
& \text{The woman allowed the man.DAT / onto(AN) the man entrance.ACC} \\
& \text{‘The woman allowed the man to enter.’}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
b. \text{Der Staat gewährte ausländischen Familien} & / \text{an ausländische Familien } Kindergeld. \\
& \text{The state allowed foreign families.DAT / onto(AN) foreign families children’s} \\
& \text{allowances.ACC.} \\
& \text{‘The state granted children’s allowances to foreign families.’}
\end{align*}\]

This contrast is accounted for by the semantics of the accusative object. *Entrance* in the (a) sentence cannot ‘change’ possession from the agent to the recipient, therefore rendering the *an*-variant ungrammatical, but *money* in (b) certainly can. Verbs such as these are interesting because they support a view that verbs have among their basic components less basic components. The basic components – namely those which would entail caused possession – influence the alternation options irrespective of the semantic content of the first object, e.g., both (a) and (b) would be ungrammatical with a *zu*-variant. However, the semantics of the first object triggers meaning components of the verb, here the legal or institutional aspect of allowing, which licenses the alternation with *an*.

When the verb-sensitive view is applied to the German data, *werfen* (throw)-type verbs are particularly interesting. Unlike English *throw*-type verbs, they do not allow the dative variant to denote a recipient unless the verb is turned into a particle verb. The simplex verb only licenses a dative DP in a benefactive context, e.g., a context of someone throwing a stick for
the dog to be fetched. However, Bamboo the dog in (33b) is not the recipient (the stick is thrown away from it), but only the beneficiary for whom the game is played.

(33) a. Gabi warf Peter den Ball zu. : Peter=recipient
Gabi threw Peter.DAT the ball.ACC to-
‘Gabi threw Peter the ball.’

b. Gabi warf Bamboo das Stöckchen. : Bamboo=beneficiary
Gabi threw Bamboo.DAT the stick.ACC
‘Gabi threw the stick for Bamboo.’

For a recipient argument to be realized as a dative DP there must be a possessive component to the verb. The challenging question of how the possessive component comes in when the verb is turned into a particle verb will be discussed in Chapter 4. The verb bringen (bring) may perhaps represent the only exception where a dative recipient alternates with a zu-recipient without morphological changes in the verb. As speculated in chapter 4, this exception is probably caused by the semantics of the verb, which entails direction toward an endpoint, while typical throw-type verbs are not specified as to the direction of the event, and therefore need a PP or a particle.

(34) a. Gabi bringt dem Gast ein Glas Bier.
Gabi brings the guest.DAT a glass beer.ACC
‘Gabi is bringing the guest a glass of beer.’

b. Gabi bringt ein Glas Bier zu dem Gast.
Gabi brings a glass beer.ACC to(ZU) the guest
‘Gabi is bringing a glass of beer to the guest.’

1.5.1 Comparison to the English dative alternation

The analysis of German dative/prepositional alternations according to the verb-sensitive approach can shed light on what is going on in English:
### Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>German alternation</th>
<th>English alternation</th>
<th>Event schema</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oli gab Peter das Buch</td>
<td>Oli gave Peter the book</td>
<td><em>Caused possession,</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oli gab das Buch Peter</td>
<td>Oli gave the book to Peter</td>
<td><em>(To=dative marker)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oli verkaufte Peter das Buch</td>
<td>Oli sold Peter the book</td>
<td><em>Caused possession</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oli verkaufte das Buch an Peter</td>
<td>Oli sold the book to Peter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oli schickte den Brief</td>
<td>Oli sent Peter the letter</td>
<td><em>Caused possession</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oli schickte den Brief an Peter</td>
<td>Oli sent the letter to Peter</td>
<td><em>Caused possession</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oli schickte den Brief zu Peter</td>
<td>Oli sent the letter to Peter</td>
<td><em>Caused motion</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oli schickte den Brief zum/ *an den Nordpol</td>
<td>Oli sent the letter to the north pole</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oli warf Peter den Ball zu</td>
<td>Oli threw Peter the ball</td>
<td><em>Caused possession</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oli warf den Ball zu Peter</td>
<td>Oli threw the ball to Peter</td>
<td><em>Caused motion</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>(Oli threw the door the ball)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>(Oli threw the ball to the door)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Aligning English and German alternations in this manner points to an interesting analysis of the preposition *to* in English, namely as a spatial preposition denoting a goal and as a dative marker denoting a non-spatial recipient. English does not have case marking, which possibly results in a disallowing of scrambling. This, in turn, can affect the discourse preferences of given vs. newly-mentioned items, as has been already shown in Wagner (2003). The comparison of *give*-type verbs in German and English shows that the *to*-construction can serve as a grammatical version denoting the same transfer, only that the theme and recipient argument are reversed. German, which allows scrambling, does not need a different construction to provide a reversed order of theme and recipient. However, if verbs do have a PP variant because their semantics licenses this PP, such as the *verkaufen* (*sell*)-type and *schicken* (*send*)-type classes, the discourse behavior of *sell*-type class verbs as exemplified in (29) above shows that the *an*-variant may behave like the English *to*-construction, as a possible, and for yet unclear reasons preferred, variant in which the theme and recipient are reversed.

On the other hand, the comparison of the *send*-type and *throw*-type classes shows that the *to*-construction can also resemble the truly spatial *zu*-construction in German. Thus, the semantic range of the preposition *to* is analyzed as including both a non-spatial dative marker and a spatial goal marker. This conclusion resembles Rappaport Hovav and Levin’s analysis of the preposition *to*; my analysis therefore presents independent evidence supporting the crosslinguistic significance and validity of their theory.
1.5.2 Separation of possession and location and the scalar approach

Another interesting consequence of my analysis is that it supports a separation of the concepts of possession and location in semantic representation. I thus argue against the widely-held view that possession is a subtype of location. This view is motivated by the fact that in cases where verbs that encode caused motion take on a human goal, and in cases where verbs that encode caused possession also involve caused motion (which may represent the majority of ‘transfer’ situations), the semantic difference between instantiations of caused possession and caused motion may be very small, often marginal, when it comes to the actual use in discourse. It is also motivated by the fact that in many languages the morphological encoding of possession is the same as that of location. Therefore, it is widely assumed that possession is not a separate grammatical concept, but a subclass of location, i.e., a human location (Lyons (1977)), or, according to the Localist Hypothesis (Gruber (1965), Jackendoff (1972), (1983)), an abstract possessional field. This assumption results in attempts to derive possessional constructions from location, as e.g. in Freeze (1992), or for German dative verbs Brandt (2004). As mentioned above, I intend to show that in German, \textit{zu} is the only preposition that marks a change of location; \textit{an} does not mark the goal of a change of location, despite its spatial use in other environments, nor does the bare dative. Thus, to derive the appropriate distribution of these prepositions, it is necessary to distinguish a possessional component, to which \textit{an} and the bare dative are sensitive, from a spatial component, to which \textit{zu} and other spatial prepositions are sensitive. This distinction argues for an assumption that possession on the one hand and location on the other give rise to each realization. Thus, each concept has a separate influence on the lexical representation of verbs, in accordance with the position outlined in Tham (2004). I do not ignore the morphosyntactic similarities in the realization of the two concepts which languages often display, but instead of deriving one from the other, my aim is rather to find a linguistic concept that subsumes both and can explain the clear relation between the two. In chapter 2.4 I will show that a scalar approach to dative-related argument alternations is a promising way to a unifying concept of the semantics and behavior of the verbs discussed in this dissertation. Both change of possession and change of location are changes along a scale, associated with a certain dimension, the difference being that change of possession is a two-value scalar change, as the path here has no internal structure, while change of location happens along a multiple value scale with a regular path. Moreover, the difference between the bare dative and the \textit{an}-variant can be explained by the scalar concept. In Kennedy and McNally (2005)’s
discussion of adjectives (and in analyses of de-adjectival degree achievement verbs, directed motion verbs, and incremental theme verbs (Hay et al (1999), Kennedy and Levin (2008), Rappaport Hovav and Levin (2010)) it has already been shown that the concept of scales with upper or lower bounds vs. unbounded scales can shed much light on these fields. The difference between *geben* (give)-type and *verkaufen* (sell)-type verbs can also be represented by a scalar concept: the latter, but not the former, lexicalizes a scale with two bounds. Only a lexicalized scale with two bounds renders the verb a *transfer* of possession verb, and not only a caused possession verb.

1.5.3 Final summary of the data discussed in the dissertation

Two prepositions that are less important in the case of the English dative alternation but appear in German transfer events will be included in my dissertation: *von* (from) and marginally *für* (for). Wegener (1985, p. 217) mentions them along with *an* as the most productive prepositions that appear as alternates to dative arguments. The *von*-variant alternates with the dative variant in ‘reversed’ transfer events; the dative DP and the *von*-PP denote here the negative counterpart of the recipient, the ‘deprivee’ (Wegener (1985) uses the term ‘loser’ for a human ‘source’ role).

(35) Die Frau stiehlt/ entwendet/ raubt dem Mann / von dem Mann das Auto.
The woman steals/ takes away/ robs the manDAT / from the man the car.
‘The woman is stealing etc. the car from the man.’

Interestingly, the semantic properties of *von* are not parallel to either *an* or *zu*, as will be discussed in Chapter 2. In addition, the motivation of a dative/*von*-alternation differs from the motivation of most dative/*an* and dative/*zu* alternations, as shown in Chapter 5; it is not motivated primarily by either a caused possession or a caused motion event schema, but instead by the kind of participation of the dative/*von* denotee, namely whether or not the denotee is a true experiencer of the event. It thus sheds light on a semantic factor still present in German: the experiencer interpretation of the dative case.

*Für* alternates with the ‘dativus iudicantis’, the ‘judger’ dative as in the following:
Das Wasser ist mir zu heiss/ zu heiss für mich.
The water is me.DAT too hot/ too hot for me
‘The water is too hot for me.’

and with the benefactive dative. Beneficiaries are, of course, not necessarily recipients; clearly, a benefactive event does not entail transfer. However, depending on the individual semantics of the verb, and the implicatures that are connected with it (e.g., verbs like kaufen (buy) vs. waschen (wash)), a recipient role can be implied. If the theme argument is indefinite, meaning that its referent comes into existence in the event, the beneficiary is particularly understood to be the person who ends up with this item in his/her possession.

Die Frau kauft/ beschafft/ näht dem Mann / für den Mann eine Hose.
The woman buys/supplies/saws the man.DAT/for the man a pants.ACC
‘The woman is buying etc. the man pants/ pants for the man.’

Man= recipient

vs.

Die Frau wäscht/ repariert der Nachbarin/ für die Nachbarin das Auto.
The woman washes/repairs the neighbor.DAT/ for the neighbor the car.ACC
‘The woman is washing / repairing the car for the neighbor.’

Neighbor = beneficiary

The semantics of für and the alternating dative constructions are interesting as this issue highlights semantic aspects of the dative (see chapter 3), of the preposition an and of verbs that license the an-variant (see chapter 2). Concerning the alternation between a dative DP and a für-phrase, meaning differences are easily isolated for the ‘judger’ dative, as will be seen in chapter 3. The denotee of the dative DP, but not of the für-phrase, has to be conscious. However, in beneficiary events this distinction is less clear-cut, as the presence of the beneficiary is not necessarily required, neither for a dative beneficiary, nor for the denotee of a für phrase. As in the difficulty in isolating semantic differences between the dative and the an-phrase regarding their ‘degree of experiencing’, I do not have (yet?) much to say about what motivates dative/für alternations in transfer events (chapter 5).
The following table gives a complete overview of the verb types and prepositional variants discussed in this dissertation:

Table 5:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geben-type class/ the dative-only variant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a. Oli gab Peter das Buch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Oli gave the book to Peter’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarly, schenken (give generously), lassen and überlassen (leave s.th. to s.o.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verkaufen-type class / the an-variant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2a. Oli verkaufte Peter das Buch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b. Oli verkaufte das Buch an Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Oli sold the book to Peter’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarly, überweisen (transfer money), vermieten (rent), vererben (bequeath), ab-/übergeben, weiterleiten (forward, give over)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schicken-type class / the an-variant and the zu-variant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3a. Oli schickte Peter den Brief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b. Oli schickte den Brief an Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c. Oli schickte den Brief zu Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3d. Oli schickte Peter den Brief zu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Oli sent the letter to Peter’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarly, senden (send), faxen (fax), funken (cable)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Werfen-type class / the zu-variant and the particle-zu variant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4a. Oli warf den Ball zu Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b. Oli warf Peter den Ball zu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Oli threw the ball to Peter’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarly, schleudern (fling), kicken (kick), stoßen (toss), schießen (shoot)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kaufen-type class and verbs of creation / the für-variant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6a. Oli kauft Peter ein Buch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b. Oli kauft ein Buch für Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Oli buys a book for Peter’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarly, verbs of creation as ein Bild malen (draw a picture), ein Haus bauen (build a house), einen Kuchen backen (bake a cake)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.6 Methodology

My analysis of dative/prepositional argument alternations in German is based on an account of subtle differences in the grammaticality and meaning of the constructions. The use of language corpora has been indispensable in achieving this aim. Examples of data found in the literature and my own examples are helpful in speculating about certain theoretical generalizations, but are not enough to firmly establish them, since the examples are often produced and judged without context. Since computer-readable texts and recordings have become easily available, and thus access to usage in real contexts and spontaneous utterances has become possible, linguists have shown that data based on introspection are often
inaccurate. With respect to the dative alternation in English, cf. Bresnan & Nikitina (2007), examples taken from authentic usage have revealed that many constructions which were judged ungrammatical by other authors are actually used in certain environments. In the case of German, attested examples from language corpora are indispensable when it comes to generalizing the factors that govern the eight alternations which are possible for the verb schicken (send), as illustrated above in (23). I have therefore been working with net documents and language corpora to which I received access. Many of the examples in this dissertation were drawn from the internet via Google searches, and some of the examples from the Cosmas II corpus of the Institut für deutsche Sprache (IDS) in Mannheim, Germany.

Concerning the examples and distribution tendencies of constructions found via Google, as often happens, the web changes and some examples may no longer be able to be verified. This is especially true regarding the Google result counts of the appearance of various constructions (see chapter 5). My results can therefore only represent tendencies, and do not provide conclusive evidence. However, I hope to show that these tendencies make important observations transparent and are therefore an important contribution to my analysis.

1.7 Outline of the dissertation

In the following chapter, I present a fine-grained analysis of the semantics and use of the prepositions that alternate with the dative case in transfer events, zu (to), von (from), an (onto), and für (for). In chapter 3 the semantic contribution of dative case will be discussed. Even though the dative is considered a structural case, in most contexts it bears the semantic feature of an experiencer. I assume an underlying HAVE-relation between the dative DP and either an entity or an event. Chapter 4 discusses the particle-zu-construction of werfen (throw)-type verbs. Interestingly, the dative argument in these constructions is a recipient, even though the verb itself does not have a possessive component. It will be shown that the recipient interpretation stems from combining the directional semantics of the particle zu with the experiencer meaning that the dative case brings with it. Chapter 5 presents the rules governing the various alternations, supported by examples of actual use. It will be shown that the choice of the event structure templates exemplified in subsection 1.3 plays a decisive role, similar to the results of Rappaport Hovav and Levin (2008) for English. In addition, some of the German alternations are influenced by the semantics of the dative case by requiring an experiencer role for the dative variant but not for the prepositional variant.
Chapter 2: The prepositional construction

The prepositional variants of transfer verbs discussed in this chapter are the *zu*-variant, the *von*-variant, the *an*-variant, and the *für*-variant. I will present the semantic components of both the prepositions and the verbs that render constructions with transfer prepositions grammatical in the context of the general semantic puzzle on the extent to which the co-occurrence of PPs with verbs can be accounted for in compositional terms. This field has not yet been deeply analyzed in the literature. My results in the rather limited field of transfer situations will illustrate how far one can get with a semantically based approach to V-PP compositionality. Furthermore, the four prepositional variants discussed in this chapter behave very differently, but a comparison of their scalar properties using the scalar approach introduced in Chapter 1 can lead to a uniform analysis.

2.1 Compositionality between verb and preposition

The following questions are asked in the analysis of transfer prepositions:

(i) What is the semantics of the individual prepositions?
(ii) How does the nature of the complement influence the semantics of the preposition, that is, the semantic effects of animate vs. inanimate complements?
(iii) What semantic components of the verb license a certain preposition, and under what circumstances do factors other than the semantics of the verb contribute to a grammatical match of verb, direct object, and prepositional phrase?
In this section I will elaborate on the issue of compositionality between the verb and PPs.

Even though many descriptive studies have discussed the individual semantics of prepositions, in comprehensive works on German grammar such as the Duden-Grammatik or single volumes such as those of Schmitz (1966), Henzen (1969), and Moilanen (1979), the more general question of the semantic principles according to which prepositions are selected by their governing verbs is a topic which has not yet been much discussed. Gawron (1986) seems to be the first to have dealt with preposition selection in a semantic framework, but his findings require further elaboration.

Gawron assumes that prepositions have semantic content, denoting a relation between the preposition and either one or two arguments. One-argument 'intransitive prepositions' are those such as inside or downstairs (as in The man is inside/ downstairs), whereas two-argument, 'transitive prepositions' are those such as against, on, under, etc. Gawron terms the two arguments PSubj and PObj. The latter prepositions are of direct relevance here. In considering the composition between the semantics of the verb and those of the preposition, Gawron points out that the preposition may share none, one, or both of its arguments with the governing verb, and the semantics of the preposition may be contained in the semantics of the verb or be additional information. The function of the PP is different in each case, and Gawron draws an insightful distinction between argument PPs, co-predicator PPs, and adjuncts:

**Argument PP**: preposition shares both arguments with the verb

Semantics of P is contained in the semantics of V, i.e., is redundant.

**Co-predicator**: preposition shares one argument with the verb,

Semantics of P is not contained in the semantics of V, i.e.,

is additional information which introduces a new argument to the verb.

**Adjunct**: preposition shares no argument with the verb,

however, takes the whole proposition as its first argument.

Semantics of P is additional information,

introducing its own argument.

Illustrative examples discussed in Gawron are the following:

(39) Jack hit the stick against the fence. (Gawron, (1))
Hit and against in (39) share the semantic component of impingement, of bringing one item forcefully into contact against another, here the stick against the fence. Both arguments of against are thus also arguments of the verb. The PP is therefore analyzed as an argument-PP. In (40), however, impingement is not a component of break, as one may break something just by dropping it. The preposition adds a new semantic component along with a new participant, the wall. However, it shares the argument vase. The PP is thus a co-predicating PP. Sentence (41) is ambiguous because a clear distinction cannot be made between an interpretation where under the bridge is the goal of the walking and one in which it is only the location where the walking takes place. These two interpretations illustrate the difference between co-predicating PPs and adjunct PPs. In the first interpretation, the PP is co-predicating, sharing the argument Mary with the verb and adding the goal semantics 'Mary under the bridge', whereas in the latter interpretation, under takes as its first argument the whole proposition, Mary walking, and relates it to the bridge. The PP is therefore analyzed as an adjunct.

In the case of argument PPs Gawron establishes his Argument Principle for Prepositions, which became the basis for future analyses of obliques, see Jackendoff (1990), Wechsler (1995), or Beavers (2006):

Argument Principle for Prepositions (Gawron, p. 344):

A subcategorized-for prepositional phrase can only be an argument-PP if the lexical relation of its head preposition is a component of the verb's lexical relation.

Argument-PPs are thus explicitly licensed on a lexical semantic basis between verb and preposition and the meaning of the preposition is included in the meaning of the governing verb. Adjuncts, on the other hand, are clearly not licensed on a lexical semantic basis between verb and preposition. The verb's meaning does not directly play a role when an adjunct is added, only the meaning of the whole proposition. At the same time, Gawron remains vague about the kind of licensing of co-predicating PPs. The only requirement he mentions is that the preposition has to share an argument with the verb. He does, however, elaborate on the way in which the interpretation of the combined predication of verb and preposition comes
about. It is subject to a sort of cognitive 'bondedness' between the two predications, one being the efficient cause of the other (walking can cause someone to be under a bridge) or one being a part, a constituent, of the situation (the instrumental with in: Jack fought the dragon with a magic sword, Gawron, pp. 352-353\textsuperscript{11}). Gawron assumes that there are additional, but at any rate very few ‘bondedness’ relations. Furthermore, he emphasizes that ‘bondedness’ does not state anything about the ordering of the facts in the clause, but leaves the interpretation based on 'shared views of how the world works' (p. 354), to the same principles that enable us to interpret chunks of discourse.

Gawron speculates whether one could account for ‘bondedness’ on lexical semantic grounds such as how the semantics of break combines with the semantics of against in (40), but unfortunately he does not go into detail. I will continue the discussion from here and hopefully contribute to further insight. To begin, there are clearly limits of compatibility between the verb and co-predicating PPs, i.e., PPs which are not selected by the verbal head, but still gain argument status in the end. This fact seems to support a semantically-based approach to the compatibility of verbs and PPs along extended lines of Gawron's Argument Principle for Prepositions. The challenge is to determine whether these limits can be explained on the basis of the semantic components of the verb and preposition alone, or whether the semantic relation is much looser, based on whether the meaning components happen simultaneously and are related to each other in a causative relation. The perception of the type of relation may ultimately be influenced by intuitive world knowledge and not necessarily by the actual physical events. I will briefly illustrate this semantic challenge of compositionality with co-predicating directional PPs in English.

There undoubtedly seems to be a semantically-based relation between the verb and a co-predicating oblique. One cannot add any oblique to any verb; there seem to be semantic restrictions:

\begin{enumerate}
\item [(42)]
\begin{enumerate}
\item a. He danced into the room.
\item b. *He laughed/ screamed into the room.
\end{enumerate}
\end{enumerate}

(in the sense ‘walked into the room laughing/screaming’)

\textsuperscript{11} With shares one argument with the verb fight, namely Jack, as he is 'with the sword', carrying it.
Dance, like walk in Gawron's example cited in (41), can be described as having an underspecified motion component. A person can dance in place, or walk in place, but cannot dance or walk without any movement. Prepositions such as into can thus latch on to specify the movement further, adding direction. For these examples, the Argument Principle for Prepositions can be easily extended by adding the possibility that the verb shares only part of the semantics of the prepositions, here the motion component, whereas other parts are additional information, here the denotation of the goal of the motion. Laugh and scream, in contrast, do not have such a motion component, so the extension with into, denoting a direction in space, does not make sense.

On reflection, matters are more complicated. Laughing and screaming are also associated with movement. Even though they are primarily sound emission verbs, the sound is created by the movement of several muscles of the body. Why can't a preposition latch onto this movement? Other sound emission verbs do combine with spatial prepositions; like laugh and scream, the following verbs do not seem to have any obvious shared semantic component (verbs like these are also discussed in Levin and Rappaport Hovav (1995)):

(43)  

a. It means that any tow truck can rumble into the garage and haul away any vehicle not displaying a valid ticket.  

(www.tripadvisor.com/ShowUserReviews-g154948-d185268-r98589496-Lost_Lake_Lodge-Whistler_British_Columbia.html )

b. At anytime a nurse could rustle into the room.  

(www.fanfiction.net › TV Shows › Numb3rs)

These VPs seem to have an unconnected compositional semantics in which the preposition into adds a totally new semantic component, directed motion. Together with the semantics of the verb, the sentence has the required meaning: The truck moved into the garage making a rumbling noise.

The semantic concepts that underlie the grammaticality in the examples with dance, rumble, and rustle on the one hand and cause the ungrammaticality in the examples with laugh and scream on the other, are co-temporality and causation. These concepts have been shown by Levin and Rappaport Hovav (1999) and (2001) to be crucial to the account of resultatives of the bare XP kind (to which the above examples belong), and the reflexisive resultatives, as in example (44) below. This finding is in accordance with Gawron's ideas on bondedness; the relation of co-temporality and causation could be instantiations of a
semantically-grounded ‘bondedness’ between the verb and PP. If the denoted motion of the PP and the sound emission of the verb are co-temporal and stand in a causative relation to each other, the two semantic chunks can be combined. In *dance*, the movement of the legs that creates the dance also causes the entrance into the room. The movement of the facial muscles or vocal cords in *laugh* and *scream* is not involved in and does not cause the movement of the person. There is no causative relation between *laugh* and the direction *into*. In a magical world in which laughing causes you to become light and start flying, the combination would be grammatical. As with *dance*, but hidden behind the sound semantics, the rumbling of the truck and rustling of the nurse have a causative relation to the direction into the room/garage. The movement of the truck entering the garage is the efficient cause of the rumbling sound of the heavy parts of the trucks. The same is true of the nurse who rushes into room: her movement of her legs while entering the room causes the rustling of her clothes. In these examples the ordering of the facts is reversed compared to *dance*. *Into the garage/into the room* causes the rumbling of the truck/the rustling of the nurse’s clothes, but the rumbling of the truck does not cause the movement *into the garage* or the rustling of the nurse’s clothes the movement *into the room*. The causative relation between the semantic chunks does not have to be of a specific type in order to license the co-predication of PP and verb.

Given this situation, why is the following sentence ungrammatical, even though the ringing of the alarm clock causes the clock to move and fall from the table, a scene that surely happens?

(44) *The alarm clock rang from the table.*

I assume that two factors play a role here, direct vs. indirect causation and world knowledge of more or less typical events. The ringing and the movement of the clock typically do not go together in a relation of co-temporality and causation, perhaps because of the second fact: the causation is not direct. The ringing does not directly cause the directed movement. The ringing might cause the clock to shake, and the shaking might cause the clock to move and fall. These two facts may make co-predication more difficult, as the human mind has more difficulty processing the construct. A similar sentence is grammatical, but here the verb *ring* appears with an additional dummy direct object *itself*. This dummy object helps to process the sentence, as the event is syntactically separated into two subevents: the clock ringing and the clock (referred to by *itself*) falling off the table. As Rappaport Hovav and Levin
(1999), (2001) show, events with a reflexive resultative do not have to happen co-temporarily, therefore a similar construction may be more appropriate to describe the event of the clock ringing and thereby falling.

(45) The alarm clock rang itself off the table.

The question of compositionality is further challenged by a comparison with other languages. Differences in the permissiveness of such loose semantic licensing can be found between the various languages. English, like German, can license verb + preposition combinations much more easily than, e.g., Romance languages. Thus, Spanish cannot combine manner of motion with a directional PP (cf. examples with *dance* and *walk* in English). To express such a sentence grammatically, a proper motion verb and a participle have to be used.

    The bottle floated to the cave.

b. La botella entro a la cueva flotando. (Talmy (1985, p.69))
    The bottle entered the cave floating.

English and other Germanic languages have therefore been classified by Talmy (1985) as 'satellite-framed languages', as opposed to the Romance 'verb-framed languages'. In satellite-framed languages, certain semantic information such as directional information is carried by material (here the preposition) outside the verb. The verb entails manner only, and the directed motion is added compositionally by the PP. The claim is that verb-framed languages, such as Romance languages, have the directional information on the verb, which the PP only specifies further. However, this conclusion is not entirely warranted either. After a careful examination of the data of Romance, Germanic, and many other languages, Beavers, Levin and Tham (2010) propose that all languages have both 'satellite-framed VPs' and 'verb-framed VPs'. They claim that difference in permissiveness of 'satellite-framed VPs' stems from the fact that the inventory of prepositions differs in these languages: English has *to* and its combinations that entail directed motion, whereas the Romance languages lack a basic directed motion preposition, as *à* is claimed to be locative in its essence, as is put forward by the studies of e.g. Fábregas (2007), Song (1997), and Son (2007).
The scope of this dissertation does not allow me to go deeper into the question of why German, but not other languages, is as permissive as is shown below, but I assume that the fact that German has many prepositions and particles available to modify the verb's meaning plays an important role. This variety allows for many different verb-preposition and verb-particle combinations. Following Beavers, Tham & Levin (2009), the fact that German has enough lexical resources for a compositional semantics might just be the reason why it is relatively permissive in the range of nonselected material that can be added in the VP. For example, there are the possible verb-particle-prepositions combinations of the verb *zischen* (whizz)

(47)  

_Aus dem Haus hera.uszischen, zum Spielplatz hinzischen,
_  Out the house hence-out-whizz, to-the playground hither-whizz,
_  auf das Klettergerüst hochzischen, die Rutsche herunterzischen,
_  onto the jungle-gym up-whizz, the slide hence-down-whizz,
_  auf der Schaukel hin- und herzischen, auf den Baum heraufzischen,
_  on the swing hither and hence-whizz, onto the tree hence-up-whizz,
_  vom Ast herabzischen, im Sand herumzischen,
_  from-the branch hence-off-whizz, in-the sand hence-around-whizz,
_  auf dem Karussell rundherumzischen, nach Hause abzischen,
_  on the merry-go-round around-hence-around-whizz, towards home off-whizz,
_  zur Tür hineinzischen, das Feuer am Herd aufzischen lassen.
_  to-the door hither-in-whizz, the fire at-the stove up-whizz let.
_  (‘to whizz out of the house, to the playground, onto the jungle-gym, down the slide, to whizz hither and hence on the slide, up the tree, down the branch, around in the sand, around on the merry-go-round, to hurry home, to whizz through the door, to kindle the fire at the stove.’)

Although I leave essential questions unanswered, as my investigations into preposition selection is in the limited domain of transfer events only, I do hope to contribute to the discussion. I propose to show that a semantically-based approach to compositionality that searches for semantic components in the verb and other lexical material in the sentence which match the semantics of the preposition and therefore license the co-predication, can explain a great deal in the compositional semantics of transfer events.
2.2 The semantics of transfer prepositions and their governing verbs

The prepositional phrases that alternate with the dative DPs of transfer situations are represented in the following table. They are headed by the prepositions an (attached on), zu (to), and von (from). I will also discuss briefly the preposition für (for), which denotes the beneficiary, but can be understood as the actual recipient. The contrast that für provides underlines the semantics of the other prepositions.

Table 6:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>recipient/goal:</th>
<th>deprivee/source:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Der Mann verkaufte das Haus <strong>an die Frau.</strong></td>
<td>Die Frau stahl das Auto <strong>von dem Mann.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The man sold the house.ACC onto(AN) the woman</td>
<td>The woman stole the car.ACC from the man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘The man sold the house to the woman.’</td>
<td>‘The woman stole the car from the man.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Der Postbote brachte das Paket <strong>zu der Frau.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The postman brought the package.ACC to(ZU) the woman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘The postman brought the package to the woman.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>beneficiary/ implied recipient:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Die Frau kaufte die Hose <strong>für den Mann.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The woman bought the pants.ACC for the man</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘The woman bought the pants for the man.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first distinction that both traditional grammars and modern analyses (e.g., Zwarts (2005), p. 3) of prepositions provide is that between spatial and non-spatial prepositions. An, zu, and von are basically considered to be spatial prepositions, influenced by the fact that
their origin is spatial *Duden-Grammatik*, paragraphs 615, 617, Graff (1824), pp. 1, 4)\(^{12}\). *Für*, on the other hand, does not have any spatial uses, even though it is historically related to the spatial preposition *vor* (in front of) (cf. *Duden-Etymologie*, p. 211). Examples of *an*, *zu*, and *von* in pure spatial events are presented in the following. In such events, the alternation with the dative case is ungrammatical:

\[(48)\] Der Junge schoss den Ball an die Decke. (*der Decke den Ball*)

The boy shot the ball.ACC onto(AN) the ceiling (the ceiling.DAT the ball.ACC)

‘The boy shot the ball onto the ceiling.’

\[(49)\] Er nahm das Buch vom Regal. (*Er nahm dem Regal das Buch*)

He took the book.ACC from-the shelf (He took the shelf.DAT the book.ACC)

‘He took the book from the shelf.’

\[(50)\] Sie schickte den Brief zum Südpol. (*dem Südpol den Brief*)

She sent the letter.ACC to-the(ZU) South Pole (the South Pole.DAT the letter.ACC)

‘She sent the letter to the South Pole.’

Furthermore, there are three classes among the spatial prepositions: those that are only locative or directional, and those which have both locative and directional uses depending on the case of their complement. Locative prepositions include *außerhalb* (outside), *bei* (near), and *gegenüber* (opposite). *Zu* and *von* are classified as directional prepositions (e.g., Schmitz (1966), Zwarts (2005)), answering the questions *where to?* (*zu*) and *from where?* (*von*) (Schmitz, pp.44, 38) or lexicalizing the basic path functions *TO* (*zu*) and *FROM* (*von*) (Zwarts, based on Jackendoff (1983, p. 162f)). *An* belongs to the third class; if its complement bears the dative case, the interpretation is locative, if it is marked by the accusative case, it is directional. As with all prepositions participating in the two-fold class (e.g., *in* (in), *unter* (under), *über* (over)), directional *an* includes the semantics of locative *an*, namely as its specific goal, therefore the locative use is taken to be the basic use in all grammars. Adapting Zwarts's analysis of *in* (table 10), we can therefore analyze *an* + accusative case, the *an* of transfer situations relevant for our discussion, as composed of two functions, the path

\(^{12}\) But see Brinkmann (1962, p.165), who argues against the assumption that the relation was first intended to be spatial, and then extended, e.g., to abstract notions, but instead that the spatial field of use is not the only one, and 'extended' makes use of other fields. However, spatial relations are much easier to demonstrate, and therefore they are often considered to be basic.
function TO and the place function ON (hanging), whereas *zu* and *von* only lexicalize one function, a path function.

Table 7: (based on Zwarts (table 10))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path function</th>
<th>Place function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>zu</em> TO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>von</em> FROM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>an + ACC</em> TO</td>
<td>ON (hanging, attached)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Zu* and *von* differ from *an* in that they do not encode specific goal or source locations. In addition, case does not play a semantic role with the prepositions *zu* and *von*. However, the accusative case with *an* seems to make a semantic contribution, as it turns the basic locative meaning *on* into a directional meaning with the specific location (ON (hanging, attached)) as its goal, *onto*.

As will be seen in the detailed discussion below, all these differences among the four prepositions relevant in transfer events make a semantic comparison of the prepositional variants complex, as the semantic components of direction, which arguably can be spatial and non-spatial, spatial motion and possession, are the result of different semantic ingredients. Nonetheless, in subsection 2.3 I will present a uniform analysis based on the scalar properties of these prepositions.

2.2.1 Animate complements of prepositions

Before I discuss the semantics of the prepositions, I want to propose some general ideas on the effect of animacy on the interpretation of prepositional phrases. As the endpoints of transfer events often involve an animate being who is then interpreted as the recipient, these ideas are important for the following sections. The animate complements of prepositions often trigger a possessive interpretation, if the context (semantics of the verb and theme argument) allows it. (Note that *Blatt* in German can mean leaf or sheet of paper.)
In (51) the interpretation is clearly spatial, whether it is a sheet of paper from the location table or a leaf from the location shoulder, but the full animate in (52) triggers a possessive interpretation, receive the sheet of paper from me. Without a special context, the interpretation leaf is discouraged because it is less connected to human possession than sheet.

Following the widely-held assumption that an, zu, and von originally denoted spatial relations, the question becomes how their semantics was extended to express possession. It does not seem to be a simple abstract use of the preposition. Usually when there is an extended use of some meaning triggered by the context, e.g., temporal expressions such as am Mittag, at noon, the original spatial meaning is fully canceled. In (52), it can be the case that the sheet of paper was simultaneously at my location and at my possession. I propose here that the effect of animacy of the complement on the preposition evokes the new concept.

Human beings are not just bodies, but also minds. They are not part of the landscape or points in space, but usually personalities, 'living souls'; the mental capacities and characteristics are at least as important as the space they occupy. A mental concept is therefore as salient as locative one, if a relation has to be interpreted. The following idiomatic examples show that the locative prepositions nahe (near) and an (on) are interpreted as referring to mental concepts:

(53)  Das liegt mir nahe
      This lies near me = I like it

(54)  jmdm etwas antun
      to on-do s.th. to s.o. = to hurt someone.

When an item reaches the location of a human being, a possessive interpretation is invited, as the automatic assumption is that human beings react to what happens in their space and
take control (possession) of it. Similarly, when an entity leaves the location, the assumption is that there had been some control before. Therefore, ‘full’ animates rarely appear in the usual locative interpretation. If the actual location of the animate is meant, a body part has to be used instead, as in (51) above and the following:

(55) Der Arzt führte eine Magensonde in den *(Magen des) Patienten.
The physician put a stomach-tube.ACC in the stomach of the patient
‘The physician put a stomach tube into the stomach of the patient.’

Another factor which accounts for the ungrammaticality of *in den Patienten (into the patient) above and for the general fact that animates are bad locations is that the geometry of animate beings is very complex, because of the various functions of the body parts (head, shoulder, arms, legs, and surely inside, stomach, lungs, heart…), and the various positions in which an animate being can be found (standing, sitting, lying…). Relations of ‘on (top of)’, ‘under’, or ‘on’ thus become directionally complex. On top of, could mean, while standing, on the head or the shoulders, while sitting, on the lap, while lying, on the back.

(56) a. As soon as I sit down, my daughter climbs onto me. (me= my lap)
b. As soon as I lie down on my tummy/my back, my daughter climbs onto me. (me= my back/ my tummy)
c. When we go to a parade, my daughter likes to stand on me (shoulders) so that she can see better.

When there is no background information, on me is too vague and therefore problematic:

(57) Der Vogel flog auf ?*mich/meinen Kopf, meine Schulter, meinen Arm.
The bird flew onto me.ACC /my head.ACC, my shoulder.ACC, /my arm.ACC
‘The bird flew onto me/my head/ my shoulder/ my arm.’

Nothing prevents inanimate things from entering a possessive relation or being referred to using possessive syntax, independent of the effect of animacy on the semantic range of locative prepositions. der Party eine festliche Atmosphaere verleihen/ giving the party a festive air, for example, is grammatical in both German and English, caused possession being interpreted here as causing the creation of a property. However, it will be seen that for a
possessive interpretation of PPs, animacy is undoubtedly a crucial ingredient, together with the semantics of the actual preposition and the verb.

2.2.2 ZU (to)

Zu, as classified above, is a spatial directional preposition which denotes a direction toward a location. The observation that even though zu encodes a spatial location, it often gives rise to a possessive interpretation when the goal is a human being is important for the present discussion of transfer events. I will illustrate and show how this arises below.

According to Zwarts (2005) zu is the spell-out of the basic path function TO. However, zu is actually more specific regarding its relation to the endpoint. It represents the complex function TO AT, where AT includes all relations that are very close, but do not involve ‘boundary crossing’ (Slobin, D. I., & Hoiting, N. (1994)) – the vicinity of the endpoint. This state can be seen in the following sentences that express the intended goal relation:

(58) Ich kicke den Ball zum Abfalleimer, weil ich ihn am/neben dem/beim/*?im13 Abfalleimer haben will.
I kick the ball.ACC to-the trash-can, because I it on-the/next-to the/by-the/ in-the trash-can have want
‘I’m kicking the ball to the trash can, because I want to have it at/ next to/ by/ *in the trash can’.

(59) Ich kicke den Ball in den Abfalleimer, weil ich ihn *am/*neben dem/ *beim/ im Abfalleimer haben will
I kick the ball.ACC into the trash-can, because I it on-the/next-to the/by-the/ in-the trash-can have want
‘I’m kicking the ball into the trash can, because I want to have it in the trash can’

This paradigm suggests the fact that in the case of locations where you most likely want to be inside, and not just in the vicinity, zu is less felicitous than in + ACC (into). Therefore, in German, you go into the city/ theater/ opera/ cinema, rather than to these places.

13 The specific acceptability of in can only be found in an interpretation where the person meant to kick the ball into the trash can. Here one might get both zu and in.
(60) Ich gehe #zur / in die Stadt.
I go to / into the city
‘I’m going to the city.’

(61) Ich gehe #zum / ins Theater/ Kino.
I go to / into-the theater/ cinema
‘I’m going to the theater/ cinema.’

(62) Ich gehe ?zur / in die Oper14.
I go to / into the opera
‘I’m going to the opera.’

Schmitz (1966) mentions that whenever zur should only mean toward, it should appear as a postposition:

(63) dem Meer/ der Heimat/ der Grenze zu fahren (Schmitz, p. 44)
the sea/ the homeland/ the border to drive
‘to drive towards the sea, the homeland, the border’

Indeed, there is a meaning difference between the following two sentences with versions of the idiomatic expression zu Ende gehen – to go to end ‘to end’: with zur before the noun, it is no longer worthwhile to watch the game, with zu following, you would probably run to watch it, as the most exciting part is still ahead.

(64) Das Spiel geht zu Ende.
The game goes to end
‘The game is ending.’

(65) Das Spiel geht dem Ende zu.
The game goes the end to
‘The game approaches the end.’

As zur means to the vicinity of, regardless of the surface or geometry of the endpoint, it is felicitous with human beings when interpreted as spatial goals (unlike an in section 2.2.4

---

14 In the zu-version, the opera cannot be a building that you plan to be next to as a goal. Therefore it is even less grammatical, unless going to the opera means going to work at the opera.
below). There is, of course, a possibility that the entity who enters the vicinity of a person really just wants to be near him, as when two animates participate in the event:

\[(66) \quad \text{Der Junge läuft zu dem Mädchen.} \]

The boy walks to the girl

‘The boy is walking to the girl.’

On the other hand, there is a strong possessive reading if an inanimate entity approaches the vicinity of an animate being, as in the following example. Imagine a ball game where the person you are throwing the ball toward is not supposed to catch the ball because you want to ‘hit him’ to gain points.\(^{15}\) Using zu in such a situation would be inappropriate, as it necessarily means that the person catches the ball. Therefore, the relevant preposition is auf (on top of):

\[(67) \quad \text{Werf nicht den Ball *zu dem da / auf den da, der ist gut im Fangen!} \]

Throw not the ball to this-there/ onto this there, he is good in catching

'Don't throw the ball to that one, he is good in catching!'

For reasons discussed in the previous sub-section, the vicinity of an animate being is understood as the region over which the person has control. This concept seems to be cross-linguistic, as the following stative expression “money on me – money with me to spend” in several languages shows:

\[(68) \quad \begin{align*}
\text{a. Ich habe kein Geld bei mir. (German)} \\
& \text{I have no money at me} \\
\text{b. Eyn li kesef alay. (Hebrew)} \\
& \text{There-NEG me.DAT money on-me} \\
\text{c. Je n'ai pas d'argent sur moi. (French)} \\
& \text{I NEG have NEG of-money on me} \\
\text{d. I have no money on me. (English)}
\end{align*} \]

\(^{15}\text{Examples are Völkerball in Germany, Chayei Sara in Israel, or dodgeball in the United States. You have to hit the person with your ball, but make sure that she does not catch it.} \)
Furthermore, as Freeze (1992) has shown\textsuperscript{16}, languages which do not have a predicate \textit{have} encode possession via an existential predicate and a locative preposition.

\begin{itemize}
\item[(69)] \textit{u merlja byla sestra.} (Russian, Freeze (1992, (2c))
\end{itemize}

\begin{itemize}
\item at 1. SG.c was sister.
\item 'I had a sister.'
\end{itemize}

Presumably the possessive interpretation of \textit{zu} + animate is a conventional implicature, as it is, as seen in (67), almost effectively non-defeasible. Only if a possessive reading does not make sense, and the real spatial vicinity of an animate is meant, can the animate being be understood as other than a recipient.

\begin{itemize}
\item[(70)] Die Lehrerin schickte die Schüler zum Direktor.
\end{itemize}

\begin{itemize}
\item Does not result in: der Direktor bekam die Schüler
\item The teacher sent the students to the principal.
\item Does not result in: the principal got the students.
\end{itemize}

The concept vicinity = possession is also supported by studies that focus on the concept of possession. Taylor (1992, pp. 202-205) claims that one of the characteristics of prototypical possession is the close spatial proximity between possessor and possessee. However, the German proximity preposition \textit{zu}, even though it can very well denote a recipient, cannot have its spatial semantics cancelled. A transfer situation expressed with \textit{zu} would entail a directed motion, a caused motion event. The following example illustrates this. A book can be moved through space, therefore the \textit{zu}-variant in the (a) sentence is grammatical. On the other hand, the item in the (b) sentence is abstract and cannot be moved to the goal. \textit{Zu} is therefore ungrammatical, and only the dative construction can be used:

\begin{itemize}
\item[(71)] a. Der Vater brachte dem Jungen ein Buch / ein Buch zu dem Jungen.
\end{itemize}

\begin{itemize}
\item The father brought the boy.DAT a book.ACC / a book.ACC to the boy
\item 'The father brought the boy a book.'
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{16} See also Harley (2002) for illustration and discussion
b. Das Buch brachte dem Jungen Glück/ *Glück zu dem Jungen.

The book brought the boy.DAT luck.ACC/ luck.ACC to(ZU) the boy

‘The book brought the boy luck.’

This situation even holds with predicates that license zu, but are not associated with a spatial event, as gehören (belong). I perceive a difference between the two sentences which can be traced back to the spatial semantics of zu:

(72)    a. Die Kinder gehören zu mir.
          The children belong to me
b. Die Kinder gehören mir.
          The children belong me.DAT

‘The children belong to me.’

A typical situation in which sentence (a) is used is when these children get into trouble on the playground, and the mother (getting up from a bench at the side) claims responsibility. The children belong to the ‘region around the mother’; as long as they are in close spatial proximity, the mother has some control over what happens to them. Sentence (b) on the other hand does not allow the possible connotation that the children are at the moment of the utterance separated from the mother. However, sentence (b) but not sentence (a) has, for modern parents, an uncomfortable complete control meaning, a pure possessive interpretation. One wants to add that Kinder gehören nicht ihren Eltern, sie gehören sich selbst (children do not belong to their parents, they belong to themselves).

To sum up, it is significant for zu in transfer situations that zu always has a spatial meaning. The recipient meaning is additional, and arises when zu takes an animate complement.

2.2.3 VON (from)

Von is described by the grammars and grammarians cited here (Duden-Grammatik, Schmitz (1966), and Brinkmann (1962)) as a directional source preposition. In Zwarts’ terminology the preposition lexicalizes the path function FROM. I propose here that von is unspecified regarding a spatial or non-spatial interpretation, unlike zu, which shows a clear preference for denoting spatial events. Moreover, I propose that the semantics of von does not
even contain a directional element, which is seemingly the reason for its underspecification regarding spatiality. In contrast, I propose that the semantic behavior of *von* can be better accounted for by taking its partitive use (Schmitz, p. 43), and not its directional one, as basic. I thus assume that *x Von y* denotes a stative part-whole relation, corresponding to *of* in English (as in *einer von meinen Freunden* (one of my friends), or *ein Stück von diesem Kuchen* (a piece of this cake)). I assume that *von* is neutral regarding a spatial or non-spatial interpretation, as a part-whole relation is compatible with both spatial and possessive concepts. The often-assigned directional (and possibly spatial) interpretation of *von* (e.g., in caused possession/ caused motion events) arises from a combination of the semantics 'being part of' with the directional semantics of the verb (direction from source only, see below), e.g., with *stehlen* (steal) *von* or with other semantic material in the VP, such as particles *weg* (away) *von*..., or *von...weg*, nouns, as in *der Weg von* (the path from ..) or participles, as in *von... entfernt* (distanced from).\(^\text{17}\) For dynamic events, I assume that a primary semantic condition for a *von*-phrase is that the semantics of the verb encodes or at least anticipates a separation of the part from the whole.\(^\text{18}\) My primary motivation for positing that *von* lacks a spatial element is its use in both spatial and non-spatial situations, as loss of possession events. Here *von* differs from *zu*, which would render an abstract theme argument ungrammatical, such as *Druck* (pressure) or *Erinnerung* (memories), which do not move places (cf. (71)).

(73) \(\vdots\) - wollen Sie den Jungen wirklich *vom Gymnasium* nehmen er hat doch nur eine 4. Ja wir wollten das, um Druck *von ihm* zu nehmen.

\(\vdots\) want you the boy.ACC really from the high school take,[\ldots].Yes, we wanted that, in order to pressure.ACC from him take.

\(\ldots\) do you really want to take the boy from the high school (to a less challenging secondary school), his grade average is only ‘satisfactory’ (and not worse). Yes, we wanted it, in order to take pressure from him.

\(\text{17}\) It seems no coincidence to me that Jackendoff's (1983) terms for the directional prepositions are \textsc{Away} FROM and \textsc{Towards}, not just \textsc{From} and \textsc{To}. \textsc{From} and \textsc{to} (in English) are arguably too weak to encode direction. Given that German seems to include \textsc{toward} and \textsc{to in zu}, this leaves *von* as slightly different from *zu*, as it is at least less directional on its own.

\(\text{18}\) For example, in addition to clear directional verbs as *stehlen* and *nehmen*, manner verbs also license *von*-phrases if they intend a separation:

\begin{quote}
Ich rubbel den Fleck vom Tisch
I rub the stain from the table
\end{quote}

(‘I am rubbing the stain off the table’)
Jeder Atemzug schürte die Erkenntnis und nahm von ihm die Erinnerung. 
Every breath stoked the awareness and took from him the memory.

Note that (73) can still be seen as an abstract motion event, as 'pressure' might be conceptualized as 'sitting on top of' someone. However, a possessive relation is possible:

Ich hatte Druck vom Chef und hab nicht drüber nachgedacht. 
'I was pressured by my boss and didn’t think about it.'

In contrast, theme arguments such as memories are clearly a possessional concept: Er hatte die Erinnerung an… (He had memories of…), favors a truly non-spatial possessive account.

The primary motivation for taking the stative partitive meaning as the basis is the appearance of von in post-modifiers of nouns. The common use of the preposition in such PPs is as an alternative to the genitive case, and, in fact, it is the common construction in spoken language, especially with inanimate ‘wholes’:

Die Zeiger der Uhr GEN (the hands of the clock)
vs. Die Zeiger von der Uhr (the hands of the clock)

With animate beings, the construction is often used, at least in spoken German. Here the part-whole relation is interpreted as possession. All possessive states, inalienable possession (body parts), alienable possession, and kinship can be expressed by von19:

a. Die Nase von meinem Hund
   The nose of my dog

Admittedly, kinship is not so elegantly explained as a part-whole relation. However, I assume that a kinship concept, e.g., ‘mother’ is, being a relational term, naturally a ‘part’ concept, and the person to which someone has a ‘part’ relation is seen, in the present situation only, as the full concept.
b. Die Hose von meiner Tante
The pants of my aunt

c. Die Mutter von meiner Freundin
The mother of my friend

Taking the partitive use as basic has the advantage that von in DPs and VPs can be given a uniform analysis. This approach is especially transparent with animate ‘wholes’. An animate complement of von denotes the ‘deprivee’ in transfer events (the animate source which experiences loss of possession). It therefore seems that the animacy of the complement of von creates a possessive relation in both syntactic categories.

The claim that von does not entail spatial direction, but is neutral towards spatial or non-spatial interpretation may be less apparent when the 'part' is an animate being, as it can often move from its 'whole'. However, a comparison of von with aus (out of, from), which is undoubtedly a spatial directional preposition, as it involves boundary crossing from 'inside' to 'outside' (according to Zwarts a combination of path function FROM and place function IN), makes my claim clear:

\[(78)\]

(a) Der Mann von der Post (the man from the post office)
= the man working at the post-office ('belonging to the domain 'post office')

(b) Der Mann aus der Post (the man from the post office)
= the man that came from the post office

In (78b) the man is not at the moment in the post office, as he has been seen in a different place. He could be the man who works at the post office, but does not have to be. On the other hand, the man in (78a) could be either at the post office or elsewhere, given that he is free to move. Even so, he is necessarily connected to the post-office, someone who works there. In other words, the part-whole relation (here, belonging to the domain post office) is an entailment of von, but not of aus, whereas the spatial source relation is an entailment of aus but not of von. Aus contains therefore a spatial element that von alone lacks.

Aus, but not von, is the preposition used to denote the origin of people or things. Von would be possessive in such an environment, which does not make much sense in (79a), but is a possible interpretation of (79b):
a. Der Mann aus / von Chile
   The man from / of Chile
b. Der Wein aus / von Italien
   The wine from / of Italy

In (79b), der Wein aus Italien (the wine (out) from Italy) is wine that can be bought elsewhere in the world. Der Wein von Italien (the wine of Italy) also includes the wine located in Italy. Even if one argues that the latter does have a spatial interpretation, the important point for my analysis is the fact that it does not necessarily have a spatial interpretation. A possible spatial interpretation may simply arise from the fact that Italy is a place, not from the preposition itself.

If von is taken to lack a spatial directional element, then a directed motion interpretation has to come from the semantics of the verb. With a directional verb, von indeed denotes the source of the direction lexicalized in the verb. If the verb refers to a spatial removal, von is interpreted spatially. If von refers to the source of a spatial path, a possible part-whole interpretation would be that the location of the person/item has previously been part of the location of the source, or, for bounded path expressions, that the beginning point of the path has been a part of the denoted location. In spatial directional events aus and von may appear to be synonyms. Aus, however, is more specific about the source than von: I analyze it as FROM IN in Zwarts’s terms, whereas von parallels zu from ‘the vicinity of’:

(80)

   I come just from/ out from the post-office/ the theater/ the swimming pool
   'I'm just coming from the post-office, the theater….'

b. Vater kommt von/ aus der Arbeit.
   Father comes from / out from work.

An important addition must be made here. Von is only grammatical as a source preposition if the verb denotes a direction from a source. In this case, the von-phrase can take advantage of the movement/direction denoted by the verb, saturating the empty source argument by specifying with its part-whole semantics the original domain to which the entity belonged. If

---

Cf. Schmitz (p. 38): von is used when the stative relation has been an (at), auf (on), or bei (similar to neben (next to)), whereas aus is used if the stative relation has been in (in).
the verb denotes a movement/direction whose perspective is toward a goal, as illustrated above in (80), the von-phrase needs an additional path element such as the adverbial weg (away) (see 81a and b). This need would be puzzling had we not questioned Zwarts's analysis of von as a preposition lexicalizing the path function FROM. However, the ungrammaticality can be accounted for by the assumption that von alone lacks a directional element. The source phrase is additional information in such an event, the still-missing argument of the verb being the goal. A mere part-whole relation is not enough to be processed as an additional source of the movement/direction. In contrast, aus, which has directional semantics, is grammatical without an adverbial. An adverbial such as heraush (hither-out) is possible as an emphasis, but not necessary.

(81) a. Er geht vom Haus *(weg).
   He goes from-the house (away)
   'He's walking from the house.'

   b. Er geht aus dem Haus (heraus).
   He goes out-of the house (hither-out)
   'He's leaving the house.'

This contrast in the grammaticality of von-phrases, depending on whether the verbs denote a direction from or toward an entity, can be also seen with transfer verbs. The verbs take, steal, and fetch in (82a) have an empty a source argument slot (if there is no further specification, er (he) is the goal), and von is therefore grammatical. The verbs send and sell require a goal argument in the first place, and er is the source if nothing else is added. A different source argument is possible, but would be additional information. Von, therefore, needs path adverbials:

(82) a. Er nahm/ stahl/ holte das Auto von der Frau
   He took/ stole/ fetched the car from the woman

   b. Er schickte/ verkaufte das Auto von Stuttgart *(aus, weg)
   He sent/ sold the car from Stuttgart (out, away)

To summarize, von denotes a part-of relation, but is unspecified as to whether this relation is interpreted as spatial or non-spatial. It is licensed as a source argument in transfer events by the direction component of transfer verbs which denote a direction-from-source transfer. The
fact that *von* lacks a spatial element makes it compatible with both verbs or VPs denoting physical change of location (as in (73) above, take son from the high school) and verbs or VPs denoting events lacking any change of physical location (take pressure from the boy).

### 2.2.4 AN (on (connected to))

*An* is originally a locative preposition, meaning touching the surface/borderline of an entity[^21]. As introduced above, it is one of the prepositions that governs both the dative and accusative cases, the latter turning the preposition into a directional one. In this basic meaning, touching the surface of, *an* rarely appears with an animate being (Moilanen (1979), p. 130).

\[(83)\]  
Er/ der Hund/ der Kasten / der Wagen ist *an mir/dir/ihm. (Moilanen p. 130, (1))  
He / the dog/ the box/ the carriage is on me/ you/ him.

As introduced in subsection 2.2.1, I suggest that this lack is probably due to the fact that human beings are not normally thought of just as bodies, here with a touchable surface. While the relation *x auf y* (*on* – by virtue of gravity) can often be inferred from common knowledge or the context, e.g., *der Hund sass auf mir* (the dog was sitting on me = on my lap), the relation *x an y* (*on*, at – by virtue of something else, which might be in addition to gravity, but not necessarily so) allows practically all sides of any body part, and thus is too vague to be interpreted. Clothes and jewelry appear in this relation, however they are not expressed in a PP construction: *Er hat eine Hose an sich* (He has pants on himself), but via the particle verb *anhaben*: *Er hat eine Hose an*. (He has pants on, 'He wears pants').

*An* + animate is thus infelicitous in spatial situations, except, according to Moilanen, for 'extended' uses (the example he gives, cited below can still in my opinion be understood spatially). Furthermore, the association with inanimate objects, such as a bur on a piece of cloth, may play a role in such examples:

[^21]: According to Moilanen (1979), the precise semantics is that the two entities don’t actually have to be connected, but positioned in such a way that a real connection is possible at any time.
Das Kind hing an seiner Mutter (Moilanen, (2)), ...wie eine Klette an einem Kleid.
The child hung on his mother…. like a bur on a piece of cloth
‘the child hung on his mother …like a limpet.’

In a certain sense, the same can also happen in directed motion situations:

Er kickte den Ball an Peter, ...der wie ein Klotz im Spielfeld stand.
He kicked the ball.ACC onto(AN) Peter, who like a log in the game-field stood
‘He kicked the ball onto Peter, who stood like a log in the field.’

Even if this sentence sounds a bit strange, it highlights the important difference between an and zu. First, zu certainly allows animate complements without restrictions, and second, whenever the verb or other material does not block a possessive interpretation, zu turns them into recipients, as Peter in (b) below. In contrast, with an, Peter cannot be the recipient, even if the use of an animate in this case is marginally accepted. The event is usually interpreted as the ball touching Peter and bouncing back.

Er kickte den Ball an Peter, *und der fing ihn.
He kicked the ball.ACC onto(AN) Peter and he caught it
‘He kicked the ball to Peter and he caught it.’

Er kickte den Ball zu Peter, und der fing ihn.
He kicked the ball.ACC to(ZU) Peter, and he caught it.
‘He kicked the ball to Peter, and he caught it.’

Analyzing an by analogy to zu and von leads to a dead end. Simply combining the original spatial preposition an with an animate complement does not create the recipient interpretation that an in transfer situations of the verkaufen (sell)-type class displays. The situation is quite the contrary: an + animate is not usually infelicitous for verbs with spatial meaning. I therefore assume that the an that appears in possessional transfer events is a specific
‘addressee-\textit{an}’\textsuperscript{22}, a separate(d) facet of meaning of the preposition \textit{an}. Below in the next subsection I will discuss some speculations as to how this \textit{an} is related to the basic locative \textit{an}. For now the fact that the locative \textit{an} is usually infelicitous with animate complements creates a semantic gap which addressee-\textit{an} now fills. In turn, addressee-\textit{an} cannot appear with inanimate goals of transfer which are incapable of receiving:

\begin{itemize}
\item[(87)] Er schickte ein Überraschungspaket an Peter/* Peters Party/* Peters Gartenhäusern
\item[\textquote{He sent a surprise-package onto(AN) Peter/ Peter’s party/ Peter’s garden-house}]
\end{itemize}

Addressee-\textit{an} is restricted to use with the accusative case. There is no locative use which could mean ‘being in the possession of’:

\begin{itemize}
\item[(88)] a. Anja verkaufte das Buch an mich
\item[\textquote{Anja sold the book onto(AN) me}]\end{itemize}

\begin{itemize}
\item[(ii)] Das Buch ist jetzt an mir
\item[\textquote{The book now belongs to me}]\end{itemize}

This lack strengthens the claim that the addressee interpretation is a specific \textit{an}, and not just an interpretation that locative \textit{an} gains from combination with an animate location. If the latter was the case, the interpretation would probably keep both a locative and a directional use.\textsuperscript{23} Moreover, as will be discussed in detail below, addressee \textit{an}, unlike \textit{zu} in a recipient interpretation, seems to have lost its spatial component:

\begin{itemize}
\item[(i)] Die Konferenz begann nicht \textit{am} Mittwoch.
\item[\textquote{The conference did not begin on Wednesday}]
\item[(ii)] *Sie wurde \textit{an} den Donnerstag verschoben.
\item[\textquote{She was onto(AN) the Thursday moved}]
\item[(iii)] Sie wurde \textit{auf} den Donnerstag verschoben.
\item[\textquote{She was onto the Thursday moved}]
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{22} The choice of this term is inspired by the use of \textit{an} on envelopes: \textit{An Familie Soundso (To family Suchandsuch)}

\textsuperscript{23} Another facet of the meaning of \textit{an}, the temporal use of \textit{an} as in “\textit{am Mittwoch (on Wednesday)}”, only appears with the dative case:

(i) Die Konferenz begann nicht \textit{am} Mittwoch.
\item[\textquote{The conference did not begin on Wednesday}]

(ii) *Sie wurde \textit{an} den Donnerstag verschoben.
\item[\textquote{She was onto(AN) the Thursday moved}]

(iii) Sie wurde \textit{auf} den Donnerstag verschoben.
\item[\textquote{She was onto the Thursday moved}]

56
Wer selber schafft und erfindet verkauft seine Idee an den Meistbietenden [...] 
Whoever himself works and invents sells his idea to the highest bidder
‘Whoever works and invents by himself, will sell his idea to the highest bidder’

Seine Idee (his idea) is an abstract term and cannot undergo spatial motion. Unlike the ungrammaticality of the theme argument Glück (luck) in the zu-variant example with bringen (70b) above, an abstract theme argument is grammatical in an an-variant.

Addressee-an is selected in possessive events, as in verkaufen (sell) above, or ‘send a letter’ below. Another theme argument (the students) that is not usually perceived as an entity undergoing a change of possession does not allow an:

(90) a. Er schickte die Schüler *an den Direktor.
    He sent the students to the principal
    ‘He sent the students to the principal.’
    → *the principal has the students
b. Er schickte das Paket an Peter.
    He sent the package to Peter.
    ‘He sent the package to Peter.’
    → Peter has the package

Verbs and themes which are usually associated with a caused possession event also select an phrases.24

24 When an becomes less felitous, für (for) takes its place:
   (i) Er schrieb eine Geschichte für seinen Onkel
       He wrote a story for his uncle
   (ii) das Rezept für Lisa
        the recipe for Lisa
Für denotes the beneficiary and is not restricted to possessive semantics.
Er schrieb einen Brief/ ein Gedicht/ eine Geschichte an seinen Onkel.
He wrote a letter/ a poem/ a story to his uncle.
‘He wrote a letter/ a poem/ a story to his uncle.’

Apart from *an-phrases in VPs, DPs which denote an entity usually caused to be possessed by someone also trigger the addressee-*an interpretation. As many items can be transferred, the limit of interpretation is most probably speaker- or context-dependent. The best examples are the typical items that are sent:

Hier liegt das Paket/ der Brief/ das Rezept an Lisa.
Here lies the package/ the letter/ the recipe for Lisa.
‘Here is the package/ the letter/ the recipe for Lisa.’

The distribution of the prepositions *an and zu can be explained in the same manner:

a. Er warf den Ball *an / zu Peter.
He threw the ball to Peter.
‘He threw the ball to Peter.’
b. Er schickte die Schüler *an / zum Direktor.
He sent the students to the principal.
‘He sent the students to the principal.’
c. Er schickte das Paket an / zu Peter.
He sent the package to Peter.
‘He sent the package to Peter.’
d. Er verkaufte das Buch an / *zu Peter.
He sold the book to Peter.
‘He sold the book to Peter.’

The verbs in the domain of transfer events are those which either have a spatial meaning (werfen (throw)), a possessive meaning verkaufen (sell)), or can appear in both (schicken (send)) (see chapter 4.5 for how a possessive reading might arise for schicken), depending on the semantics of the direct object. *An and zu are both grammatical only in the latter case, in events where spatial motion and caused possession are both semantic entailments of the verb.
or VP. However, if one or the other, but not both, notions of spatial motion and caused possession is present, an and zu appear in a complementary distribution. Addressee-an is licensed by a possessive verb, not necessarily by a spatial one (for further detail, see the following subsection). Zu, as seen in the previous subsection, requires spatial motion. A verb that only entails caused possession does not license zu.

The latter conclusion is not trivial. Why is (93d) ungrammatical with zu, as a spatial motion is most likely implied, or could otherwise be added by the semantics of zu? After all, verkauften, even though it does not entail spatial change, is compatible with spatial PPs that denote inanimate goals, as nach Frankreich, or, zum Nordpol (to the North Pole)\textsuperscript{25}:

\begin{equation}
(94) \quad \text{Er verkaufte die Waren nach Frankreich/ zum Nordpol}
\end{equation}

He sold the goods to France/ to the North Pole

First, neither France nor the North Pole is the recipient. The recipient is simply unexpressed in sentences as (94), which is possible, as the expression of the recipient is not obligatory with verkauften (sell)-type verbs. (Er verkaufte die Waren (He sold the goods)). The interpretation of (93d) with zu has been that Peter is both the goal and the recipient. This interpretation is impossible, because of the blocking effect of a preposition which better matches the semantics of the verb, namely an. The recipient is an optional argument of the verb verkauften. The zu-phrase in (93d), should denote this recipient argument. As an argument-PP, it should be headed by a preposition whose semantic content is also contained by the governing verb. As zu does not have possessive content (it is fully acceptable in pure spatial events with pure spatial verbs), but does have semantic content not contained by verkauften, the spatial motion component, it is less suitable than an. An, not entailing spatial change, but on the other hand not cancelling it, is therefore the better match for verkauften, and blocks zu. This analysis predicts correctly that a zu-phrase which does not denote the recipient is possible, as in (94) above.

\textsuperscript{25} Countries and cities without the definite article appear with nach, countries or regions with the definite article with in. Only locations that are generally perceived of as points appear with zu.
2.2.4.1 The non-spatial ‘loss of possession’ component

Undoubtedly, the package in (95a) and the book in (95b) undergo both possessional and spatial changes.

\[(95)\]
\[a. \text{Er schickte das Paket \textit{an} Peter.}\]
\[He sent the package\textit{onto(AN)} Peter\]
\[‘He sent the package to Peter.’\]
\[b. \text{Er verkaufte das Buch \textit{an} Peter.}\]
\[He sold the book\textit{onto(AN)} Peter\]
\[‘He sold the book to Peter.’\]

However, I argue that the spatial change does not arise from the semantics of the preposition \textit{an}, but from the spatial semantics of the verb in the case of \textit{schicken} (sentence a) and from the common understanding of the event, as in selling a book (sentence b). As most possession transfers also involve a transfer in space the claim that \textit{an} is truly a non-spatial preposition in its recipient/addressee role is not easy to support. Even so, the following properties of addressee-\textit{an} phrases allow me to conclude that, unlike its basic locative preposition, addressee-\textit{an} has lost its spatial semantics.

First, \textit{an} is perfectly acceptable in transfer situations where no change of location takes place. If you sell or rent a house to somebody, the house is most unlikely to move.

\[(96)\]
\[\text{Der Mann verkaufte/ vermietete das Haus an einen Kunden}\]
\[The man sold/ rent the house\textit{onto(AN)} a client\]
\[‘The man sold/ rent the house to a client’\]

It can, of course, be argued that not the house, but at least something, a contract or money, moves. Therefore, as in the case of sound emission verbs such as \textit{rustle} or \textit{rumble} above (section 2.1), which allow a directional preposition if the sound is associated with a certain motion, the association of the event of selling or renting with the fact that something does indeed move may just license the arguably spatial preposition \textit{an}. However, even more abstract objects, such as \textit{die Idee} (the idea) in (89) above, and \textit{Lehrbefugnis} (teaching authority) below, are still grammatical. In contrast to \textit{verkaufen} (sell), \textit{verleihen} (grant)
denotes an event which does not necessarily involve a contract but could be just a friendly gesture. The association with a real spatial change of something has become more difficult to see.

(97) Das Fakultätskollegium der Geisteswissenschaftlichen Fakultät der Universität Innsbruck verlieh an Dieter Schäfer die Lehrbefugnis als Universitätsdozent.
The faculty-council the humanities faculty.GEN the University of Innsbruck.GEN granted onto(AN) Dieter Schäfer the teach-authority as associate-professor.ACC

‘The faculty council of the Faculty of Humanities of the University of Innsbruck granted to Dieter Schaefer the authority to teach as associate professor.’

(Cosmas II, 198/JUN.21789 Tiroler Tageszeitung, 03.06.1998)

Another piece of evidence is the fact that an addressee-an-phrase cannot be dependent on the adverbial hin (hither). According to the Duden-Grammatik (paragraph 585), hin (hither) is a locative adverbial denoting the direction away from the speaker, the opposite of her (hence), which is interpreted as toward the speaker. Hin can take PPs as complements, e.g., nach Norden hin (to the-north hither, 'to the north'), attach to a verb to form a particle verb, e.g., hinrennen (run to), or appear in combination with other particles, and take either DPs or PPs as complements, e.g., (auf) den Berg hinauf (up) the mountain hither-up, 'up the mountain'). Taking a closer look, hin adds or strengthens a path element, which spatial, but not non-spatial events naturally have. As such it is grammatical with zu, as zu, even in a transfer situation with an animate, is still a spatial goal. With an, however, it is only grammatical with purely spatial an, not with the addressee-an.

(98) a. David schickte das Paket zu seiner / *an seine Mutter hin.
   David sent the package.ACC to(ZU) his /onto(AN) his mother hither
   ‘David sent the package ‘hither’ to his mother.’

b. David kickte den Ball an die Decke hin.
   David kicked the ball.ACC onto(AN) the ceiling hither
   ‘David kicked the ball ‘hither’ onto(AN) the ceiling.’
However, there is a certain semantic component present in grammatical an-variants which can easily be misinterpreted as a spatial motion component or a spatial path element. I will argue in the following section that this component denotes loss of control/possession on the part of the agent (terminology adopted from Beavers (2005, (10)), who uses the term for the description of a similar phenomenon). I argue that the verbs/VPs which license an contain this component, but the verbs/VPs which do not license an lack it, especially the geben (give)-type verbs. By ‘loss of possession’ I refer to the basic meaning of simply ‘cause to not have’, devoid of the negative connotation ‘against one’s will’ that lose often has. The component is thus a specification of the role of the external argument; it creates a counterpart to the ‘cause to have’ component, which possessive verbs specify for the role of the third argument, the recipient. Thus, verkaufen-type verbs denote real ‘transfer’ of possession. See the following contrasts:

(99)  
a. Die Universität verlieh Geld/ einen Preis/ die Lehrbefugnis an den Forscher.  
The university granted money/ a prize/ the teaching authority onto(AN) the researcher  
‘The university granted a prize/ the teaching authority to the researcher.’  
b. Die Lichter verliehen einen festlichen Glanz *an die Stadt.  
The lights granted a festive glitter onto(AN) the city  
Should mean: ’the lights gave the city a festive glitter.’

Even though the item undergoing transfer can be abstract, as in sentence (a), either still allowing some kind of a spatial change as in the case of Preis (prize), or making a spatial change quite difficult to imagine, as with Lehrbefugnis (teaching authority), there is a limit. The question is what makes the circumstances in (b) different from those of a very abstract (a). One possibility is that there cannot be a spatial change in (b), but a powerful imagination or knowledge of the setting of an event as granting authority in (a) might allow spatial change. However, I propose that the an-variant does not anticipate spatial change, but a loss of control/possession on the part of the agent. An-variants with these verbs thus denote actual transfer of possession events, often associated with a performative component, a certain procedure or ceremony, whereas events that cannot be realized in an an-variant, but only in a dative variant, are mere caused possession events. The verbal semantics does not specify the role of the external argument; a previous owner, controller, or initiator of a transfer is not
entailed by the semantics (though still possible in the actual situation). Regarding the semantic components I propose that the component present in an-constructions is an additional ‘loss of possession’ component to a ‘caused possession’ meaning. This component is motivated by clear transfer of possession events, as with verbs such as verkaufen (sell) and vermieten (rent), or Geld verleihen (grant/lend money) in (99a). Here the agent loses possession of the actual item that the recipient receives, and to the same extent. With verkaufen it is a permanent loss and gain, but with vermieten it is only a temporary loss and gain. To the best of my knowledge, these two verbs will always have an an-variant, as the ‘loss of possession’ component is a basic component of the verbs themselves. However, I admit that the entity of which the agent loses possession or control can be quite abstract, and is not necessarily the same actual item that the recipient receives possession/control of, as in the examples above with abstract entities such as prizes, authority, or below in (101) rights. Even though it is not exactly clear what a university loses when granting a prize or authority (both of which can be granted repeatedly), it clearly had control over the prize or authority before. The university had control of the decision to whom to grant it and to whom not, and when not to grant it any longer. What it loses may be the control of what the prize or the authority means de facto each time they grant one. Another possibility is that in a formulation of (99) the prize and authority are conceptualized as something that is transferred to the recipient. In any case, in clear contrast, the lights in (99b) do not have any control over their glitter, nor do they lose this glitter and transfer it to the city by giving it.

The ‘loss of control/possession’ component on the part of the agent restricts the semantic type of the external argument of verbs in an-constructions, or verbs that license an-variants in general. It has to be able to lose something, to undergo a change from ‘have’ to ‘have not’ and in most cases also be the initiator of this change. This means that an animate being usually appears as the subject. The external argument of a mere caused possession event, as in (99b) above, can be an inanimate or natural cause:

a. Peter schenkte Oli seine Briefmarkensammlung.
   Peter gave Oli.DAT his ACC stamp-collection
   ‘Peter gave Oli his stamp collection.’

Possible counterexamples to this claim are the verbs vererben an (to inherit), and verlieren an (to lose, e.g., one’s heart to). See the next subsection for a discussion of the latter.
b. Peter verschenkte seine Briefmarkensammlung an Oli.
   Peter gave-away his stamp collection.ACC onto(AN) Oli

c. Das Schicksal/ sein einzigartiges Talent schenkte Oli ein langes Leben.
   The fate/ his unique talent gave Oli a long life.ACC
   ‘Fate/ his unique talent gave Oli a long life.’

d. *Das Schicksal/ sein einzigartiges Talent verschenkte ein langes Leben an Oli.
   The fate/ his unique talent gave-away a long life.ACC onto(AN) Oli
   ‘Fate/ his unique talent gave a long life to Oli.’

(101) a. Das Gericht/ das Gesetz gewährt dem Vater das Besuchsrecht.
   The court/ the law grants the father.DAT visiting rights.ACC
   ‘The court/ the law grants the father visiting rights.’

b. Das Gericht /*das Gesetz gewährt das Besuchsrecht an den Vater.
   The court/ the law grants visiting rights.ACC onto(AN) the father
   ‘The court/ the law grants visiting rights to the father.’

The 'loss of possession’ component is still often found in the semantics of one of the
verbal morphemes, such as prefixes or particles. For example, in *verkaufen (sell), *vermieten (rent), and *verschenken (give away generously), the prefix “ver” was once a particle with the
transparent meaning ‘away’ (Duden-Etymologie, article "ver"). Other prefixes and certainly
particles still have a transparent meaning, as über (over) in überweisen (transfer money onto
a different account), weg (away)/zurück (back) with geben, and weiter (onward) with leiten
(lead). Interestingly, the original spatial meaning of these prefixes and particles does not turn
the whole verb into a spatial verb; combinations with geben (give) are still ungrammatical with zu.28

(102) Jen gab das Buch an ihre Freundin / *zu ihrer Freundin zurück.
   Jen gave the book.ACC onto(AN) her friend / to(ZU) her friend back
   'Jen gave back the book to her friend.'

27 Kaufen (today: 'buy') once meant 'to deal’, and thus verkaufen (sell) and kaufen (buy) are semantically related
– ver-kaufen was a 'dealing away’, and kaufen was a dealing for one’s own benefit (cf. Duden-Etymologie,
article "kaufen").
28 In the scalar approach to preposition analysis developed in section 2.3, the addition of these particles would
mean that they increase the structure of the lexicalized scale of geben, not by adding their own, arguably multi-
value, scale, but by turning the scale of geben into a two-value scale.
This special semantics of *an*, which distinguishes it from *zu* on the one hand and the dative case on the other, can be accounted for by assuming that the direction component, though non-spatial, is still active. Recall the peculiar compositional nature of prepositions such as *an*. Direction is brought into the PP by the use of the accusative. Historically, as Zwarts (2005) shows, the accusative case meant directed toward, and even if bare accusative DPs have lost this meaning with time, the semantics still exists when used with these prepositions. However, the fact that the preposition *an* itself does not entail direction may have created a much weaker directional semantics, one that lacks a path element. Deriving the ‘loss of possession’ component from the directional semantics of the accusative case could be the reason why addressee-*an* is, unlike the basic spatial *an*, restricted to this case, as shown above in (88).

In the following section I speculate on how addressee-*an* is based on the semantics of locative *an*. The relevant semantic component is most probably the contiguity component of *an*. Colleman and de Clerck (2009, p. 20) propose for the Dutch cognate *aan* (on, ‘to’), which, like German *an*, is also distinguished in its range of meanings from pure spatial *naar* (*nach, zu, ‘to’*) and alternates with a double object construction in Dutch, that the possessive interpretation is based on the similarity of ‘possessor’ and ‘contactee’. The cognitive concept for this construal is that possessor and possessee are in close spatial proximity (cf. Taylor (1992, pp. 202-205), just as an item being attached to another item stands in a close spatial relation to its contactee. Yet taking spatial closeness as the basis for the derivation is too weak, as *an*, according to this analysis, does not seem to be so different from *zu* in a recipient interpretation of e.g. *bringen* or *werfen*-type verbs. However, I have demonstrated above that there are differences between *zu* and *an* with respect to the creation of the recipient interpretation. Decisively, *zu*, but not *an*, has not lost its spatial component. Another possibility, which better accounts for the loss of the spatial component of addressee-*an*, is that contact, ‘touching’ an animate in a mental sense is similar to the concept of possession, but not regarding the spatial position, within vicinity of an animate, but in its mental effect on the animate. In other words, the contiguity component of *an* is interpreted as ‘mentally affecting’ if the complement is animate, and, as ‘affecting someone’ is a non-spatial concept, verbs which entail spatial directed motion (as *throw* or *kick*) cannot create the correct environment for this interpretation, but possessive verbs can. Even so, ‘affecting’ seems to be too strong. In chapter 5.3.2 I show that *an*, unlike dative DPs, may denote recipients which are not experiencers, are not affected, such as *Postfach* (post box) or an impersonal or even...
electronic Empfänger (receiver). A third thought may be more plausible: contiguity and attachment as a hold-relation, a force relation of one entity holding another entity, at least to the same extent as the spatial relation of closeness. In the following I will elaborate on this thought.

‘Attachment’ is less a spatial concept than ‘being on top of (auf) ’ or ‘under (unter)’, or certainly ‘toward’, because the semantic emphasis is on the connection between the two entities, on the manner in which the two entities are related to one another, and not on the spatial place of the one or the other. Moilanen (1979, pp. 130, 136) states explicitly that the relation which the preposition an denotes is not meant to be an optic orientation for the communication partners, as are horizontal and vertical relations, but simply to express contact between the two entities. Therefore, in order to interpret the locative meaning of x an y no particular position of the observer is needed; the connection between the two entities is apparent from any location. Continuing from Moilanen’s insights in his account of locative prepositions, a spatial observer point might not even be needed for an in order to interpret attachment; if the entities are actually connected, it should be clear whether or not some force connects the two entities. In contrast to the concept of auf, which is in accordance with the force of gravity29 (Der Stift liegt auf dem Tisch (‘The pen lies on (top of ) the table’)) or irrelevant to it (Der Fleck ist auf dem Pulli (‘The stain is on the sweatshirt’)), the concept of x an y defies the force of gravity, is a force against the force of gravity (*Der Fleck ist an dem Pulli (*‘The stain is (hanging) on the sweatshirt’) but Die Brosche ist an dem Pulli (‘The brooch is (hanging) on the sweatshirt’)), Brosche but not Fleck is fine, as the former would fall down if no force connected it to the sweatshirt. The relation x an y can therefore be described as a hold-relation, one entity holds another entity, at least to the same extent as it is a spatial relation of closeness. The concept of possession, a have-relation, can also be described as a force relation; something which I have the power to hold near me, is owned by me. I think that the same intuition underlies the concept of have as a ‘control’ relation, at least one facet of have (Tham (2004)). Not surprisingly, the original meaning of haben (have) is thought to have been grasp or catch (idg. *kap), a concept which results in holding an

29 Moilanen (p. 100): (initial description) x auf y is true iff (a) both entities are on the same axis (vertical), (b) share a surface of contact of which the underlying surface (y) is the carrying surface, which hinders x to fall (i.e. gravity secures the place of x on the entity y.)
entity by force (Duden-Etymologie (1989, p. 261))\textsuperscript{30}. The non-spatial addressee-\textit{an} can therefore be derived from the locative \textit{an} based on its denoted \textit{hold}-relation.

In chapter 3.2.4 I posit, quite similarly, for the dative case that it is assigned to the subject of a \textit{have}-relation. In order to account for the appearance of inanimate dative DPs, which are’ wholes related to some ‘parts’, I discuss the derivation of a \textit{have}-relation from a \textit{hold}-relation, too. Not surprisingly, Wegener (1985, p. 227), who finds semantic differences between the prepositional and the dative variants, but struggles with \textit{an}, admits that \textit{an}, among all prepositions alternating with the dative, has lost its spatial meaning to the greatest extent, and is ‘the preposition that competes with the dative in the strongest way.’\textsuperscript{31}

2.2.5 The semantic contributions of the verb, verbal object, and preposition

I now return to the issue discussed in the first section of this chapter, Gawron\textquotesingle s thoughts on preposition selection. If the PP is a subcategorized-for argument, the preposition should share its semantics with the governing verb. If it does not share its semantics with the verb, but still shares an argument with the verb, then it is a co-predicating PP, and Gawron does not answer the question how these PPs are licensed. Concerning both subcategorized-for and co-predicating PP-arguments, the appearance of addressee-\textit{an} phrases and also some exceptional \textit{zu}-phrases and other spatial prepositions with possessive verbs suggests interesting modifications to Gawron\textquotesingle s proposed principle.

There are certainly verbs which entail transfer of possession and verbs which only entail caused possession, no matter whether loss of possession is or is not part of the situation described. As already mentioned in chapter 1, this difference is the general semantic difference between \textit{geben} (give)-type verbs and \textit{verkaufen} (sell)-type verbs. Given the semantics accorded to \textit{an}, Gawron\textquotesingle s principle predicts that the \textit{an}-variant, entailing transfer of possession, will only be grammatical in the latter class, as can be seen in the following cases:

\textsuperscript{30}The old meaning is still preserved in the Southern German use of \textit{heben} (standard German to lift, to raise) a cognate of \textit{haben} (have). \textit{Heben} means here \textit{hold}, also in combinations as \textit{festheben} (hold tight) (standard German would be (\textit{fest}halten). \textquoteleft Lift\textquoteright{} is often expressed by adding a particle: \textit{hoch heben} (hold high).

\textsuperscript{31}This can be supported by the Dutch dative alternation \textit{aan}; the corresponding Dutch preposition is even used as an alternation to the prototypical dative with the verb \textquoteleft give\textquoteright{} (cf. Colleman (2009)).
a. Der Arzt gab dem Patienten /*an den Patienten die Spritze.
   The physician gave the patient.DAT/ onto(AN) the patient the syringe.ACC
   'The physician gave the patient an injection.'

b. Der Autor widmete sein Buch. seiner Mutter / *an seine Mutter.
   The author dedicated his book.ACC his mother.DAT/ onto(AN) this mother
   'The author dedicated his book to his mother.'

(103a) has two meanings; 'giving (the syringe for) an injection', does not really involve a change of possession. Quite the opposite is true, as the syringe usually remains in the hands of the physician. The prediction would thus be that this an-phrase is ungrammatical. However, an is also ungrammatical in the interpretation where the physician hands the actual syringe to the patient, as is zu, because the verb geben itself does not entail loss of possession on the part of the agent or spatial motion. Assuming that an is subcategorized, Gawron's Argument Principle for Prepositions is verified here. (Below I will deal with exceptional examples, in which the preposition seems to be involved in the addition of a loss of possession component.)

However, as also introduced in chapter 1, some verbs license or do not license an depending on the semantics of their first object. If the theme object is abstract and cannot change possession from the agent to the recipient, the an-variant is ungrammatical (the following (a) sentences). If the theme object is concrete, change of possession is entailed, and the an-variant is grammatical (the following (b) sentences). The fact that loss of possession on the part of the agent is still entailed in the dative variant of these verbs, or, in other words, that there is no difference in meaning between the dative variant and the an-variant, is evidence that these an-phrases are still regular subcategorized arguments, and not copredicating PPs. The semantics that licenses the PP headed with an in the grammatical cases therefore comes from the joint semantics of verb + first object:

   The audience ‘donated’ the singer.DAT applause.ACC/ onto(AN) the singer applause.ACC
   'The audiences applauded to the singer.'
   The woman donated 100 Euro.ACC the club.DAT / onto(AN) the club
   ‘The woman donated 100 Euro to the club.’

(105)  a. Die Frau gewährte dem Mann / *an den Mann Eintritt
   The woman allowed the man.DAT / onto(AN) the man entrance.ACC
   b. Der Staat gewährte ausländischen Familien / an ausländische Familien Kinder geld
   The state allowed foreign families.DAT/onto(AN) foreign families children’s allowances.
   ‘The state allowed children’s allowances to foreign families.’

The examples with *verleihen* (grant, give) mentioned above are repeated here:

(106)  a. Die Lichter verliehen einen festlichen Glanz der Stadt / *an die Stadt.
   The lights granted a festive glitter.ACC the city.DAT / onto(AN) the city
   ‘The lights gave the city a festive glitter.’
   b. Die Universität verlieh einen Preis dem Forscher / an den Forscher
   The university granted a prize.ACC the researcher.DAT / onto(AN) the researcher
   ‘The university granted a prize to the researcher.’

There is also a possibility of co-predication. The verbs *geben* and *schenken* do not usually license *an*-variants, as alone they do not entail a loss of possession for their external argument. However, in specific cases they appear in *an*-variants. Here, it is not the joint semantics of verb + DO that has the special semantics which matches the semantics of *an*, as the specific meaning disappears in the dative variant. The *an*-phrases here are thus undoubtedly co-predicating, adding meaning to the verb, and are seemingly licensed by one shared semantic component – the caused possession component. However, the preposition cannot be the only element which triggers the special meaning, because then it should be able to do so with other theme arguments, such as the *syringe* in the example above. The remaining option is that the preposition together with its arguments, its PSubj, PObj, or both, creates the specific caused possession meaning, which now entails loss of possession on the part of the agent. The verb *schenken* (give generously), for example, is used in the *an*-variant
when endowments or bestowals of money, property, or legacies are made (PSubj would thus be decisive for licensing):

(107)  a. Er schenkte das Buch seiner Tochter /*an seine Tochter.
       He gave generously the book.ACC his daughter.DAT/ onto(AN) his daughter
       ‘He gave his daughter the book as a present.’

b. So muss offen bleiben, ob es sich um den Weinberg handelt, den Cilina im Jahr 773 an das Kloster Lorsch schenkte, gleichzeitig die erste urkundliche Erwähnung von Neckarhausen.
       'Thus it has to remain an open question, whether that vineyard is meant, which Cilina bestowed onto(AN) the monastery Lorsch in the year 773, and which at the same time represents the first documental mentioning of Neckarhausen.'
       (Cosmas II: M06/NOV.84780 Mannheimer Morgen, 02.11.2006, Ressort: Rhein-Neckar; Alte Weingärten geben den Forschern Rätsel auf)

c. Unternehmer Schlau plant, Teile seines Vermögens an seine Kinder zu schenken.
       Enterpriser Schlau plans parts his incomes.ACC onto(AN) his children to give generously.
       'The enterpriser Schlau is planning to give parts of his income as an endowment to his children.'
       (Cosmas II: X96/DEZ.29553 Oberösterreichische Nachrichten, 05.12.1996, Ressort: Wirtschaft; Schenkungen ins Ausland)

Other examples involve the verb geben. These rare examples with an show that here again, a specific PSubj and/or PObj with an creates a special meaning. To give money an people – to distribute, to pay, to give an article an a newspaper = to send to a newspaper in the hope of making it public, to give clothes, etc, an charity = to donate.

(108)   a. Nicht wie andere Fussballvereine, wir geben das Geld an alle. (Google)
       Not like other football clubs, we give the money.ACC onto(AN) everybody
       ‘…we distribute the money between all.'
b. Kleider an einen Wohltätigkeitsverein geben
   Clothes.ACC onto(AN) a charity club give
   ‘donate clothes to charity’

   c. Er gab den Artikel an eine Zeitung. (Google)
   He gave the article.ACC onto(AN) a newspaper
   ‘He sent the article to a newspaper (to be published).’

   *Geben* seems to be even more exceptional than *schenken* in licensing co-predication, as, apart from *an*, the spatial preposition *zu* and the preposition *in* are possible, with the specific meaning of putting something into the custody of somebody/somebody’s place.

   (109) a. Er gab das Kind zu seinen Eltern / in eine Kindertagesstätte.
   He gave the child.ACC to (ZU) his parents/ into a day care center
   ‘He gave the child to his parents (into custody)/ He put the child in a day care center.’

   b. Er gab das Geld zur Bank und lebte von den Zinsen behaglich.
   He gave the money.ACC to(ZU) the bank and lived from the interest comfortably
   ‘He put the money on the bank and lived from the interest comfortably.’

   (www.wuppertaler-muellmuseum.de/137RP.pdf)

   c. Anschließend verständigte sie die Polizei und gab das Geld in die Obhut der Beamten.
   After-that called she the police and gave the money.ACC into the custody the officers.GEN
   ‘After that she called the police and gave the money into the custody of the officers.’

   (http://www.lobberich.de/aktuell/archiv/2007/11-presse-november.htm)

While the co-predications with *an*-phrases and *zur*-phrases of *schenken* and *geben* above could still be motivated by a situation that involves the transfer of possession (however, the difficult question would then arise as to why not all contexts can motivate such PPs, as discussed in (103a)), the *an* in the following rather idiomatic expressions headed by *verlieren* (lose) illustrates that the interpretation involves the semantics of the preposition itself. Here, the preposition, still anchored in the semantics of the verb and sharing an
argument, can add very new and unanticipated semantic content to the verb. The event that the verb *verlieren* denotes is usually not associated with a recipient participant. Unsurprisingly, the verb does not license a dative recipient. However, the *an*-phrase can add one and turn the verb into one which describes a specific situation with idiomatic semantics. In the case of *verlieren*, which clearly has a loss of possession component, the preposition *an* turns the event into a transfer of possession in that it adds the caused possession component by denoting the added recipient.

(110)  

a. *Uschi verlor dem Thomas ihr Herz.*  
Uschi lost Thomas.DAT her heart.ACC  
Should mean 'Uschi lost her heart to Thomas.'

b. Uschi verlor ihr Herz an Thomas\(^{32}\).  
Uschi lost her heart.ACC onto(AN) Thomas  
'Uschi fell in love with Thomas.'

(111)  

a. Joe verlor seine Frau (*seinem Freund).*  
Joe lost his wife.ACC (*his friend.DAT)  
‘Joe lost his wife’ can’t mean: ‘to his friend.’

b. Joe **verlor** seine Frau **an seinen Freund.**  
Joe lost his wife.ACC onto(AN) his friend  
'Joe lost his wife because his friend fell in love with her.'

These data pose interesting questions regarding the principles that govern preposition licensing. First, it seems that not only the verbal entailments, but sometimes also the joint semantics of the verb and its direct object license subcategorized PP arguments. Gawron did not propose this possibility. Furthermore, co-predication is possible in some – perhaps conventionalized – cases, if part of the semantics of the preposition is shared by the verb, i.e.,

\(^{32}\) Similarly to the abstract theme arguments above in (95a) e.g. *authority*, a person does not literally lose his/her heart, so a transfer of possession event seems to be discouraged, and the *an*-variant becomes illogical. However, the loss of one's heart is understood as a loss of control, note the following use of 'give away one's heart to somebody (*verschenken* is clearly a *verkaufen* (sell)-type verb) and the illustrating context:

[Trulla spielte mit ihm [Thangan] und verschenkte ihr Herz an ihn, so sehr verschenkte sie ihr Herz, dass sie auch ihren Verstand verlor und Dakodo in die Wueste schickte.][3]

(http://forscherliga.wikia.com/wiki/Trulla)  
‘Trulla played with him [Thangan] and gave away her heart onto(AN) him (‘to him’), so much did she give her heart that she also lost her mind and sent Dakodo into the desert.’
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the caused possession component. However, a challenging question arises: which verbs license their PP arguments with their own semantic entailments, (such as *widmen* (dedicate) or *verkaufen* (sell), which always have an an-variant), which verbs allow the DO to contribute to its licensing entailments (such as *verleihen* (grant) and *spenden* (give, donate), which often have an an-variant), and which sort of verbs (such as *geben* and *schenken*) license the co-predication of an-phrases very rarely with a specialized meaning. Finally, what is special about *geben* that it even appears with spatial prepositions, which do not seem to share any semantic component.

One generalization seems to be relevant for all these data. Verbs behave differently regarding their kind of licensing of PPs depending on the completeness of their meaning (*Sinnvollständigkeit*, completeness of meaning), Heuer (1977, p. 68f). Verbs as *widmen* (dedicate) and *verkaufen* (sell) are quite complete in their meaning; there is no need for a theme argument in order to understand the event denoted by these verbs. These verbs depend solely on their own semantics in the licensing or disallowing of an-phrases. Other verbs, such as *verleihen* (grant/give), *gewähren* (allow), and *spenden* (donate/give) are, considered alone, much vaguer in their meaning, and the semantics of the theme argument is decisive in making the meaning of the denoted event complete. As a result, the semantics of the DO will be decisive in determining whether or not the event is a suitable match for the preposition. Finally, there are verbs which are so underspecified that not only the theme argument, but also the preposition contributes to the final meaning. The verb *geben* – like *give* in English, is often called a light verb, which contributes little to the final meaning of the VP – arguably only caused possession. It seems that with *geben* the verb does not license the preposition, but instead the theme argument, and perhaps also the choice of the third argument. The verb itself provides the basic event structure of causing a possessive three-place event, with which the joint semantic concept of the theme argument and the preposition and maybe also the recipient argument, such as *Artikel an Zeitung* (article to newspaper) (for *einen Artikel an die Zeitung geben* (to give (submit) an article to the newspaper)) is compatible.\footnote{Perhaps the verb *geben* is even chosen ‘later’ in the processing as the only possible verb that does not add unnecessary information on manner or means to embed the concept of theme argument + preposition + recipient argument into a VP. Other arguable light verbs such as *tun* (do) or *machen* (make) are not compatible with (non-spatial) three place events: *Er tut/macht seinen Artikel an die Zeitung* (He does/makes his article onto (to) the newspaper)
possession event. The question as to which concept is sufficiently specified to 'stand alone' may be speaker and context dependent. *Buch an Peter* (book to Peter) without context is according to my intuition not specified enough as to the context, for example, purpose of the transfer, but *Artikel an Zeitung*, or *Kind zur Tagesmutter* is, as these expressions refer to a specific setting of publishing and child care respectively.

Furthermore, especially regarding verbs which have underspecified meanings, such as *verleihen* (lend, grant, or just give, respectively), the above data provides another important insight. Verbs seem to distinguish between the semantic components they are associated with in that some components are more basic than others. The caused possession component is the basic component of these verbs, and thus cannot be cancelled, but the loss of possession component, which licenses the *an*-variant with appropriate theme arguments (*Preis* (prize)), but not *Atmosphäre* (atmosphere)), seems to be built on the caused possession component because it can be added or activated by additional semantic material, such as the DO *Preis*. Which of the two processes happens, the addition of the component or activation, remains a speculation, that is, what does the lexical entry for these verbs look like. Addition would mean that the loss of possession component is not present in the lexical entry, but activation would mean that it is. Intuitions are probably speaker dependent, and may be influenced by the prototypical events which these events denote. For the verbs *verleihen* (grant/give) and *spenden* (donate/give), for example, I prefer to believe that somehow the loss of possession component is listed for these verbs and an appropriate theme argument activates it, as the real transfer of possession events seem to be more prototypical than the granting/donating of abstract properties (as in *Bücher verleihen* (to lend books), and *Geld spenden* (donate money)). For the verb *gewähren* (allow) my intuition is reversed, because one prototypically allows someone a certain action, ‘to do something’, in which the embedded event is not transferred from agent to recipient (as in *jm Eintritt gewähren*/*jm gewähren einzutreten* (to allow entrance to s.o./ s.o. to enter)).

In the following section I elaborate a bit on the *geben* + *zu/in* examples, which seem to be the most exceptional, as it seems to be counterintuitive that a verb which is highly associated with pure possession events (for some authors, such as McIntyre (2006), it is the German spell-out for cause + have)) is compatible with spatial events. This compatibility is probably due to the special semantics of *geben*, which is actually very difficult to represent; among all the verbs discussed here, it is the least 'complete' in its meaning. Unsurprisingly, it
is very often found as a building block in compositional expressions and can be combined with almost any particle, often creating abstract meanings. Furthermore, there is also the existential geben (Es gibt... 'there is...') and, unlike the English give, geben in German does appear in simple spatial events, such as recipes:

(112) a. Die restliche Milch in einen Topf geben
    The remaining milk.ACC in a pot give
    'Put the remaining milk into a pot'
    (Rosemarie Büchele, Schwäbisch kochen, 1993, Gräfe und Unzer Verlag, München, p. 50)

b. Die weiche Butter, das Ei, und 1 Prise Salz auf den Mehrrand geben
    The soft butter, the egg, and little salt.ACC onto(AN) the flour-edge give
    'Put the soft butter, the egg… onto the edge of flour' (ibid., p. 52)

These instances of geben have a similar interpretation to the English put. It seems that geben, a verb that probably every native speaker of German acquired very early and intensively, is still associated with human hands, the prototypical means of transfer. Therefore, geben can appear in simple transfer situations in which hands are involved. In these instances there is no caused possession involved, but spatial motion instead. These examples would be ungrammatical in the dative version. In its usual caused possession meaning, geben may be more permissive in licensing spatial additions than, e.g. schenken, which only appears in caused possession events, and is more complete in its meaning, as it adds the manner component ‘generously’, or ‘as a present’.

However, even though the movement of hands while transferring may be responsible for licensing spatial events in the setting of cooking, and let us speculate about the compatibility of geben with spatial prepositions in general, a possessive context usually has to be present. In the geben-examples with children and money above, even though the causing of

34 For example: Zugeben = to admit, angeben = to mention, to boast, sich übergaben = to throw up, sich hingeben = to lose oneself in admiration
35 A dog putting its bones into a hole is infelicitous with this use of geben:
   *Der Hund gab die Knochen in ein Loch.
   The dog gave the bones into a hole.

36 Intuitive with a very short spatial path, as when path emphazizers such as hin (hither) sound strange. This is especially true for those geben + zu cases in which caused possession does play a role. However, I do not know yet what this would mean for the semantics of the preposition zu – lexicalizing a spatial two-value path?
   i. *Die Milch in den Topf hinein geben (cf. Die Milch in den Topf hinein schütten)
      The milk into the pot hither-in give (cf. The milk in the pot hither-in pour)
   ii. *Er gab das Kind zu den Eltern hin (cf. Er schickte das Kind zu den Eltern hin)
      He gave the child to the parents hither. (He sent the child to the parents hither)
possession takes place in a spatial setting, not any location can be the spatial goal of *geben*, but only a location that is still compatible with a caused possession event. Assuming that possession of a child means custody, a child can be given to the grandparents, 'put into the custody of his grandparents', but giving her 'to the doctor' sounds strange, as a visit to the doctor's office is usually not supposed to involve a change of responsibility over the child. A context which indicates that the doctor is supposed to be the new custody figure restores the intended meaning.  
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(113)  

a. *Er gab das Kind an seine Eltern.  
He gave the child.ACC onto(AN) his parents  
Should mean: ‘He gave his parents the child.’  
b. Er gab das Kind zu seinen Eltern.  
He gave the child.ACC to(ZU) his parents  
‘He gave the child into the custody of his parents.’  
c. *Er gab das Kind zum Doktor.  
He gave the child to(ZU) the doctor  
Can only mean: ‘He gave the child into custody of the doctor.’

Similarly, one can give the child to the day care center, or even to a boarding school (which might be less felicitous because you no longer carry older children), but not to a high school, as a high school is not perceived as having responsibilities over the child other than its educational aims.

(114)  

a. Er gab das Kind in eine Kindertagesstätte.  
He gave the child.ACC into a day care center  
‘He put/enrolled/ brought the child into a day care center.’  
b. ?Er gab seinen Sohn in eine Ganztagsschule/Internat.  
He gave his son into a all-day-school/ boarding school  
‘He put/enrolled/ brought his son into all day school/ boarding school.’  
c. *Er gab seinen Sohn in eine weiterführende Schule.  
He gave his son into a secondary school  
Should be: ‘He enrolled his son into a high school.’

37 The dative variants are also grammatical if a possessive interpretation is justified, but, as predicted by the analysis of these *zu*-variants as co-predicating, the specific meaning of transfer into different custody is lost.
Therefore, theme arguments which do not anticipate a certain need for custody (other than children or money), and goal-phrases which are not associated with a custody place, would need a certain context to make sense, but are theoretically possible:

(115) a. *Er gab das Buch zu seinem Freund.
    He gave the book.ACC to(ZU) his friend
    Should be: ‘He gave the book to his friend.’

b. Er gab das Buch, ein unersetbarer Familienschatz, zu seinen Eltern.
    He gave the book, a non-replaceable family treasure.ACC to(ZU) his parents
    ‘He gave the book, a non-replaceable family treasure to his parents (into custody)

These examples allow me to conclude that, despite the demonstrated exceptional compatibility with spatial events, geben (give) is primarily associated with caused possession events, where it can be maintained to be the prototypical realization.

2.2.6 Summary of 2.2.5

In this subsection I show how the data on possessive verbs with their possible prepositions support Gawron’s Principle for Argument Selection but also pose new questions as to how prepositions are licensed by verbs. Concerning subcategorized PPs, some verbs, such as widmen (dedicate), are ‘alone’ responsible for licensing. Other verbs, such as verleihen (grant, give) depend on the semantics of their DOs. Some verbs, such as schenken (give generously) allow co-predication in specified situations. Here again, the theme argument has been shown to be decisive in licensing, and together with the preposition a specific meaning of the verb has been created. Regarding the question of which verbs act in this or that manner, the concept of ‘completeness of meaning’ (Heuer (1977) provides some guidelines to the licensing behavior of verbs. The more specified, ‘complete’ a verb’s meaning is, on its own, the more preposition selection will depend on the verb itself. If the meaning of the verb alone is vague and is clarified, ‘completed’, by the theme argument, this argument will play a role in licensing, too. If the verb has a thoroughly underspecified meaning, such as geben (give), prepositions are much more freely expected, but not in all contexts, only with theme arguments with which they denote a specific concept. It seems that here it is not the verb itself that licenses the preposition, but the semantics of the theme argument which creates a specific concept, arguably involving the joint semantics of theme
argument, preposition, and recipient. The verb *geben* (give) may only provide the basic structure for causing a three-participant event.

In the following subsection I will discuss the preposition *für* (for), which has been left aside till now, before all prepositions are compared to each other in the last section.

### 2.2.7 FÜR (for)

As introduced in chapter 1, the recipient meaning of *für* is accounted for differently than in the cases of the prepositions *zu*, *von*, and *an*. First, it alternates with dative DPs which are usually analyzed as non-selected by the governing verb and whose argument status is questioned, the beneficiary dative. More details will be given in chapter 3. Furthermore, a *für*-phrase is generally (cf. Jackendoff (1990)) analyzed as an adjunct-PP, yet, as seen below, it seems to be somewhere in between a regular co-predication and an adjunct.

The preposition *für* is historically related to the spatial preposition *vor* (in front of), but it does not have any spatial uses today, and is very naturally combined with both animate and inanimate complements. *Für* denotes the purpose or intention of an action or item (Schmitz (1966), p. 13), and very often denotes the beneficiary, but not exclusively: *eine Belohnung/eine Gefahr für Lisa* (a reward/a danger for Lisa). The intention or beneficiary of an event with a theme object can be understood as the recipient if the theme object comes into existence or is intended to change possessor by the event. Thus creation/preparation predicates such as *malen* (draw), *bauen* (build), and 'making available' predicates such as *kaufen* (buy) and *beschaffen* (make available), but not mere manner predicates such as *waschen* (wash) may imply a recipient argument, as in the following examples (Wegener (1985, p. 94), Jackendoff (1990, p. 195), Greene (1976))

Furthermore, an indefinite DP can strengthen or even evoke this implicature, as the item assumingly does not seem to have existed before or is new information with no associated previous purpose. The verb *nähen* (sew) may or may not imply a recipient argument depending on the in/definiteness of the complement of *für*:

---

38 All the sources speak of the (optional) dative DP of these verbs, but the fact that the first interpretation of this additional argument is the recipient, more than the beneficiary, is also true for the *für* (for)-phrase which alternates with these datives. At least in German, the dative DP of these verbs would be ambiguous between denoting a beneficiary (of the whole action), or a recipient (of the theme argument), as is the DP that *für* or *for* in these cases denote.
a. Die Frau malt / baut / kauft/ für den Mann ein/ das Auto.
The woman draws / builds / buys/ for the man a/the car.ACC
‘The woman is drawing/… a/ the car for the man.’

man= recipient

vs.

b. Die Frau wäscht für die Nachbarin ein/ das Auto.
The woman washes for the neighbor the car.ACC
‘The woman is washing a/the car for the neighbor.’

neighbor= beneficiary

c. Die Frau näht für den Mann eine Hose.
The woman sews for the man pants.ACC
‘The woman is sewing pants for the man.’

Man=recipient

vs.

d. Die Frau näht für den Mann die Hose.
The woman sews for the man the pants.ACC
‘The woman is sewing the pants for the man.’

man = beneficiary

The change of possession that happens in events with für is different from possession changes denoted with zu, von, or an. First, für never exclusively denotes a recipient; the beneficiary meaning is also always accessible, and context decides to what extent it accompanies the recipient interpretation, or is even the only interpretation. Compare (116d) with (117). Here the factory is most likely primarily or even exclusively the beneficiary:

(117) Die Frau näht Hosen für die Fabrik.
The woman sews pants.ACC for the factory
‘The woman sews pants for the factory.’

Factory=beneficiary

In a recipient interpretation, für- phrases appear with verbs that either do not have a path element or a non-spatial direction element, such as verbs of creation or preparation, or with
verbs whose directedness is already satisfied, namely source-, not goal-oriented, such as with verbs of 'making available'. For example, the children who ask the following question most likely wish to receive ice cream:

(118) Kaufst du für uns ein Eis?
Buy you for us an ice cream.ACC ?
‘Will you buy ice cream for us?’

Even though the ice cream in this buying event is intended to undergo a change of possession from the seller to the children, this change is not directed toward the children. The change denoted by the verb occurs from the seller to the buyer: *Eis vom Eisverkäufer kaufen* 'to buy ice cream from the ice cream seller'. The actual recipient is the external subject, *du* (you) in the example above (cf. Jackendoff (1990)'s semantic analysis of 'buy'). Only then it is implied to reach the intended final recipient. In other words, the directed change of possession is already satisfied by the verb + theme argument alone, even if the source is not mentioned. The *für*-recipient is a grammatical addition, as *für* is not selected by a direction verb. This creates a contrast between the prepositions *für* and *an*, and further highlights the above proposed 'non-spatial direction component: *an* is ungrammatical with this verb.

(119) Die Frau kaufte eine Hose *an den Mann/ für den Mann
The woman bought pants.ACC onto(AN) the man/ for the man
‘The woman bought pants *to/ for the man.’

On the other hand, *für* with a directional verb which still has an open goal argument is not ungrammatical, but it only denotes the beneficiary.

(120) Er kaufte für seine Frau das Auto. ⇒ die Frau bekommt ein Auto.
He bought for his wife the car ⇒ the wife gets a car
(121) Er verkaufte für seine Frau das Auto. ̀⇒ seine Frau bekommt ein Auto.
He sold for his wife the car ̀⇒ his wife gets a car.

I assume that this behavior is caused by a blocking effect, similar to the blocking effect that renders *verkaufen* + *zu* ungrammatical, as is assumed in subsection 2.2.4. There it was
assumed that the semantically more specific preposition is always preferred and blocks the choice of a semantically less specific preposition. As the expected preposition that best fits the semantics of the verb *verkaufen* (sell) is *an*, the recipient interpretation is blocked for the 'worse match' that *für* would make, even though if a directional environment is lacking or with verbs that denote an opposite direction, a recipient interpretation is within the semantic range of *für*. The difference of the extension with *für* in contrast to *zu* is that *für* does have an alternative meaning, namely denoting the beneficiary of the sale. The construction is thus not rendered ungrammatical, but a different meaning is created. *Zu*, on the other hand, competes with the same interpretation that *an* would provide in this situation, and is thus totally blocked.

Concerning the argument status of *für*-phrases which alternate with dative DPs in general and recipient-*für*-phrases in particular, they seem to be an intermediate category between Gawron's co-predicating PPs and adjunct PPs. Do they share an argument with the verb, or do they have the whole proposition as PSubj? Recall Gawron's generalization that if it shares an argument with the verb, the *für*-phrase would function as a co-predicating PP, whereas if the whole proposition is shared as the subject of the preposition, the status of the *für*-phrase would be an adjunct, as in *Mary walked under the bridge*. The fact that the basic interpretation of a *für*-phrase is a benefactive interpretation, i.e., the denotee of the complement of *für* benefits from the event, favors the latter analysis, however, the often-found implication that the beneficiary gets the item involved in the event as a result, favors the analysis in which only the theme argument functions as PSubj. I do not have an answer that could fit into Gawron's theory as it is. However, the analysis might be along the following lines: Both options seem to be inexact. It is neither the whole proposition from which the beneficiary benefits, nor the theme argument only, but some kind of result phrase of the event, which includes the theme argument and part of the verbal meaning:

(122)  

a. Er malte ein Bild für sie: *[ein gemaltes Bild]_{PSubj} für [sie]_{PObj}  
He drew a picture for her: [a drawn picture] for [her]

b. Er wusch das Auto für sie: *[das gewaschene Auto]_{PSubj} für [sie]_{PObj}  
He washed the car for her: [the washed car] for [her]

This analysis would unify both the recipient + benefactive interpretation of (a) and the benefactive-only interpretation of (b). In (a), she benefits from *a* drawn picture, which means
the picture could be now in her possession, or for her benefit in some way, i.e., she was supposed to draw it, so he helped her. In (b) she benefits from the washed car; the car already existed, but it was not washed before.39

2.3 Summary of section 2.2

According to the individual semantics of the prepositions isolated in the subsections above, the event schemata that prepositional constructions with zu, von, and an associate with are summarized in the following table (in contrast to zu, von, and an, für does not fit into this comparison):

Table 8:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>+inanimate location</th>
<th>+animate location</th>
<th>+animate non-location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zu</td>
<td>caused motion, denoting: goal</td>
<td>caused motion, or caused possession, +/- caused motion, denoting recipient + goal</td>
<td>Ungrammatical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Von</td>
<td>caused motion, denoting: source</td>
<td>caused motion, or caused possession, +/- caused motion denoting: deprived, with/without being source</td>
<td>caused possession (loser)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An with spatial verb; with possessive verb</td>
<td>caused motion, denoting: goal</td>
<td>unusual, if not ungrammatical</td>
<td>ungrammatical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ungrammatical</td>
<td>caused possession (recipient)</td>
<td>caused possession (recipient)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4 Unifying change of possession and change of location using a scalar approach

The above analysis, which shows crucial differences between an and zu and raises doubts about the spatial nature of addressee-an in transfer events, has consequences for the discussion of the relation between the concepts of location and possession introduced in chapter 1. An is not just a spatial possibility for expressing caused possession, compared with the non-spatial dative variant (cf. Wunderlich (2005)). The underlying concept of regarding

---

39An interesting thought, communicated to me by M. Rappaport Hovav, is that the constituents which für shares with the verb, in contrast to the constituents which an and zu share with the verb, are reminiscent of the two applicatives of Pylkkänen (2002). In this manner, für can be analyzed as a preposition that replaces event related (‘high’) applicative phrases (at least result states, similar to the Spanish ‘middle’ applicatives as proposed by Cuervo (2003)) and an and zu entity related (‘low’) applicative phrases.
an as a spatial alternate to the non-spatial dative variant defines possession as a sub-type of location and suggests that any event of transfer of possession can be construed as a directed motion event. A similar analysis is made in the case of English to-phrases in the dative alternation (Krifka 2003, Harley 2002). Here again, to should be the spatial, the double object (‘dative’) variant the non-spatial alternate, both describing a possessive event. However, the complementary behavior of an vs. zu (which in the case of send appears to fit the above analysis) casts doubts on this analysis. An, though originally a spatial preposition, seems to behave like the dative case, and not like the spatial preposition zu. The examples above that are grammatical with an would also be grammatical with the dative case, but not the others:

(123) Er schickte *dem Direktor/ *an den Direktor die Schüler.
He sent the principal.DAT the students.ACC/ onto(AN) the principal
the students.ACC
Should be: ‘He sent the students to the principal.’

(124) Er schickte dem Peter/ an Peter das Paket.
He sent Peter.DAT/ onto(AN) Peter the package.ACC
‘He sent Peter the package/ the package to Peter.’

(125) Er verkaufte dem Peter/ an Peter das Auto.
He sold Peter.DAT/ onto(AN) Peter the car.ACC
‘He sold Peter the car/ the car to Peter.’

Localist semanticists, such as Freeze (1992), Gruber (1965), and Jackendoff (1983, 1990), certainly do not ignore these similarities between the dative case and the semantics of the English to or an respectively, which do not need a proper spatial motion environment to be licensed. Instead, Jackendoff (1983, p. 192). proposes that when the event is a possessive event, an abstract motion is taking place along a path in an abstract possessive field. The path can no longer be a continuous transition, as possessive fields are discontinuous, and therefore 'degenerates into its endpoint' (p. 192); it no longer has an internal structure to which one may make reference, as with path modifiers such as all the way/halfway, or with additional source phrases such as from my house/ at the beach (cf. Rappaport Hovav and Levin (2008b, pp. 135-138). The ‘motion’ component is interpreted in such ‘path’ analyses as a change of state. This method seems to be a plausible way to analyze the above proposed 'non-spatial direction
component’, arguably provided by the assignment of the accusative case to the complement of recipient-

of recipient-an, which creates the semantic component ‘loss of possession’. However, instead of proposing an abstract path element in the an-variants and a concrete path element in the zu-variants, both the similarity between the two components and the difference between them can be more elegantly captured and represented by referring to the scalar properties of the semantics of the verbs and prepositions. I propose that the concept of scalar change underlies both locative concepts and possessive concepts and can also account for the relation between them.

Semantic scales, which have successfully been used in the analysis of gradable adjectives, have three crucial parameters (Kennedy and McNally (2005)): a set of degrees which represent measurement values; a dimension which indicates the kind of measurement (cost, temperature, speed, volume, height, etc.); and an ordering relation. Furthermore, scales can be open or ‘unbounded’, or partly or fully closed or ‘bounded’ (Kennedy and McNally (1999, 2005), Hay et al. (1999)); they all have degrees which are ordered in a certain direction, and are either specified or unspecified for a minimum and/or maximum value, where the specified value constitutes the bound. The diagnostic for bounds is the grammaticality of degree modifiers such as completely, fully, or 100%. The semantics of adjectives, verbs, and their event structures can be analyzed and compared along these three parameters.

The following example illustrates the parameters for adjectives. The adjectives tall and short lexicalize a scale with a set of degrees on the dimension ‘height’. They differ in the ordering of the degrees, with the scale of short being the reverse, the negative of that of tall. Both adjectives have an unbounded scale, which can be seen in the ungrammaticality of the degree modifier completely/ fully/ 100%. Other adjectives showing similar semantics are deep and shallow, eager and uneager.

(126)  Her brother is completely ??tall/??short.  (Kennedy and McNally (2005, (25a))

The adjectives loud and quiet have scales of the dimension sound volume. Again, they differ in the ordering of their degrees, but both are bounded at the lower end, which can be seen in the ungrammaticality of the degree modifier on the adjective that refers to the upper end of the scale. Other adjectives of this type are bent and straight, famous and unknown.
The room became 100% loud/quiet. (Kennedy and McNally (2005, (26b))

The adjective *certain*, on the other hand, is bounded at the upper end of the scale. It is grammatical with *fully*, but its opposite *uncertain* is not. Other adjectives with partly (upper) bounded scales are safe and dangerous.

We are fully certain/uncertain about the results. (Kennedy & McNally (2005, (27a))

And finally, adjectives such as *full, empty, open, closed, and visible and invisible* have a fully-bounded scale pattern. All of them are grammatical with one of the respective degree modifiers:

The figure was completely visible/invisible. (Kennedy & McNally (2005, (28c))

Not only gradable adjectives, but also the semantics of verbs and event structures can be analyzed using this concept, especially in events with deadjectival degree achievement verbs, e.g., *lengthen, straighten*, where the scale of their base adjectives is involved in the structure of the event they denote; *lengthen* denotes a change of state along the dimension ‘length’, and is, without a specified maximal value, unbounded. *Straighten*, on the other hand, has in its base adjective a natural bound, and the verb is thus associated with a bounded scale. Various studies (e.g., Hay *et al.* (1999), Kennedy and Levin (2008), Rappaport Hovav and Levin (2010), Beavers (2009)) have shown that in addition to degree achievement verbs, incremental theme verbs (e.g., *eat, destroy*) and verbs of directed motion (e.g., *ascend, arrive*) can be unified under a scalar approach. The shared element in their semantics is assumed to be a function that measures the degree to which an object changes relative to some scalar dimension over the course of an event (Kennedy and Levin (2008, p. 1))⁴⁰. The scalar dimensions can be distinguished into three prominent kinds of scales: property scales, path scales, and volume/extent scales (Hay *et al.* (1999)). These linguists have shown that verbal behavior and factors of the contexts with respect to telicity and atelicity can be

---

⁴⁰The page number refers to the pdf version in: http://www.stanford.edu/~bclevin/kl07-measure.pdf
captured by such an approach. Telicity can be expressed when the change in the value of the scalar attribute or the bound of the scale is specified, whereas atelicity arises when the change or bound is unspecified. For example, *The workmen widened the street six meters in ten days/*for ten days / I returned in ten days/*for ten days. vs. The workmen widened the street for ten days / I ascended *in five minutes/ for five minutes. The bound can be given by the semantic nature of the argument, as illustrated with *eat* (Hay et al. (1999)). *Eat an apple* has a bounded scale, as the volume of an apple is limited by being an entity with borders, whereas *eat rice* an unbounded one. *Eat an apple* can therefore be telic, whereas *eat rice* is atelic:

(130)  

a. He ate an apple in/ for an hour.  (telic or atelic)  
b. He ate rice *in/ for an hour.  (only atelic)

Another element of the scales that is decisive for analyzing verbs and their event structures is the distinction between multi-value (or complex) and two-value (bipartite, simplex) scales. Rappaport Hovav & Levin (2010) show how directed motion verbs and change of state verbs can be analyzed by referring to their scalar properties, enabling a comparison regarding the kind of scale they lexicalize. The following section gives a clarifying overview of the scalar properties mentioned above.

Event structures can be differentiated by the following properties. First is the distinction between dynamic predicates which involve some change and static predicates which do not involve any change, as, e.g., *love*. Only predicates which entail a change may or may not have scalar properties. Predicates which entail a scalar change are both change of state verbs (*clean*) and directed motion verbs (*enter*), while manner predicates (*wipe*) entail a non-scalar change. Furthermore, in all classes of scalar predicates there are predicates with a multi-value scale and predicates with a two-value scale. *Arrive* and *crack* have two-value scales, while *return* and *cool* have multi-value scales. Predicates which entail multi-value scales can be further divided into bounded and unbounded scales. In the domain of directed motion and result predicates, bounding distinguishes between *return* and *rise*, or *empty* and *lengthen* (Rappaport Hovav and Levin (2010, pp. 30-32)).

The following figure illustrates the event structure properties introduced above:
Beavers (2011) presents a thorough study of the application of the scalar approach to English caused possession verbs (he includes basic caused motion verbs which participate in the dative alternation). He assumes that most caused possession verbs are associated with a two-value scale (exclude bring?). Yet, he points out that unlike a two-value scale that involves a spatial path and goes from one location to another, the two-value scale of the dimension of possession, e.g., of *give*, is not a transition that goes from a previous possessor to a new possessor, but concerns the state of possession, a transition from the recipient not possessing the theme to the recipient possessing the theme. *Give* does not encode information about the prior state of possession, unlike verbs such as *send* and *throw*. Here, Beavers claims that a loss, or at least a leaving of possession on part of the causer is encoded, at least in most instances. He further distinguishes four types of result states which appear, alone or in combination, in events of caused possession with the verbs that participate in the dative alternation (*give, sell, send* and *throw*):

(131)  

a. Caused possession – recipient comes to possess theme  
b. Loss of possession – causer ceases to possess theme  
c. Leaving – theme leaves a specified source  
d. Arrival – theme arrives at a specified goal  

(Beavers (2011, p. 74))

Beavers does not use the term ‘bound’ at this point, but claims that these result states are responsible for the telic behavior of caused possession verbs, which he discussed earlier in
his paper (section 5) by referring to the punctuality of pure caused possession verbs and the ‘prospective’ transfer. I therefore assume that they can be considered as bounds to the scale with which the verbs participating in the dative alternation are associated.

*Give*-type verbs can be thus analyzed as verbs that lexicalize a scalar change, a two-value scale on the dimension of possession, in contrast to *arrive* and *enter* which lexicalize two-value scalar changes in the dimension of location. *Give*-type verbs can further be distinguished from verbs such as *send* and *throw* which are basically associated with a multi-value scale on the dimension of location, a path, even though they can also lexicalize caused possession. Evidence for the existence of a spatial path is, as discussed in detail in Rappaport Hovav and Levin (2008, pp. 135-138), the grammatical addition of path phrases specifying the source and the goal (*I send the bicycle from my house at the beach to my house in the mountains* (10b)), or modifiers to the *to*-phrase such as ‘all the way’ or ‘halfway’ (*Jake threw the ball all the way/halfway to Bill* (16b)).

I assume that the German dative verbs behave similarly. They can first be distinguished between scalar change verbs (*geben* (give), *verkaufen* (sell), *schicken* (send), *stehlen* (steal)), as the change they denote happens along ordered values, and non-scalar change verbs (e.g., *malen* (draw, paint) for the *für*-variant). Furthermore, *geben*-type verbs and *verkaufen*-type verbs lexicalize a two-value scale in the dimension of possession, involving at least the transition from the recipient not possessing the theme to the recipient having possession of the theme, whereas *schicken*-type verbs and *werfen*-type verbs are associated with a multi-value scale in the dimension of location, involving a transition from the location of the causer to the location of the goal/recipient. Relevant evidence, the grammaticality of adverbial *hin* (hither) (cf. 94)), provides data that argue for the entailment of a spatial path element in *schicken* and *werfen* events, but not in *geben* and *verkaufen* events:

(132)  
*Er gab das Buch seiner Freundin hin.*

He gave the book.ACC his girlfriend.DAT hither

‘He gave the book (‘hither’) to his girlfriend.’

(133)  
*Er verkaufte das Buch an seine Freundin hin.*

He sold the book.ACC onto(AN) his girlfriend.DAT hither

‘He sold the book (‘hither’) to his girlfriend.’
The observation that, as can be seen, the un/grammaticality of a zu-variant represents a diagnostic for the dimension location (with optional possessive change) as opposed to possession alone is an important one. Based on the semantics of von as discussed above, I assume that stehlen (steal)-type verbs are associated with a two-value scale with the dimension of location or possession, depending on the semantic context. A more abstract dimension may well underlie both dimensions, such as a part-whole-relationship. A spatial path can be inferred from the semantics of the verb, but it is often not entailed\(^{41}\), and surely is not needed for the realization of a von-phrase. The sentence \textit{Ich nehme/stehle das Buch vom Regal} (I take/steal the book from the shelf) is true once the book is separated from its whole, the shelf, even though a second event specifying the goal of a path may follow immediately and is often implied: \textit{Ich nehme das Buch vom Regal und lege es auf den Tisch} (I take the book from the shelf and put it on the table.).

Concerning the property of bounded vs. unbounded scales, I assume that the fact that transfer events can always be construed as telic events\(^{42}\) indicates that the scales associated with these verbs are bounded. The four result states of caused possession verbs mentioned by Beavers above represent the specified values of these bounds.

In this sense, schicken (send) and werfen (throw) transfer events are fully bounded. The lower end represents the specification of the previous location of the theme argument, and the upper end the goal/recipient location. But what about geben (give) and verkaufen (sell)-type verbs? Beavers does not clarify how a combination of the result states caused possession and loss of possession can be mapped onto the scale the verb/VP is associated with. I suggest that two-value scales can also differ regarding the property of boundedness. Two-value scales always seem to be bounded, but only at one end. For example, arrive and enter specify the value of the upper bound, the goal location. The lower end of the scale is only the negated value; the source location is not specified exactly. Therefore, in analogy to multi-value scales, also a value of a two-value scale can be left unspecified. However, two-value scales differ from multi-value scales in that they always have one value specified; they

\(^{41}\) The verb \textit{holen} (go fetch) may be a counterexample, as it seems to have unique semantics as does its counterpart \textit{bringen} (bring)

\(^{42}\) See Beavers (2011) for a discussion and illustration of telicity facts.
cannot be open, unbounded scales. However, I propose in the following section that two-value scales can also be fully specified, fully bounded.

Assuming that *verkaufen* (sell)-type verbs entail both loss of possession on the part of the agent and caused possession on the part of the recipient (i.e., entail two result states according to Beavers (2011) above), the difference between them and *geben* (give)-type verbs and accordingly *stehlen* (steal)-type verbs, that is, the difference between a mere caused possession/mere loss of possession and leave vs. transfer of possession, could be captured by assuming that *verkaufen*-type verbs (but not *geben*-type verbs or *stehlen*-type verbs) are associated with two two-value scales, one referring to the state of possession of the deprivee, the other to the state of possession of the recipient. However, the two scales are inherently connected to each other. Even though possession cannot be half the way between the previous possessor and the recipient, as the scale is not multi-value, the loss of possession of the agent is the condition for the gain of possession of the recipient. The scale of *verkaufen*-type verbs is thus one two-value scale; however, it is distinguished from the two-value scales of *geben*-type verbs and *stehlen*-type verbs in that is fully specified. Both the lower end (regarding the direction of the change of possession encoded), the previous owner, and the upper end, the prospective owner are specified. Unlike in English, where *give* does not show different behavior with respect to argument realization from *sell*, the presence of such a fully specified two-value scale can nicely be made transparent in German. The grammaticality of the *an*-variant would be a direct reflex of this kind of scale. As discussed in detail above (2.2.5), *an* entails ‘loss of possession’, it also denotes the recipient. It either makes the entailment of loss of possession on the part of the agent transparent, as in *verkaufen an* (sell onto(AN), ‘sell to’), or triggers a loss of possession interpretation as in *verleihen an* (grant onto(AN), ‘grant to’). In addition, it can add a loss of possession component, as in *schenken an* (give generously onto(AN), ‘bestow to’), or even as in *verlieren an* (lose onto(AN), ‘lose to’), in which the verb (lose) provides the loss of possession component; it is therefore a reversed scale, and can complete the other bound by adding the recipient.

With this analysis of *geben*-type, *stehen*-type, and *verkaufen*-type verbs as lexicalizing two-value scales, and in particular *verkaufen*-type verbs as lexicalizing a fully specified two-value scale, I have shown the similarity of these verbs to spatial motion verbs, but also the differences between them. I cannot deny that a bounded two-value scale particularly seems to anticipate a kind of a ‘path’ from one value to the other, which makes Jackendoff’s analysis of an abstract path element very plausible. In this kind of account change of possession would
be a subfield of change of location, an abstract locational change. A scalar approach, on the other hand, allows the assumption that possession and location are separate concepts which languages may, but do not necessarily need, to conflate. It still allows a unified analysis of change of possession verbs and change of location verbs. Both change of possession and change of location are scalar changes, the first along two-value scales, and the latter along two-value or multi-value scales. The difference between a possessive scalar change and a spatial scalar change, as e.g. in *give* and *enter*, is primarily the dimension of the scale they lexicalize: possession for *give* and location for *enter*. In this sense, the concept of scalarity is a language-shaping motor that underlies the concepts of both possession and location.

The prepositional constructions discussed in this chapter are licensed by/ are reflexes of the following scalar properties that the event denotes:

Table 9:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>bounds</th>
<th>scale</th>
<th>dimension</th>
<th>scalar change</th>
<th>event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2 bounds: causer, goal         | multi-value      | location          | yes           | *zu-variant*  
|                                 |                  |                   |               | *Erwarf den Ball zu ihm*  
|                                 |                  |                   |               | *He threw the ball to him* |
| 1 bound: source/deprive        | two-value        | location or       | yes           | *von-variant*  
| (causer is not necessarily     |                  | possession (arguably something more abstract as 'part-whole-relationship') |               | *Ernahm das Geld/ den Druck von ihm*  
| the future possessor)          |                  |                   |               | *He took the money/pressure from him* |
| Fully specified: causer and    | two-value        | possession        | yes           | *an-variant*  
| recipient                       |                  |                   |               | *Er verkauftedas Auto an ihn*  
|                                 |                  |                   |               | *He sold the car to him* |
|                                 |                  |                   | no            | *für-variant*  
|                                 |                  |                   |               | *Er malte ein Bild für ihn*  
|                                 |                  |                   |               | *He drew a picture for him* |
2.5 Summary of chapter 2

Chapter 2 provides a fine-grained semantic description of the prepositions that appear in alternation between PPs headed by *zu*, *von*, *an*, and *für* and the dative case in transfer events. The description has been embedded in the general question of how PPs are licensed by a governing verb and by what semantic components associated with the verb. A spatial environment is needed for the preposition *zu*, but not necessarily for *von* and *an*, as they lack a spatial path element. The still directional nature of these prepositions is accounted for by assuming that the scalar properties are different. Whereas *zu* lexicalizes a multi-value scale, *von* and *an* only a two-value scale. These semantic properties allow *von* and *an* to appear in abstract, non-spatial, 'pure' recipient/deprivee situations, as two-value scales can go along either a location or a possessional dimension, in contrast to *zu*, which, even under a recipient interpretation, will always keep the goal interpretation. *Für* is shown to be different from the other prepositions. Its recipient interpretation is not entailed, but arises from the implications of an event involving a theme argument that is intended to be for the benefit of a person. Unlike *zu*, *von*, and *an*, it needs a non-directional verb for its recipient interpretation to be made effective.

The semantic properties of the prepositions are presented so as to be relevant for the realization of different event schemata. After analyzing the semantics of the dative case in the next chapter, the results of both this chapter and the next will be compared in Chapter 5.
Chapter 3: The dative construction

This chapter is devoted to the dative construction, often called the ditransitive construction. The German dative has long been a focus of interest and much has been written about it. The scope of this dissertation precludes the presentation of an analysis covering all aspects of the dative case, which can be found in Wegener (1985) in her extensive study, which deserves its all-encompassing title Der Dativ im Deutschen (The dative in the German language). Her work has served as the basis for many of my thoughts.

In this chapter, I focus on the dative which appears in VPs, and ask one question in particular: what does the assignment of the dative case contribute semantically to the DP and the construction? The answer will go beyond the various dative functions which have traditionally been assigned to the dative case, such as recipient, benefactive, experiencer, judger, external possessor, and interested person. Even though these functions have been shown to belong to a set of crosslinguistic dative functions, I will show that they do not really need to be stipulated, but can be derived compositionally by combining the meaning of the verb and a basic semantic feature of the dative case.

The search of the nature of this basic contribution leads to the conclusion that the dative case is strongly associated with the role of an experiencer. By focusing on the datives which do not have semantically identical paraphrases involving prepositions or other cases, I will show that the dative case has an experiencer role in these instances. No other case or preposition can convey the same combined semantics of a conscious but non-agentive participant of an event. On the other hand, the suggestion that all dative DPs are necessarily experiencers turns out to be incorrect, as there are inanimate dative DPs, which cannot experience anything.
Following linguists such as McIntyre (2006), I propose that the key to this puzzle is the assumption of a \textit{HAVE}-relation as the basic semantic feature of the dative case. Moreover, inanimate datives, which participate in a part-whole relation, recipient datives, and datives which are necessarily animate experiencers can all be accounted for by assuming a division of dative DPs into two major types (following the influential study of Pylkkänen (2002)): an entity-related dative and an event-related dative. Verbs which appear with a dative DP of the first type entail the establishment of a \textit{HAVE}-relation between a ‘haver’ and the theme argument. They therefore select the dative DP based on their semantics, and the prominent roles associated with this type of ‘haver’ are the recipient and the whole of constituent parts. All the other verbs which may appear with datives of the second type do not have such an entailment, but are rich enough semantically to allow the inference of a \textit{HAVE}-relation of a more or less specific kind, resulting in the above-mentioned array of dative functions: beneficiary, maleficiary, external possessor, experiencer, or simply an interested person. The basis for the specification is a \textit{HAVE}-relation between the ‘haver’ and the event. The dative of the second type will therefore be termed the event-related dative. I will show that the \textit{HAVE}-relation of the second kind can only be fulfilled by animate beings, by denotees which are first of all experiencers of the event. In this way I close the circle back to the above-proposed basic role with which the dative case is associated in most instances.

Finally, I will illustrate how this approach to the dative case accounts for the behavior of the dative case with the dative DP of transfer verbs. \textit{Geben}-(give), \textit{verkaufen}-(sell), \textit{schicken}-(send), and \textit{stelen}-(steal)-type verbs will be examined in this chapter, and the dative DP of \textit{werfen}-(throw)-type verbs will be the subject of Chapter 4. The discussion of the differences between these constructions and PP constructions and the factors motivating the choice between them will be taken up again in Chapter 5.

3.1. On case and meaning

Prepositions, as discussed in the previous chapter, and case share the characteristic that both express a relation between an argument and the governing verb. Linguists have been aware of this relation for centuries, as can be seen in Adelung (1781, pp. 135, 344), who applies the same description to the function of case and prepositions, as denoting a \textit{Verhältnis} (relationship) to the predicate, and makes the interesting observation that prepositions replace the use of case in languages which have a ‘defective’ case system, such as German when compared to the ‘perfect’ Latin. Moreover early localist theories proposed the same meanings
The accusative case was proposed to have a directional meaning, like prepositions such as *zu* (to), and the dative case a locative meaning, like prepositions such as *in* (in). Among modern linguists, Fillmore (1968) assumes that both surface cases (see below for details) and prepositions (among other devices) are parallel linguistic means to express the relation of a deep structure case to the verb. Even though all the authors agree that each case is associated with a certain meaning, there is a difference between the semantics of a preposition and the semantic contribution or motivation of the assignment of a case. Prepositions express relations which are usually semantically determined, but the relation of a case to the governing head may be to a great extent grammaticalized, and pinning down a semantic meaning can be difficult. This is especially true for the nominative and accusative cases (or in ergative languages, the ergative and the absolutive), which are for this reason also called the core cases (Blake 1994, pp. 119-144). These cases are to a great extent the first two building blocks used to build a grammatical sentence, and around which other cases and/or PPs appear. The same is not true for the instrumental and the various locative cases which have one primary semantic function. The stronger the connection between a single semantic function and a specific case, the more it will be considered an alternative means of marking to the marking of pre- or other adpositions in languages that do not have them. The dative case seems to stand between true core cases and true non-core cases. Blake (1994) calls it the 'main non-core case', but assumes that it should be counted among the syntactic cases, those which have more structural than semantic meaning.

Fillmore (1968, pp. 69, 71) captures the peculiar semantic behavior of cases in his theory of deep structure cases vs. surface structure cases. A case which marks a certain DP in the spell-out of sentences is actually a surface case. It is linked to a deep structure case, the actual semantic basis of the case. Which case underlies which surface case is not fixed, and may vary from one verbal context to another. The surface case is thus free, often expressing only a syntactic relationship to the head verb, but also answers the intuition that it nevertheless expresses certain semantics. Despite the problematic sides of Fillmore's theory, the difficult decision how many deep structure cases should exist and the problem that he mainly focused on English, he does provide important insights. One is the case notion of the 'experiencer', “the entity which receives or accepts or experiences or undergoes the effect of an action”, which appears in his final version (1971, p. 116) among the most relevant case notions. It will
be shown in this chapter that the properties of the German dative case support the existence of this case notion.

3.2 The semantic roles of the dative case in the verbal context

The German dative is a good example of a 'main non-core case' (Blake (1994)). German does not have 'real' non-core cases (I exclude from this discussion the genitive, as it is not used very often in spoken language, and is not productive as a verb-governed case), but uses its wide range of prepositions to express relations such as instruments or locations. On the other hand, the dative is the one case which can be quite securely assigned a set of semantic functions. Thus, it is not surprising that the dative, in contrast to the accusative and surely the nominative, alternates with prepositions, the non-core 'cases' in German, which point to distinguishable semantic roles.

The traditional description of the German dative case (e.g., Curme (1904), Havers (1911, pp. 1-4), Behaghel (1923)) is a list of the various interpretations of the dative DP in its semantic context. Based on these descriptions and the one in Wegener (1985), I list the following traditional roles or meanings available to DPs marked with the dative case:

43 In fact, the dative takes over most of its functions, cf. the title of the popular book by the journalist Bastian Sick *Der Dativ ist dem Genitiv sein Tod* (the dative is the genitive:DAT his death, ‘The dative is the genitive’s death’).
Table 10:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recipient</strong></td>
<td>Der Mann gab/verkaufte/kaufte/brachte der Frau das Auto.</td>
<td>The man gave/sold/bought/brought the woman the car.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deprivee</strong></td>
<td>Die Frau stahl dem Mann das Auto.</td>
<td>The woman stole the car from the man.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beneficiary</strong></td>
<td>Der Mann backte der Frau einen Kuchen.</td>
<td>'The man baked a cake for the woman.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maleficiary</strong></td>
<td>Die Königin bereitete Schneewittchen einen Giftapfel zu.</td>
<td>The queen prepared a poisoned apple for Snowwhite.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Possessor (plus beneficiary)</strong></td>
<td>Die Mutter wusch der Tochter die Blusen.</td>
<td>'The mother washed the daughter's blouses.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(plus maleficiary)</strong></td>
<td>Das Mädchen trat dem Jungen auf den Fuß.</td>
<td>'The girl stepped onto the boy's foot.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interested person (ethical dative)</strong>:</td>
<td>(only as pronominals, not full DPs): Das sind mir Lehrer!</td>
<td>That are me.DAT teachers 'Are these teachers, I am shocked!'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Judger (dativus iudicantis)</strong>:</td>
<td>Das Thema ist mir wichtig.</td>
<td>'The subject is important for me.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experimenter</strong></td>
<td>Mir ist etwas passiert.</td>
<td>'Something happened to me.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mir ist kalt.</td>
<td>'I am cold.'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These roles are part of a universal inventory of dative functions for languages which have a dative-type encoding, as can be seen on the semantic map of the functions of the dative case and related prepositions in European languages (Haspelmath (1999)):

---

44 A generally-accepted English term does not seem to exist for this dative. McIntyre (2006) calls it the 'estimative dative'.

In order to include the negative meanings, I have specified ‘direction from’ and ‘direction to’ (ignoring the differences for the time being) and added the deprivee and the malefactive, the negative counterparts of the recipient and benefactive. I have circled the range of meanings of the German dative case, which shows that German is quite prototypical⁴⁵.

Even though the roles seem to be universal for languages with some kind of the dative case, scholars agree that these interpretations are not inherent meanings of the dative case marking, but are arrived at compositionally in combination with the semantics of the verb (possibly with context). Wegener points out some important regularities as to which verb meaning results in which semantic role of the dative DP (p. 321). I present her results here with my own additions, followed by an explanation:

⁴⁵ Wegener has found that the predicative possessor (Das Buch ist mir – The book is me.DAT ‘mine’) is found in some southern German dialects. However, direction seems to be the role farthest from the meaning of the German dative case. In the case of prepositions which are neutral to direction or location, such as ‘in, auf, and unter, the case which turns them into directional prepositions is the accusative.
Table 11:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb type</th>
<th>Semantic role of dative DP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>creation of possession or change of possession</td>
<td>recipient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>removal or loss of possession</td>
<td>deprivee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>creation of an item</td>
<td>bene/maleficiary, recipient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>change of state/location of item</td>
<td>bene/maleficiary, possessor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verbs describing psychological processes or verbs of sensation</td>
<td>experiencer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluating adjectives</td>
<td>judger (dativus iudicantis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>any other verb (or even whole IP)</td>
<td>interested person (ethical dative)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Positive context/verb meaning will result in a recipient or beneficiary reading, while, negative context/verb meaning indicates the role of the deprivee/maleficiary. Furthermore, concerning the combination of bene/maleficiary and possessor, the following should be noted. If the theme argument is definite, a beneficiary + possessor interpretation is created, while an indefinite theme argument can create a beneficiary + recipient meaning. The latter phenomenon has been illustrated in Chapter 2 with the interpretation of the preposition *für*. Verbs of creation imply an additional recipient interpretation, especially when the theme argument is indefinite, which indicates a coming into existence or possession in the denoted event. The former phenomenon, a beneficiary + possessor interpretation, is entirely reserved to dative DPs. A definite theme argument creates an additional possessor interpretation of the dative DP; a definite item most likely already existed when it changed its state or location,
and if no other possessor comes into consideration, the dative DP is understood as its possessor. This is especially strong and hardly cancellable if the item is a body part. The following paradigms illustrate how verbs of creation (*malen/bauen/etc.* (paint, build)), simple manner verbs (*waschen* (wash)), and change of state verbs (*nähen* (sew)), together with the definiteness or indefiniteness of the theme argument, create possible combinations of dative roles:

(135)  

a. Die Frau malt / baut / kauft/ dem Mann *ein/ das* Auto.  
   ‘The woman draws / builds / buys/ the man DAT a/the car ACC’  
   man = beneficiary, recipient  
   vs.

b. Die Frau wäscht der Nachbarin *ein* Auto.  
   ‘The woman washes the neighbor DAT a car ACC’  
   neighbor = beneficiary only  
   vs.

c. Die Frau wäscht der Nachbarin *das* Auto.  
   ‘The woman washed the neighbor DAT the car ACC’  
   neighbor = beneficiary, possessor of car  

d. Die Frau näht dem Mann *eine* Hose.  
   ‘The woman sews the man DAT a pant(s) ACC’  
   man = beneficiary, recipient  
   vs.

e. Die Frau näht dem Mann *die* Hose.  
   ‘The woman sews the man DAT the pants ACC’  
   man = beneficiary, possessor

The phenomenon that a dative DP can have, and in fact, usually has more than one of the above-mentioned roles of the dative case should be highlighted. The interpretation meant by the speaker evolves from the lexical semantic content of the verb and other material. Thus,
the dative DP in the following example can be simultaneously the beneficiary, recipient, and possessor (‘author’). No prepositional variant can express this complex role, leaving the dative variant as the only possible choice if such an interpretation is needed:

(136)

a. Der Architekt baute der Frau das Haus.
The architect built the woman.DAT the house.ACC
‘The architect built the house for the woman, which she designed herself (+ to her joy)’
b. ≥ Der Architekt baute für die Frau das Haus.
The architect built for the woman the house.ACC
‘The architect built the house for the woman.’
c. ≥ Der Architekt baute das Haus von der Frau.
The architect built the house.ACC of the woman
‘The architect built the house of the woman (e.g., that she designed)’

The difference between prepositions, which, as has been clearly shown in Chapter 2, also relate a third participant to the event, and dative case is that prepositions denote a relation quite clearly specified by their lexical semantics, while the dative case is initially a non-specified relation. The verb or verbal context may clearly specify the interpretation of the dative, but if the verb is underspecified with respect to the role of its dative marked argument, the dative case may allow several roles from among the set of dative roles. Prepositions realize fewer roles, typically only one role from the set.

3.2.1 Summary

It has been shown that dative DPs in German play several distinguishable semantic roles which are part of a crosslinguistic set of functions of the dative case. It is the verb and the verbal context that determine the actual interpretation. The role of a dative DP can be a combination of several roles if the context evokes such an interpretation. These findings support the assumption that the actual roles of dative DPs are only facets of a more basic semantic role of the dative case itself. The remainder of this chapter will address the two questions which now arise: what is the semantic contribution of the dative case, and what is the verbal and contextual contribution that licenses a dative DP and determines its final semantic interpretation?
3.3 Isolating the role of the experiencer

In the following section I will show that one can isolate the role of the experiencer as the semantic contribution which is unique to the dative case. After delimiting the facets of meaning which can be taken over by the prepositional or other constructions, and after isolating the semantic difference between dative and PP/other case constructions which are perceived as variants, the role of the experiencer role remains, and is therefore arguably the inherent meaning component of the dative case.

As I will illustrate in the following subsections, the dative constructions which show semantic uniqueness when compared to possible variants are the body part possessor (136), the judge dative (dativus judicantis) (137), the experiencer dative (138), and the non-intentional causer dative, a type of experiencer dative with result VPs (139):

(137)  Ich brach mir das Bein.
       I broke me.DAT the leg.ACC
       'I broke my leg.'

(138)  Die Sache ist ihm wichtig.
       The issue.NOM is him.DAT important
       'The issue is important for him.'

(139)  Mir ist kalt.
       Me.DAT is cold
       'I am cold.'

(140)  Mir ist die Vase zerbrochen.
       Me.DAT has the vase.NOM broken
       'I broke the vase (unintentionally)'

Two important facets of meaning can be isolated here: a consciousness of the event and, in addition to it, in cases where an overt agent is missing and the denotee of the dative DP is the only person involved, a lack of intention concerning the event or the result of the event. Both facets are components of the semantic role ‘experiencer’, the person ‘who encounters or undergoes an event’ (Oxford English Dictionary: experiencer), but is generally not directly
responsible for it. An experiencer can involuntarily be the causer of an event, but he/she is never its agent. The role of the experiencer is thus a central contribution of the dative case. The dative case can convey this role in the most economical way, without a need for other linguistic material. No other construction in German can assign this role as an entailment.

3.3.1 The body part possessor dative

As often pointed out by authors who have dealt with the body part dative (e.g., Bally (1926), Hatcher (1944), Lamiroy and Delbecque (1996)), the alternation with a genitival adnominal construction (or a PP headed by von (of)) leads to an alienation of the body part and body. As body parts are usually connected to the body of the possessor, even when they are broken, sentences such as (141b) are infelicitous. Wegener (1985) does not accept sentences of this kind at all, and counts the body part possessor among the obligatory datives. The closer the physical contact between theme and possessor, the more obligatory the dative (p. 93). A possible felicitous interpretation here is that the leg is an artificial one. This option leads to the isolation of an important semantic contribution of the dative case; the breaking event of an artificial body part is not felt by the possessor. The possessor may only have realized that the leg was broken after the event. The dative can still be licensed, as the possessor might be unhappy about this. However, the possessor did not feel the breaking. In the usual situation in which the leg is a natural body part, the possessor necessarily feels the breaking and is fully conscious of the event, and therefore only the dative can be used here. (141c) shows that no other preposition can create this meaning.

(141)

a. Ich brach mir das Bein.
   I broke me.DAT the leg.ACC
   ‘I broke my leg.’

b. ?? or ≠ Ich brach mein Bein/ ein Bein von mir
   I broke my leg.ACC / a leg of me.ACC
   ‘I broke my leg/ a leg of me.’

c. *Ich brach für mich/ an mich/ zu mir/ bei mir/ von mir... das Bein
   I broke for me/ on me/ to me /with me from me…. the leg
   ‘I broke my leg’

Body part possessors are thus natural experiencers of what happens to their parts.
3.3.2 The judger dative (dative iudicantis)

The feature of ‘consciousness’, one of the components of the role of the experiencer, can also be isolated in examples with the ‘dative iudicantis’, a dative DP appearing with evaluative adjectives (Wegener (1985, pp. 229-231)). A prepositional variant exists with the preposition für (for), but the two constructions differ semantically. The denotee of the dative DP, but not the denotee of the PP with für, is necessarily conscious of what is being said, which can be shown by the ungrammaticality of the following additional clauses:

(142) a. Das war ihm wichtig, *aber er selber war sich nicht davon bewusst.
   This was him.DAT important, *but he didn't realize it himself
b. Das war wichtig für ihn, aber er selber war sich nicht davon bewusst. (cf. Wegener (184a))
   ‘This was important for him, but he didn't realize it himself.’

In the following situation, the baby can only be aware of the temperature of the water when his body actually touches it.

(143) a. Das Wasser war dem Baby zu heiß, *ich merkte es zum Glück schon bevor ich es hineinsetzte
   The water was the baby.DAT too hot, *fortunately, I realized it before I put him into the water.
b. Das Wasser war zu heiß für das Baby, ich merkte es zum Glück schon bevor ich es hineinsetzte. (cf. Wegener (184d))
   The water was too hot for the baby, fortunately I realized it before I put him into the water

3.3.3 The experiencer dative

The experiencer dative appears in the initial sentence position in the unmarked clause, even if there is a nominative DP present. Placing the nominative argument first would render the sentence strange without context: (cf. (145)), *Etwas Wunderbares ist mir passiert (Something wonderful.NOM has me.DAT happened, ‘Something wonderful happened to me’). Very often there are paraphrases in which the experiencer is a ‘regular’ subject and is
encoded in the nominative case. Semantically identical alternations between the dative experiencer and the nominative experiencer exist, but are rare (note that the predicate used here is haben (have), and see below in 3.5 that this is probably not accidental):

(144) Mir ist angst – Ich habe Angst
Me.DAT is fear – I had fear
'I am frightened'

In most cases the alternating nominative construction is a paraphrase using additional words to add the semantic concept of experiencer:

(145) a. Mir ist etwas Wunderbares passiert
Me.DAT has something great.NOM happened
'Something great happened to me’
b. Ich hatte ein wunderbares Erlebnis
I had a great experience

c. *Bei mir/ in mir/ an mir/ …. ist schlecht
With me/ in me / on me…. is bad
Should mean: ‘I am sick.’
For (145a) there are, however, grammatical prepositional variants, with a changed meaning. With both, mit (with) and in (in), the person denoted may be consciously experiencing the event, but is not necessarily doing so. The dative case, on the other hand, assigns consciousness as an entailment to the denotee of its argument.

\[(148)\] 
a. Mit mir ist etwas Wunderbares passiert, aber ich hatte nichts davon bemerkt  
With me has something great happened,…  
‘Something great happened with me, but I noticed nothing’
b. In mir ist etwas Wunderbares passiert, aber ich hatte nichts davon bemerkt  
In me has something great happened, ….  
‘Something great happened in me, but I noticed nothing’
c. Mir ist etwas Wunderbares passiert, *aber ich hatte nichts davon bemerkt  
Me.DAT has something great happened, ….  
‘Something great happened to me, *but I noticed nothing’

Wegener (1985, pp. 193-200) points out that the experiencer dative in German is still productively used with new psychological verbs. Even though there do exist diachronic changes from dative to nominative as in \[mir \text{ dünkt} – ich \text{ denke (me.DAT thinks} – I think)\], new psych expressions, as below, appear, though not generally in the nominative. Also, if a well-established nominative construction exists, German speakers like to add dative variants:

\[(149)\] 
Mir stinkt’s – ‘Ich habe genug davon’ 
MeDAT smells it– I have enough,  
‘I am fed up with’

\[(150)\] 
Ich weiss < Mir ist bewusst  
I know – me.DAT is be-known  
‘I am aware of’

In contrast to English or French, in which the experiencer is encoded as an unmarked subject, replacing former dative constructions, the dative construction in German is very much alive, pointing to the still active semantic contribution of the dative case:
3.3.4 The non-intentional causer dative

The non-intentional causer dative is very similar to the experiencer dative; the border between them is difficult to define. Syntactically they appear in the same position, both are sentence initial in the unmarked clause; also a non-intentional causer dative would sound strange in another position in an isolated sentence: #Die Vase ist mir zerbrochen (The vase.NOM is me.DAT broken, ‘the vase broke on me’). In an event where the agent is missing, but necessarily exists, the dative marked argument is understood as a potential, though non-intentional causer. The paraphrase in which the subject is in nominative case is neutral with respect to the intentionality of the breaking, tending to an ‘on purpose’ interpretation, the regular agentive meaning.

a. Mir ist versehentlich/ *absichtlich eine Vase zerbrochen
   Me.DAT is by accident/ on purpose a vase.NOM broken
   ‘I broke the vase (unintentionally) by accident/*on purpose’

b. Ich habe eine Vase versehentlich/ absichtlich zerbrochen
   I.NOM have a vase.ACC by accident/ on purpose broken
   ‘I broke a vase by accident/ on purpose’

In contrast to a body part possessor, the denotee of the dative DP does not have to be conscious of an event at the very moment it happens, but at some point there must be consciousness, as otherwise the dative is ungrammatical (sentence b below). Only a nominative subject is possible, as in (c). There is a fine difference between the past perfect and the present perfect in (a). The past perfect is a much better choice, as it implies that the speaker knows about the event now:

a. Mir ist die Vase zerbrochen, aber ich ?*habe / hatte nichts davon gemerkt
   Me.DAT is the vase.NOM broken, but I have/ had nothing of-it noticed
   ‘I broke the vase (unintentionally), but I noticed nothing’
b. *Mir ist die Vase zerbrochen, aber ich habe nie etwas davon gewusst
   Me.DAT is the vase.NOM broken, but I have never something of-it known.
   ‘I broke the vase (unintentionally), but I never knew about it.’

c. Ich hatte versehentlich die Vase zerbrochen, aber habe nie etwas davon gewusst.
   I.NOM had accidentally the vase.ACC broken, but have never something of-it known.
   ‘I broke the vase accidentally, but I never knew about it.’

The difference between the dative and the nominative constructions is already clear to young children. I often hear sentences such as the following, when a child does not want to claim responsibility for his act:

   (154) Nein, ich hab’s nicht zerrissen, es ist mir zerrissen.
   No, I.NOM have it.ACC not torn, it.NOM is me.DAT torn.
   ‘No, I didn’t tear it, it just got torn.’

3.3.5 Summary and concluding remarks

I have shown that the two facets of meaning which seem to be central to the dative case are consciousness and lack of intention, both components of the role of the experiencer. The dative case is therefore the preferred, perhaps even the obligatory choice in the following cases: In a situation in which a speaker wants to express an event of which she is a pure experiencer, a neutral case assignment such as the nominative case would need additional information, an adverbial phrase, e.g., ‘accidentally’, and would therefore be less economic. If experiencing is an inherent part of the expression, as is the case with events involving body parts, other constructions even seem to be ungrammatical. Finally, if the speaker wants to convey that the participant added to the VP is not an agent, but at most the involuntary causer of the event, the dative construction is the preferred choice. In addition, as mentioned above, the dative case can also combine several interpretations. An involuntary causer can also be affected by the event he/she causes, just by being unhappy about it and/or because he/she is also the possessor of the theme argument. The dative construction can express all of these meanings with just one linguistic operation, namely case assignment:
Experiencers, body part possessors, and especially non-intentional datives are often used in connection with negative events or experiences. The following sentences show that a positive counterpart would be ungrammatical.

(155) \[ \text{Mir}^{(i)} \text{ ist die Vase}^{(i)} \text{ zerbrochen} \]
\[ \text{Me.DAT is the vase.NOM broken} \]
\[ \text{a. The vase broke on me} \]
\[ \text{b. My vase broke} \]
\[ \text{c. My vase broke on me.} \]

This negative connotation is not due to a ‘negative’ feature of the experiencer that the dative case encodes, but is connected to the things which are or are not expected to happen in life. Naturally, experiencers are much more affected by an unexpected event than by an expected one, and because the normal course of events is usually pictured as positive, this leaves the negative events to be ‘experienced’ more strongly than positive ones. These facts provides a reason for the negative flavor of dative experiencers presented without context, for example (155). However, if the positive event is less expected, experiencers and non-intentional causers are also found:

(158) \[ \text{a. Mir ist warm. (indicated: zu warm)} \]
\[ \text{Me.DAT is warm (indicated: too warm)} \]
\[ 'I am hot.' rather than: ‘I am comfortable.’ \]
\[ \text{b. Mir ist schön warm. (indicated: trotz der Kälte)} \]
\[ \text{Me.DAT is nicely warm (indicated: despite the cold)} \]
\[ ‘I am comfortably warm.’ \]
Finally this ugly vase broke on me!

3.4 The dative - the case of the animate?

The conclusion that the experiencer role is a semantic role which only a dative argument can convey necessarily associates the dative case with animacy. Only animate beings, especially human beings, can be conscious, sentient, and reflective. This subsection shows that the dative case is deeply associated with animacy, in accordance with the long linguistic tradition describing the dative case as ‘the personal case’. Adelung (1781, p. 135) describes the dative case as ‘the relation of the personal entity’, Wilmanns (1909, p. 660) sees the dative case as ‘denoting a closer personal relation’, and Wegener (1985) assumes that the dative case bears the feature /animate/. However, despite the strong correlation between the dative case and animacy, as illustrated in this subsection, I will argue and illustrate in the next subsection that a deeper semantics underlies and creates the animacy effect, namely the often-described HAVE-relation in dative constructions (Green (1974), Wegener (1985), McIntyre (2006) Rappaport Hovav and Levin (2008)). The animacy effect is created by a HAVE-relation of the dative DP and a complex event. One can only have an event if one can experience it, and only animate beings have the capability to experience.

3.4.1 Personification

The striking phenomenon which supports the correlation of the dative case with animacy is the fact that allowing a dative DP to refer to an inanimate object often sounds funny to informants, because these objects are perceived as being personified. The personification phenomenon can also be found as a deliberate manipulation of a sentence in order to create a certain connotation:

The context of the following example is a task: to design an exhibition about the effects of the drug thalidomide on children born to women who had used it during pregnancy. Using the dative case for the table, an inanimate item, creates a personified interpretation here,\textsuperscript{46}

\textsuperscript{46} In 3.5 will be shown that inanimate datives do appear as non-personified if they are the wholes of constituting parts, but only with verbs which entail little more than the description or establishment of this part-whole relation, such as \textit{geben} (give), which also selects this dative argument. As will be explained then, the verb...
underlining the analogy between the table and a child whose arms or legs did not grow to normal size due to the effects of thalidomide.

(160) du musst einen tisch gestalten... ich würde dem tisch ein bein absägen... damit wäre dann wohl alles gesagt...

You have to design a table... I would the table.DAT a leg.ACC off-saw… that would tell everything.

(http://de.answers.yahoo.com/question/index?qid=20080604120037AA4vjSD)

In a neutral context such as the following, a riddle about a clown cutting the legs off a table, the table is encoded by a PP (at the table) or as a genitive adnominal (of a table). The table is understood as just a piece of furniture.

(161) Die Aufgabenstellung für die beiden Clowns war, bei einem Tisch die Beine abzusägen. Unser Clown hat aber nur einen Arm. Der andere Clown hat sich entweder im Wohnwagen geirrt oder aus Kameradschaft die Beine des Tisches abgesägt...

The task for both clowns was, at a table the legs off-saw. (*to saw off the legs from a table). But our clown has only one arm. The other clown either got into a wrong caravan or sawed off the legs of the table out of comradeship.

(http://spiritus-erlangen.de/forum/thread/162.6)

3.4.2 Case constellations and animate arguments

Wegener (1985, p. 180ff) shows in an interesting discussion of the case constellations of verbs with three participants that dative DPs are primarily reserved for animate participants. Moreover, she shows that in non-productive case constellations such as double accusative or genitive constructions which undergo language change, the dative case takes over the animate participant, while the inanimate participant is almost never replaced by a dative DP. She presents this discussion as evidence for an inherent semantic feature /animate/. Even though I

absägen (saw off) does not license such a (non-personified) inanimate part-whole relation because it contains too much semantic information which would have to be experienced by the non-selected added argument, the table.
find this claim too strong (see next subsection) her findings are still important because they show the undeniable tendency of the dative case to correlate with animate arguments.

In German, verbs with three participants are found in six different constellations involving the accusative, dative, and genitive cases and PPs: ACC ACC, ACC DAT, ACC GEN, ACC PP, DAT PP, and PP PP. Four other combinations which are theoretically possible are not or no longer attested; Wegener claims that they are ungrammatical, partially because of case doubling: DAT DAT, GEN GEN, DAT GEN, and GEN PP. Among the former, only four are still productive, ACC DAT, ACC PP, DAT PP, and PP PP. The remaining two are confined to a small number of verbs, Acc Acc, and Acc Gen, and are claimed to be vanishing.

Wegener shows how animate DPs are distributed among the grammatical constellations, and finds that if the argument restricts animacy, the restriction is predominantly found with the dative arguments of the constellations. In the constellation ACC PP there is no restriction on animacy in either part:

ACC PP
animate + animate: jn zu jm schicken (to send s.o. to s.o.)
Animate + inanimate: jn zu etwas überreden (to convince s.o. to s.th.)
Inanimate + animate: etwas zu jm bringen (to bring s.th. to s.o)
Inanimate + inanimate: etwas an etwas heften (to stick s.th. to s.th)

No restriction is found in the combination PP PP either, though this constellation is rare:

PP PP
Animate + animate: mit jn über jm reden (to talk about s.o. with s.o.)
Animate + inanimate: zu jm von etwas sprechen (to speak with s.o. about s.th)
Inanimate + animate: von etwas auf jn schliessen (to conclude from s.th. onto s.o.)
Inanimate + inanimate: von etwas auf etwas schliessen (to conclude s.th. from s.th)
In the constellation ACC DAT (or DAT ACC)\textsuperscript{47} she finds that all variants are possible, though the combinations with inanimate dative arguments are rare (and are discussed in the subsection below):

**DAT ACC**

Animate + animate: jm jn vorstellen (to introduce s.o. to s.o.)
Animate + inanimate: jm etwas geben (to give s.o. s.th)
Inanimate + animate: einer Sache jn opfern, aussetzen (to sacrifice, to expose s.o. to s.th.)
Inanimate + inanimate: einer Sache etwas hinzufügen (to add s.th. to s.th)

In the constellation DAT PP only two combinations are possible, and both show an animate dative argument:

**DAT PP**

Animate + animate: jm zu jm verhelfen (to help s.o. reach s.o.)
Animate + inanimate: jm bei etwas helfen (to help s.o. with s.th)

Wegener concludes that only the dative case is sensitive to the animacy of its argument, and allows inanimate arguments only in a few cases. Neither the accusative case nor prepositional heads behave in a similar manner. This usage already shows the tendency of the dative case to be the case for animates. However, much stronger evidence can be found in case uses which replace the two exceptional constellations ACC ACC and ACC GEN:

### 3.4.3 The dative in former double accusative constructions

A few verbs assign accusative case twice to both of their arguments. These are prominently verbs of teaching: *lehren, unterrichten* (teach), *abfragen, abhören, abprüfen* (to test s.o. on s.th.).

(162) Er lehrt die Kinder die Grammatik.  
(Henng (61a))  
He teaches the children ACC the grammar ACC
‘He teaches the children grammar.’

\textsuperscript{47} In section 3.5 it is shown more in greater detail that the unmarked word order in a constellation in which the inanimate argument is assigned the dative case is Acc Dat, not Dat Acc
The sun teaches all creatures the longing after the light. ACC.
‘The sun teaches all creatures the longing for the night. But it is the night that raises all of us to the stars.’

(Khalil Gibran: Sämtliche Werke, Düsseldorf: Patmos, 2003, S. 1243)

(164)    Der Lehrer fragt mich die Vokabeln ab.
The teacher asks me the words ACC off
‘The teacher is testing my vocabulary.’

Double accusative constructions are rare in everyday speech. Wegener claims that they are being replaced by the ACC PP and DAT ACC constructions. I found support for this claim in my Google search of the verb *lehren*. In written German, both the accusative and dative cases are used for denoting the person being taught in both formal and informal contexts. In spoken German, instead of *lehren*, the verb *beibringen*, not surprisingly a regular DAT ACC verb, is often used for *teach*.

(165)    Das […] Lehrmaterial zur kosmischen Erziehung […] lehrt dem Kind auch die Achtung vor Gottes Schöpfung.
The teaching-material to-the cosmic education also teaches the child DAT respect ACC for God’s creation
‘The teaching material for cosmic education also teaches the child respect for God’s creation.’

(http://www.squidoo.com/montessorimaterial)

(166)    Willibald Bezler lehrt dem Affen schwäbisch.
Willibald Bezler teaches the monkey DAT Swabian ACC
‘Willibald Bezler teaches the monkey the Swabian dialect’

(167) Der Master Key [...] lehrt dem Studenten, Möglichkeiten und Chancen zu erkennen.
The Master Key [...] teaches the student possibilities and chances to notice.
‘The Master Key teaches the student to notice possibilities and chances.’
(http://www.buecher.de/shop/bewusstsein/das-master-key-system-m-audio-cd-u-dvd-rom/haanel-charles-f/products_products/detail/prod_id/23874484/)

(168) Wer lehrt einem am besten das Meditieren?
Who teaches one best the meditating.
‘Who teaches one meditation best?’
(http://www.esoterikforum.at/forum/showthread.php?t=31145)

An example of an ACC PP construction replacing the ACC ACC construction is found with the verb unterrichten (teach, mainly in school contexts):

(169) Ich unterrichtete die Kinder hauptsächlich in Englisch und vereinzelt auch in Mathematik.
I taught the children mainly in (the subject) English and partially also in math.
‘I taught the children mainly English and partially also math.’
(http://www.jharkot-projekt-e-v.de/jharkot_RG_08_1.html)

Wegener’s support for the active animate feature being inherent to the dative case is the fact that if the double accusative construction is replaced and if an animate is present, it is either replaced by an ACC in the ACC PP construction, or by a dative DP in the DAT ACC construction. It is never the case that the inanimate DP is replaced by a dative DP. If the dative and accusative cases were both insensitive to animacy, both constructions should appear.

(170) *Er lehrt die Kinder der Grammatik.
He taught the children the grammar.
Should be: ‘He taught the children grammar.’

(Wegener (61i))
In addition to Wegener’s observation of DAT ACC replacing the double accusative construction, I found a number of examples in which *lehren* ACC ACC is not replaced by a DAT ACC construction, but alternates with it, as in contexts where the person being taught is potentially affected by the teaching process or teaching material. This discovery not only shows the tendency to animacy, but also indicates the semantic function of the experiencer of the dative DP. *Lehren* is grammatical and prescriptively correct in a DAT ACC construction in the expression *jm das Fürchten lehren* (to teach s.o. fear). Dative arguments are found in negative contexts, presumably influenced by this expression. The use of the accusative case for the animate participant would sound strange in these contexts; it would ‘miss the point’. (The heat in (174) is understood as personified. *Lehren* selects animate dative DPs, or metonymies as in (175)).

(173) Das Wetter draußen, das lehrt einem gerade das Gruseln

The weather outside, it teaches one.DAT just-now the thrilling.ACC

‘The weather outside, it gives one the creeps right now’

(http://blah.tamagothi.de/2010/01/19/das-wetter-draussen-das-lehrt-einem-gerade-das/)

(174) Die heiße Sonne lehrt der Hitze das Frieren

The hot sun teaches the heat.DAT the freezing.ACC

‘The hot sun intimidates the heat with freezing’ (in the context of solar energy used for cooling system)

(http://www.wetterauer-zeitung.de/Home/Kreis/Staedte-und-Gemeinden/Butzbach/Artikel,-Die-heisse-Sonne-lehrt-der-Hitze-das-Frieren-_arid,110728_regid,3_puid,1_pageid,73.html)
SV Oßweil lehrt dem SV Kornwestheim das Verlieren.
Sports club Ossweil teaches the sports club Kornwestheim.DAT the losing.ACC
‘Sports cub A teaches sport club B how to lose, (humiliates sportclub b’)

3.4.4 The dative in former genitive constructions

The change of the animate argument from an ACC DP to a DAT DP in the double accusative construction might be seen as following the natural word order and fitting smoothly into the structural assignment of the dative case to the middle complement. Therefore I present Wegener’s next findings showing that ACC GEN constructions are no longer productive in German. There are two possibilities: either the genitive is turned into a PP or the construction is replaced by a DAT ACC construction. Wegener shows that here again the changes are sensitive to the presence of an animate argument and to which of the two is the animate argument. If the change is to a DAT ACC construction, the animate participant becomes the dative DP, even if he/she is not the genitive marked argument, but the accusative. These are the changes:

An example in which the GEN DP is replaced by a PP (not sensitive to animacy, direct replacement of the genitive by a PP) is displaced with the verb erinnern (remember). The DAT ACC option does not exist, probably for idiosyncratic reasons:

Sich/ jn einer Person/Sache erinnern > sich/jn an jn/etwas erinnern
Oneself/s.b. a personGEN/matter remind > oneself/S. b. at a person/matter remind
' to remember/ remind s.b. about s.b./s.th.'

ACC GEN to DAT ACC:
If one argument is animate and one inanimate, the accusative DP, never the genitive, always denotes the animate. This means there have to occur two changes, the genitive DP must be turned into the final accusative DP, and then the original accusative DP into a dative DP. The
case change makes a detour. Instead of using the shorter and more economic way of changing the genitive into a dative, both arguments are assigned a different case. It would seem that the double accusative construction presented above represents an intermediate stage of the mutation, an ‘accident’ (Paul (1919, p. 419)).

\[(177)\] jn eines lehren > jn etwas lehren > jm etwas lehren (see above)
\[
\text{s.b.ACC s.th.GEN teach} > \text{s.b.ACC s.th ACC teach} > \text{s.b.DAT s.th.ACC teach}
\]

The prefixed expression ‘jn eines Besseren belehren’ (to teach s.o. ACC a better matter GEN, 'to disabuse s.o.‘) is still used today.

Examples of GEN>ACC and ACC>DAT replacements:

\[(178)\] Ich ward meines Wunsches gewährt (Goethe) > jm. etwas gewähren
I was my wish.GEN granted > s.b.DAT s.th.ACC grant
'to grant s.th. to s.o.

\[(179)\] jn eines berichten> jm etwas berichten
s.b.ACC s.th.GEN report > s.b.DAT s.th.ACC report
'to report s.th. to s.b.'

Some verbs are still used with the genitive today; however, the DAT ACC version is much more common:

\[(180)\] jn seines Geldes berauben > jm sein Geld rauben (in Wegener, (68))
\[
\text{s.b.ACC his moneyGEN rob} > \text{s.b.DAT his moneyACC rob}
\]

\[(181)\] jn einer Sache versichern > jm etwas versichern (cf. Wegener, (71a, b))
\[
\text{s.o.ACC a matterGEN assure} > \text{s.o.DAT s.th.ACC assure}
\]

'\text{to assure s.o. of s.th}'

Wegener points out that the ditransitive of the verb \textit{versichern} (assure) is interesting. Most of the possible complements for this verb are feminine, as possible nouns that this verb bear feminine gender, e.g., \textit{seiner Freundschaft} (one's friendship), \textit{Zuversicht} (hope), \textit{Dankbarkeit} (gratefulness), \textit{Huld} (mercy). The genitive feminine morpheme happens to be equivalent to
the dative feminine morpheme; German speakers may have been especially tempted to just keep the spell-out of the construction as it is, and reinterpret the genitive DP as a dative. However, here again the change has been a twofold one in order to avoid an inanimate DAT next to an animate ACC argument:

(182) a. Er versicherte ihm seine Freundschaft  
He assured him.DAT his friendship.ACC  
'he assured him of his friendship'

Rather than:

b. Er versicherte ihn seiner Freundschaft  
He assured him.ACC his friendship.DAT

Wegener's point that inanimacy is the primary motivation for the outcome of the case constellation still holds. The animate participant always becomes the dative argument, no matter its previous position or case.

In accordance with the above findings, in the now extinct DAT GEN constructions, where the dative argument denotes the animate participant, the genitive argument has been changed either into a PP or an accusative DP (Paul (1919, p. 452ff), Wegener (72)). The dative DP is left untouched:

(183) jm wessen danken > jm für etwas danken  
s.b.DAT s.th.GEN thank > s.b.DAT for s.th. thank  
'to thank s.b. for s.th.'

(184) jm wessen gönnen > jm etwas gönnen  
s.b.DAT s.th.GEN grant > s.b.DAT s.th.ACC grant  
'not to begrudge s.o. s.th'

Wegener concludes from this correlation between the dative case and animate arguments that the dative case has an inherent semantic feature /animate/. This conclusion neatly explains the obvious correlation and the driving principle behind case changes. Even so, a small detail is missing…
3.4.5 The flaw in the picture: inanimate datives

The picture presented here about the distribution of the dative case, which argues so overwhelmingly for the inherent animacy feature of the dative case, has one little flaw: there do exist inanimate dative DPs. Wegener does not ignore the counterexamples to her findings which led her to claim that the dative case has an /animate/ feature. One group of verbs did not change from ACC GEN to an animate dative and inanimate accusative argument construction, but instead into an animate accusative and inanimate dative argument construction. Some of these verbs use the particle unter (under), and she also mentions a few others, such as opfern (sacrifice) and aussetzen (expose). All show the atypical word order ACC DAT instead of the DAT ACC word order of most dative verbs (McIntyre (2006, 43 a, b)):

(185)  ...weil der Arzt einen Privatpatienten einer Operation unterzog.
      since the doctor.NOM a private-patient.ACC an operation.DAT subjected
      ‘since the doctor subjected a privately insured patient to an operation’

(186)  ...weil sie ein Kind einer Gefahr aussetzte.
      since she.NOM a child.ACC a danger.DAT exposed
      ‘since she exposed a child to a danger.’

These examples allow the maintenance of the claim that the dative is the case of the animate by pointing out that these constructions are no longer productive, but are restricted to this limited set of verbs, and that they have atypical word order and are best accounted for as datives which came about differently. See 3.5.2 for details. However, there exist counterexamples to an experiencer/animate reading of the dative which seem to have exactly the same structure as the dative constructions discussed so far, are as productive as animate datives, and are governed by typical verbal heads such as geben and verleihen (give) which could very well also have animate dative arguments. These datives represent a true challenge to Wegener’s claim of animacy; not surprisingly, she does not account for them (p. 293)48:

48 She describes these dative DPs as possible only with “basic verbs” (she includes geben and verleihen), and only with the semantic role of “recipient, not beneficiary or experiencer”. I will provide a very similar description in 3.5.3 and will account for these properties straightforwardly.
All of these examples show that assuming an inherent /animate/ component of the dative case is not the correct approach to an analysis of the German dative. This feature would render the above examples ungrammatical. Thus, in order to make the claim that the experiencer role is the central semantic contribution of the dative case credible again, non-experiencer datives have to be explained. This challenge has turned out to be a constructive one. The conditions under which inanimate dative DPs (those which are neither personified nor metonymies of animates) can and cannot appear will be shown to be equivalent to the factors which trigger an experiencer interpretation. The observation that the HAVE-relation
underlies both an experiencing animate dative and a non-experiencing inanimate dative is central to my account.

3.5. The dative as the subject of a HAVE-relation

3.5.1 Three different ‘havers’ and two types of datives

As has been pointed out by Green (1974), McIntyre (2006), and Rappaport Hovav and Levin (2008), the grammaticality of an animate or inanimate argument realized as a dative DP corresponds nicely to that of the predicate have. Using the paraphrase with the predicate bekommen (get) –meaning ‘come to have’ –the HAVE-relation can be made transparent. Sentence (a) entails sentence (b), and the implied result is sentence (c):

(193)  a. Er gibt mir ein Buch.
   He.NOM gives me.DAT a book.ACC
   'He is giving me a book.'

   b. ☐ ich bekomme ein Buch.
      I.NOM get a book.ACC
      ‘I am getting a book.’

   c. ➔ ich habe ein Buch.
      I.NOM have a book.ACC
      ‘I have a book.’

This semantic relation between give, get, and have is also true for inanimate dative DPs:

(194)  a. Der Autor gibt dem Buch einen interessanten Titel.
       The author.NOM gives the book.DAT an interesting title.ACC
       'The author is giving the book an interesting title.'

   b. ☐ das Buch bekommt einen interessanten Titel.
      the book.NOM gets an interesting title.ACC
      ‘The book is getting an interesting title.’

   c. ➔ Das Buch hat einen interessanten Titel.
      The book.NOM has an interesting title.ACC
      ‘The book has an interesting title.’
Finally, V(P)s which license non-selected bene/malefactive datives can also be paraphrased using the verb *bekommen* (get); in English the situation is even clearer, as here the experiencer-*have* construction is used:

\[(195)\]

\[\begin{align*}
(a) & \quad \text{Ich schreibe dem Lehrer einen Brief.} \\
& \quad \text{I write the teacher.DAT a letter.ACC} \\
& \quad \text{‘I am writing the teacher a letter.’} \\
(b) & \quad \text{Der Lehrer bekommt (von mir) einen Brief geschrieben} \\
& \quad \text{The teacher.NOM gets (by me) a letter.ACC written} \\
& \quad \text{‘The teacher is \textbf{having} a letter written to him (by me).’}
\end{align*}\]

The HAVE-relation of the first two examples is a relation between two entities: in (193) between a possessor and a possessee and in (194) between a whole and a part or property. The HAVE-relation of (195) is not between two entities, but between an entity and an event, or at least parts of an event. This relation and the role of this ‘haver’, the experiencer, will be discussed in detail in the next subsection. The discovery of (at least) two different dative types, an entity-related and an event-related dative, has already been posited in the influential work of Pylkkänen (2002), by Cuervo (2003) for Spanish, and by McIntyre (2006) for German. However, to the best of my knowledge, no one has tried to trace the animacy effect and the role of the experiencer back to different kind of datives and their HAVE-relations and produce a unified account of the semantics of both entity-related and event-related datives, of inanimate and animate datives. I will first outline the findings of the two dative types in the syntactic frameworks cited above. Building on those insights, I will account for the animacy effect in the following subsection.

Based on analyses of the applicative morphemes in Bantu languages, Pylkkänen (2002) proposes that third participants such as dative-like arguments are always introduced by an applicative head, never by the verb itself. Furthermore, the constituent with which the applicative projection merges may vary. She found two distinctive merging points, above the VP, applying an individual to an event (VP), and below the VP, applying an individual to an entity (DP). She calls these two distinctive projections the High Applicative and the Low Applicative:
She assigns the high applicative the semantic function of simply introducing another participant to the event. These participants can be specified as e.g. bene/ malefactive or instrumental. The semantic interpretation of the low applicative is transfer of possession, in one or the other direction (recipient or source). These two applicatives are part of a universal inventory of heads from which a particular language can select. A language such as Chaga, for example, is a high applicative language. It licenses a non-selected third participant with any verb, even stative verbs. English, on the other hand, is analyzed as low applicative language, as the double object construction is highly limited to verbs that lexicalize or associate easily with some kind of transfer of possession.

Cuervo (2003) shows that Spanish can best be analyzed by assuming a third kind of applicative, an "affected applicative", applying the dative argument to one subevent of a verb with a complex event structure, namely the projection of little vBE, semantically, the result state. This applicative is interpreted as the bene/malefactive in Spanish. This analysis opens up the possibility that only parts of an event may be related to the dative, and thus allows to distinguish between event-related datives of languages such as Spanish and event-related applicatives of ‘real’ high applicative languages such as Chaga. In this dissertation, I do not present an explicit syntactic analysis for German datives; however, Cuervo’s idea of a ‘middle applicative’ might be relevant for German, too.49

49 Wegener mentions ‘resultativity’ as an essential semantic component of events that can be realized in a dative construction (Wegener (1985, p.69). However, she adds that whether an event is resultative or not seems to be dependent on the speaker and cannot be measured objectively (p.74). This is why Cuervo’s theory cannot be applied to German directly. Not all events that appear with dative arguments can be split into two clear defined subevents. Implied results, as ‘becoming clean’ for a verbs as *waschen* (wash) or *wischen* (wipe) (see (i)) are fully acceptable, as is simply the fact that some event affects the speaker in some way or another (see (ii) below).

(i) Pablo hat Valeria das Auto gewaschen (cf. Cuervo (95))
Pablo has Valeria.DAT the car.ACC washed
‘(a) Pablo washed the car for Valeria/ (b) washed Valeria’s car/ (c) washed Valeria’s car for her.’
McIntyre (2006) adopts Pylkkänen’s two-fold distinction for German; however, unlike Pylkkänen, who does not assume that a language as German has a high applicative, he does analyze German bene/malefactives, possessive datives and source datives as event-related, and only recipient datives as entity-related. (McIntyre (2006, 2a and b):

a. Event related:                                           b. Entity-related:

(weil) Anne ihm den Teller zerbrach                     (weil) ich ihm ein Buch gab
(since) Anne him.DAT the plate broke                    (since) I him.DAT a book gave
'=(since) Anne broke his plate.'                           '=(since) I gave him a book.'

Furthermore, McIntyre elaborates on the semantic function of these applicative heads and assumes that the semantics of have \((\text{HAVE}_{(a,b)})\) underlies the interpretation of these applicative/dative heads. For the purpose of my field of interest, namely the semantic interpretations of the different datives, I am especially interested in the interpretation of this \(\text{HAVE}\)-relation. In the following section I describe the nature of a \(\text{HAVE}\)-relation and show that it can express seemingly different datives, and finally also account for why most datives are associated very closely with animacy.

3.5.2 The proto-role properties of ‘havers’

In the following section I describe the nature of a \(\text{HAVE}\)-relation and show that it can express seemingly different datives. The danger in defining the \(\text{HAVE}\)-relation is circular reasoning. In the literature which deals extensively with this subject, such as Heine (1997),

(ii) Ein Papagei saß ihm auf der Stuhllehne (Wunderlich (1996), (45.d))
The parrot sat him-DAT on the back-of-the-chair
‘The parrot sat on the back of his chair, to his annoyance.’
several terms appear which all refer to the same subject: have means possession and possession means control, have also means a part-whole relation and a part-whole relation means inalienable possession, control means possession, and, above all, have is ‘colorless’ (Buck (1949, p. 740)). The literature dealing with the analysis of the dative case is equally problematic. Wunderlich (1996, 2000) assumes that the primitive predicate POSS underlies the assignment of the dative case, again referring to the concept of possession. However, as not all dative DPs have the role of a possessor, not even a future possessor (e.g., completely natural datives such as Er öffnete mir die Tür (He opened me.DAT the door.ACC, ‘He opened the door for me’)), the term has to be understood more abstractly. Pylkkänen (2002) simply assumes an asymmetric semantic ‘relation’ between the applicative (realized as the dative case in German) and its complement, but does not indicate how this semantic relation is translated into the various roles of the dative case. McIntyre (2006) points out that the relation resembles the semantics of the English have. But what is the semantics of have? Is it possession or an abstract relation? Below I give my own description of the HAVE-relation, hopefully contributing something to the discussion of this very vague concept.

A HAVE-relation is a relation between two connected entities in which one entity, the 'haver', is more dominant than the other. I accept the general assumption about the origin of the word haben, as well as the English have, from the Indogermanic *kap, ‘grip’, ‘grab’, 'catch' (Duden-Etymology, p. 261) and take it as the basic relation (however, its result state ‘have something gripped/ caught’ (possibly in an abstract sense)): one holds the other.\(^{50}\) In southern German this meaning is still preserved in the use of the etymologically-related verb heben (there: hold, in Standard German: lift, raise): Kannst du mir mal die Tasche heben? Can you hold my bag for a second? Moreover, the hold-relation is often associated with a spatial relation; what you hold is generally near you. Even so, the relation is not essentially a location relation, but one of force. Special powers might enable the holding of an object far away, while something close by is not necessarily being held. The above may explain why possession and location are often similarly encoded in language, but the two concepts should be treated as two separate language-shaping motors. Possession does not entail spatial closeness, but rather control (see Tham (2004), however, this is only true for possessors, not for inanimate ‘holders’, wholes).

An important point in the syntactic assignment of the dative case is that 'havers', even though they play the dominant role in the HAVE-relation, are necessarily non-agentive. A

\(^{50}\) In chapter 2 I speculated that this relation also underlies the preposition an.
'haver' is therefore assigned the nominative case (the case which an agent gets when one exists) if the 'event' only consists of a HAVE-relation, as in (196). If an agent or causer is present in a ‘cause-have’ event, the agent will become the subject, and the 'haver' the dative marked DP:

(196)  

a. Ich habe ein Buch.  
I.NOM have a book.ACC  
‘I have a book.’  

b. Er gab mir ein Buch.  
he.NOM gave me.DAT a book.ACC  
‘He gave me a book.’

This usage is in accordance with prominent theories of argument linking. Kiparsky (1997) defines the semantic conditions for an argument to be realized in the syntax as a dative DP via his feature system of two features: 

\[ +/- HR \] =highest role and 

\[ +/- LR \] =lowest role. A candidate for a dative DP is an argument which plays neither the highest nor the lowest role with respect to the other roles present in the argument structure: 

[-HR –LR]. Wunderlich (1996, 2000) was inspired by Kiparsky's feature system, but formulates the semantic conditions for the dative case assignment slightly more elegantly, indicating the dependence of this case assignment on the presence of other roles. His features consist of 

\[ +/- hr/lr \] (there exist a higher/lower role). The dative case is again in the middle; there must be both a higher and a lower role present (\[ +hr +lr \]). The dependence of the dative case assignment on simultaneous higher and lower roles is formulated by Primus (1999) in her definition (using Dowty's (19991) proto-role framework) of the proto-recipient role (realized as the dative DP) as thematically dependent on a protoagent and protopatient.

In my search for the exact factors which make the ‘haver’ the higher role and the ‘havee’ the lower role, in order to make the argument a compatible subject of the HAVE-relation and a possible candidate for the dative case in a cause-have event, I also return to Dowty (1991). In order to avoid circular reasoning, I define the HAVE-relation based on Dowty's proto-agent and proto-patient properties, which are meant to be argument entailments for all predicates. The HAVE-relation seems to be best describes as an asymmetric connection between two entities in which one entity has more of the properties of the agent proto-role or fewer of the properties of the patient proto-role than the other. Even so, the first entity, the subject of the
HAVE-relation, must still have fewer agent proto-role properties than the causer of the HAVE-relation. This condition makes the dative marked argument a secondary subject in the clause, as in the case of Neumann's (1999) ‘alternative subject’, referring to her observation that the dative DP is ‘equally dominant’ in the event, as the (recipient) dative DP eventually has the thing which the subject is giving.

In the following section I present a uniform analysis, based on Dowty’s (1991) proto-role properties, of the three different types of ‘havers’ introduced above, of entity-related datives as possessors of possessees, or wholes of parts, or finally, in the next subsection, of event-related datives as the bene/malefiaries of events.

The properties which Dowty attributes to the proto-agent and the proto-patient are (Dowty 1991, p. 572):

Contributing properties for the Agent Proto-Role:
- a. volitional involvement in the event or state
- b. sent[i]ence (and/or perception)
- c. causing an event or change of state in another participant
- d. movement (relative to the position of another participant)
- e. exists independently of the event named by the verb

Contributing properties for the Patient Proto-Role:
- a. undergoes change of state
- b. incremental theme
- c. causally affected by another participant
- d. stationary relative to movement of another participant
- e. does not exist independently of the event, or not at all

Dowty formulates his Argument Selection Principle with two corollaries based on these lists of properties (p. 567). Summarizing Dowty's Argument Selection Principle together with the second corollary (which refers to three-participant predicates), he predicts that the argument with the most proto-agent properties will be realized as the subject, the argument with the most proto-patient properties will be realized as the direct object, and the argument with the fewest proto-patient properties will be realized as an oblique. Dowty does not speculate about a language like German with distinct case marking, but I assume that the dative object is in the 'oblique' category; it should therefore have fewer proto-patient roles.
than the theme argument. This suggestion resembles the linking theories above in that the dative marked argument is in a middle role between the agent and the theme argument.\textsuperscript{51}

Even though Dowty himself asserts that the properties are tentative and may not be exhaustive, I will show how the subject of a HAVE-relation comes to play a higher role than the theme argument, and is therefore a candidate for dative case marking. I understand from Dowty that the argument selection ‘process’ of three-place predicates compares the properties of all the arguments simultaneously. Slightly deviating from this, I will compare the properties of the two non-agent arguments against each other in a separate process and decide on a higher role, an intermediate subject, which will then be compared to the agent. This method reflects the semantic relation between the predicate have and the dative construction, and more easily allows a comparison and uniform analysis of the three ‘havers’ introduced above: the possessor, the whole, and finally the experiencer.

The HAVE-relation which underlies (Ich habe ein Buch ‘I have a book’) is a control relation between an animate and an inanimate entity, a possessor and a possessee. A control relation assigns the controller powers over the item controlled; the controller acquires the capability of changing the location and state of the item. The proto-agent properties are sentience and the capability of causally affecting the possessee in its location, state, etc. The possessee has proto-patient properties; it can potentially undergo a change of state and can potentially be causally affected by the possessor.\textsuperscript{52} The ‘haver’ thus clearly has a higher role than the ‘havee’, and is realized as the subject. If this relation is embedded in a cause-have event, the causer of the HAVE-relation has the additional proto-agent property of being the volitional causer. In this case the status of the ‘haver’ is reduced, and it is realized as the intermediate dative object, as in Er gab mir ein Buch, ‘He gave me (DAT) a book’. Alternatively, inspired by Neumann’s (1999) observation of the ‘semantic topic function’ of the dative marked argument, namely that the dative DP receives the thing which the subject is

\textsuperscript{51}Furthermore, Dowty does not provide an analysis of the double object construction in English (give John the book), hinting that the reader should combine his remarks on events with two changes of states with those on the role of a human participant (footnote on p. 597). I assume that he refers to the subjects of receive and undergo, which, usually being human, have sentience, a proto-agent property, which might be enough for them to be realized as the subjects, no matter how many proto-patient properties they have (p. 581). As analyzed below, the importance of sentience for the licensing of non-selected datives and as the essential role of a ‘haver’ of events will become clear.

\textsuperscript{52}I am aware that Dowty (1991) does not consider ‘potential’ proto-role properties, that is, instead of a straightforward entailment of what happens in the event only a ‘capability’ to activate a certain role. However, I think that my addition does not contradict, but rather refines Dowty’s proposal, as it may help in the analysis of other non-dynamic predicates.
giving, one could say that in a cause-have event the subject, the causer, is transferring proto-agent properties to the dative marked argument, making it the potential subject in a following event. This distribution of roles is similar for all verbs which entail the establishment of a HAVE-relation; these verbs subcategorize for a dative argument, like the geben -type and verkaufen-type verbs. The third participant of the events described by these verbs, the recipient, obtains, comes to have the referent of the theme argument in the course of the described event.

The inanimate dative DPs in the productive inanimate dative constructions, which resemble the animate dative construction in the type of verbs and the word order, can also be analyzed as subjects of have:

(197)  
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{Tanz und Folklore verliehen dem Fest eine mittelalterliche Atmosphäre} \\
& \text{Dancing and folklore gave the festival a middle-age atmosphere.} \\
& \text{‘The dancing and the folklore gave the festival a middle-age atmosphere’} \\
\text{b. } & \text{Das Fest hat eine mittelalterliche Atmosphäre} [...]
\end{align*}

(198)  
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{Sie gaben dem Haus } \{\text{einen Namen/einen Preis/eine neue} \\
& \text{Fassade/Charakter}\}. \\
& \text{They gave the house } \{\text{a name/a prize/a new façade/character}\}. \\
& \text{‘The house has a name/ a façade, ....’} \\
\text{b. } & \text{Das Haus hat einen Namen/ eine Fassade/} \\
& \text{‘The house has a name/ a façade, ....’}
\end{align*}

(199)  
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{Ich wünsche dem Buch eine breite Leserschaft.} \\
& \text{I wish the book } \text{a broad readership.} \\
& \text{‘I wish the book a broad readership.’} \\
& \text{(books.google.co.il/books?isbn=317020540)} \\
\text{b. } & \text{Das Buch hat eine breite Leserschaft} \\
& \text{‘The book has a broad readership’}
\end{align*}
Unlike animate subjects of *have*, inanimate subjects cannot be controllers of their possessee; they cannot potentially cause a change of state or otherwise affect their ‘havee’. The decisive relation which licenses the dative here is the (constituting) part-whole relation or property-whole relation. The essence of a part/property-whole relation is the dependence of the part/property on the whole, making the relation also a *hold*-relation and the equivalent to a *HAVE*-relation of an animate with his/her possession. The relevant pair of proto-agent and proto-patient properties of Dowty’s list, which can explain the superior role of the whole over its part or property, is the independent existence of the whole vs. the dependent existence of the part/property on the *HAVE*—‘event’, in this case on the fact that the whole is holding it.

Before I continue with a discussion of inanimate dative DPs, in which I will show how their grammaticality or ungrammaticality is the key to the connection between the *HAVE*-relation and the role of the experiencer of the third ‘haver’, the event-related dative, I will show how yet other datives can be accounted for with the *HAVE*-relation. Even though they do not have grammatical *bekommen* (get) paraphrases or grammatical *haben* (have) result phrases, they can be analyzed as at least bearing the underlying semantics of a *HAVE*-relation to another entity, or simply as being a ‘haver’ in the sense of having more proto-agent properties and/or less proto-patient properties than another argument (if present) in the argument structure.

In the exceptional dative marking in the ACC DAT examples, e.g., in the *under*-examples above, repeated here, the dative assignment can be accounted for, or at least traced back to, a mismatch between the usually expected proto-agent and proto-patient properties of the arguments.

(200)  
weil der Arzt einen Privatpatienten einer Operation unterzog
since the doctor.NOM a private.patient.ACC an operation.DAT subjected
‘since the doctor subjected a privately insured patient to an operation’

(201)  
weil sie ein Kind einer Gefahr aussetzte
since she.NOM a child.ACC a danger.DAT exposed
‘since she exposed a child to a Danger’
The patient in (200) and the child in (201) are causally affected and undergo a change of state, at least potentially (the child being in danger), by the dative marked *Operation* (operation) and *Gefahr* (danger). The usual sentience and capability of perception of these animates can also be questioned here; people undergoing surgery and children in danger are generally less sentient of what is happening to them at that moment than in other situations. These arguments have no proto-agent properties, which usually make an animate argument come out in the middle. On the other hand, the operation and the danger do not come out as the lowest arguments, as, though non-sentient, they are the entities which are made capable by the external causer of (potentially) causing a change in the animate. They do not undergo a change of state, as usual theme arguments do. According to this analysis the HAVE relation is reversed here; the 'haver' is the inanimate operation or the danger, and the animate being, the patient or the child, is the entity that is held, (cf. Wegener (p. 185). In accordance with this analysis, the arguments in the middle, the operation and the danger, are assigned the dative case. I do not claim that situations of operations or danger cannot be construed otherwise. In English, it is grammatical to paraphrase: *The surgeon caused the patient to have an operation*. However, I think that using verbs such as *unterziehen* (subject) and *aussetzen* (expose) and having the animate accusative marked are exactly the factors which convey a different meaning, a meaning in which the animate is much more a wholly-affected ‘patient’ than in a paraphrase such as the English one above. Wegener mentions a construction pair where the animate is assigned the dative case and another time the accusative, which should convey the difference that in (a) the result is that ‘I have the task’, whereas in (b) ‘the task has me’:

(202)  a. Ich stelle mir eine Aufgabe

   I put me.REFL.DAT a task.ACC

   ‘I am assigning myself a task’ – I cause me to have a task

b. Ich stelle mich einer Aufgabe                     (Wegener (70a, b))

   I put me.REFL.ACC a task.DAT

   ‘I am faced with a task (see below)’ – I cause a task to have me

In the forum discussion of the LEO online dictionary on the correct translation of (b) I found interesting hints to the correct interpretation, one which supports Wegener’s claim that in (b) the HAVE-relation is reversed. One of the example sentences is:
Wir stellen uns der Aufgabe, Langzeitarbeitslose Menschen und Sozialhilfeempfänger wieder in den Arbeitsmarkt zu integrieren.

We.NOM put us.REF.ACC the task.DAT, ‘to integrate permanently unemployed persons and welfare recipients again into the job market.’

(http://www.tszfw.de/tsz_3.swf)

The best translation of the underlined phrase was produced by the author ‘anjaaufsuche’: to be faced with the task, and she explains her choice with the following wording:

ist mehr passiv; hat den Anklang dass man sich diese nicht selbst gestellt hat, und vor allem dass es eine schwere Aufgabe sein kann, die nicht leicht zu losen ist

that one.NOM he REFL.DAT this[the task]ACC not by-oneself put has,

‘This is more passive; it sounds that one did not assign this task to oneself (‘on purpose’), and, above all, that can be a difficult task, which can’t be solved easily.’

(by author ‘anjaaufsuche’,

This analysis of German ACC DAT expressions with a reversed HAVE-relation is unusual. The prevalent approach to these constructions (Cook (2006), McIntyre (2006), Meinunger (2006)) is that the dative DP in these ACC DAT examples is a different dative, a ‘low’ dative, and may be derived from a locative expression, a 'hidden PP' (Meinunger (2006)). In this way they explain the reversed word order (ACC DAT instead of DAT ACC), as PPs come after the accusative argument, unlike the dative argument, and there is no experiencer feature of the denotee of the dative DP. I will leave the decision as to the correct analysis open, as the prevalent analyses also reconcile the non-experiencing inanimate DPs with the experiencer role hypothesis by simply arguing that these datives are different from those appearing as recipients, beneficiaries, and possessors in the usual ditransitive constructions. In addition, these types of dative DPs only appear with a small group of verbs and are no longer productive.
Additional datives which are not restricted to animate denotees are those which appear with ähneln (resemble)-type verbs:

(205)  

My brother/ This picture.NOM resembles me/ the other.DAT  
‘My brother/ this picture resembles me/ the other.’

b. Ich mache mein Bild dem Bild von Picasso ähnlich/ gleich.  
I.NOM make my picture.ACC the picture of Picasso.DAT similar/alike  
‘I make my picture resemble the picture of Picasso.’

(206)  

Sie setzt Musiker Priestern gleich  (cf. McIntyre (2006, (41c))  
She.NOM musicians.ACC priests.DAT likens  
‘she likens musicians to priests.’

These examples are also classified as ‘low datives’ by McIntyre (2006), as they appear after the accusative DP in the unmarked word order. They cannot be analyzed as HAVE-relations in a strict sense, but the exceptional case marking can again be traced back to the fact that the entity, whether person or inanimate thing, to which something is compared is expressed as more dominant than the entity that is compared. The emphasis must be on ‘expressed’, as sentences such as (205a) can be reversed without an apparent change in meaning: *Ich ähnele meinem Bruder* (I resemble my brother) and also have a symmetric expression: *Mein Bruder und ich ähneln uns* (my brother and I resemble each other). The entity to which something else is compared is the constant of comparison; it exists independently (a proto-agent property), and is not affected or changed. It therefore plays the higher role, and accordingly is assigned the dative case. The entity which is compared to or made to resemble the constant is made dependent on it, and is potentially changed according to it (two proto-patient properties). This situation resembles the *hold*-relation between a whole and its part or property, which has been presented as a proper HAVE-relation above, and the dative case marking could possibly be traced back to this semantic basis.

I will similarly speculate about predicates which assign the dative case to their lone internal argument, as in the case of helfen (help). The exceptional type of participation of the

53 It is probably lexically fixed as the case of the constant of comparison, unlike the case of the other argument, which is raised to the subject position or is assigned the accusative case in a causative construction.
denotee of this argument in the event may again be the reason for its exceptional case marking. The complement of helfen is assigned the dative case, which should require the condition that there exists a lower role. As no other participant is syntactically present, Wunderlich (1996) stipulates a 'lexically marked [+lr]' feature for these predicates. However, the complement of helfen does have proto-agent properties; it is thus not a typical protopatient, as a person who is helped is sentient (*einem Toten helfen (*to help a dead person)), is usually active and moving, or at least actively involved in what he/she is being helped with, and might have the possibility to cause things. In jm/einer Sache folgen (to follow .someone/something) the person/thing denoted by the dative exists independently of the event, and is moving or associated with movement (to follow a sign /an arrow). Clearly not all theme arguments which have some of Dowty's proto-agent properties (though still fewer proto-agent properties than another participant) appear in the dative case, as the default case for direct objects remains the structural accusative, but I assume that if there is an exceptional dative case marking, no matter whether it is because of lexical idiosyncracy, it can be traced back to the semantic condition of the dative case.

3.5.3 Entity-related and event-related datives and the role of the experiencer again

In this subsection I return to the relevant dative construction, the productive and widely-used DAT ACC construction. I will present my finding that inanimate dative DPs can only appear if the verb selects an entity-related dative, one which only entails the establishment of a HAVE-relation between the two entities, while the role of the experiencer is inherently connected to event-related datives as a requirement for 'havers' of events which entail more than just causing a HAVE-relation. This finding is the key to the reconciliation of the dative case realizing the above-proposed role.

The verbs which appear with inanimate dative arguments (non-personified and not a metonymy of animates) are quite restricted. In most search results I only found geben and verleihen (give). The events in which these verbs appear with inanimate datives are all events in which a HAVE-relation (or a not-HAVE-relation) is established with modality modifications such as wünschen (wish), but no more than that. In some examples the expression is not eventive at all, but merely describes the existence of a HAVE-relation (such an ‘event’ seems to have even fewer semantic components, only one state and not both a prestate (a not-HAVE-relation) and a poststate (a HAVE-relation):
(207) Stahl verleiht dem Beton Stabilität.
Steel gives the concrete.DAT stability.ACC
‘Steel gives concrete stability.’

It is striking that, as soon as more semantic information is lexicalized than in the basic give, the inanimate DP is either ungrammatical or understood as personified.

(208) a. der Geschichte eine Überschrift geben
b. *der Geschichte eine Überschrift schreiben

the story.DAT a title.ACC give/*write
‘to give the story a title/ to write a title over the story’

(209) a. dem Text einen Abschnitt zufügen/ anhängen
b. *dem Text einen Abschnitt dazuschreiben/ dazukleben

the text.DAT a paragraph.ACC add/*write. *stick
‘to add/*write/*stick a paragraph to the text’

(210) a. dem Fest eine mittelalterliche Stimmung verleihen
b. *dem Fest eine mittelalterliche Stimmung machen

The party.DAT a middle-age atmosphere.ACC give/*create
‘to give the festival a middle-age atmosphere/ to create in the festival a…’

(211) a. ?dem Stuhl eine Lehne geben55
b. *dem Stuhl eine Lehne bauen

the chair.DAT a back.ACC ?give/ *build
‘to give the chair a back/ to build onto the chair a back’

This situation is very curious, as many of these verbs infer the HAVE-relation; the meaning of the (b) sentences is quite well understood. Even so, realizing these wholes with a dative DP assigns them the role of an experiencer.

54 Machen (make, create) in German is more specific than geben (give) in this context, as it contains an activity component.
55 I assume that the slight infelicity of this example is caused by the fact that the event is highly associated with a specific activity, that of a carpenter.
Inanimate dative-marked DPs are ungrammatical in VPs which have more semantic information than the mere establishment of a HAVE-relation. Why is this so? The answer is two-fold: (i) the additional semantic requirements of many dative verbs are in general only fulfilled by an animate being (e.g., widmen (dedicate), verkaufen (sell), schenken (give generously), (ii) for most verbs which appear with dative DPs the HAVE-relation is not between a ‘haver’ and an entity, but between a ‘haver’ and an event, or at least part of the overall event expressed by the sentence. I will illustrate that inanimates are incapable of playing a higher role than events, of ‘having’ events. Only animate beings can ‘have’, can take part, control, or form an opinion about an event by being sentient. In the following section I will address these two factors which minimize the appearance of inanimate dative DPs and leave the German speaker with the deep intuition that the dative case plays the role of the experiencer.

(i) Additional semantics which requires animacy

Inanimates, with their sole proto-agent role as the independent exister over their part or property, appear in events which only lexicalize the establishment of a HAVE-relation. Verbs with a root which can be ‘stripped’ and associated with the bare event schema of causing a HAVE-relation (x causes y to have z) are thus grammatical with inanimate arguments. In this case, the HAVE-relation is that of whole-part/property, not possessor-possessee. In German, the verbs geben and verleihen and apparently also zufügen and anhängen (add) in the context of texts, and beimischen (add) for gas or liquids (cf… dem Gas war ein Reizstoff beigemischt (the gas.DAT was an irritant.NOM admixed, ‘There was an irritant admixed to the gas’) Neumann (1999, (4)))56 are such verbs. Despite other meaning components which can be realized in other event schemata (such as verleihen (rent something out) and spenden (donate), these verbs can only mean give, causing a HAVE relation.57 The dative arguments

56 The German verb for a completely neutral process of addition, addieren (add) is restricted to mathematical adding. All other processes of increasing an object with another part or property are expressed by particle verbs which have an additional component, often an original activity component such as put, set, mix, hang, lay, bring. Fügen is arguably the most neutral verb, as in zu- or an- or beifügen,(add). Other verbs which correspond to the English add are: anhängen (hang at), beilegen (put at), beifüllen (set at), beimischen (mix at), anreihen (order at), and anbringen (bring at). I assume that the grammaticality of inanimate dative DPs depends on whether these verbs can only refer to a neutral add, and to what extent the other meaning component is dominant. The grammaticality of a dative construction with an inanimate dative DP may therefore be speaker-dependent. The construction which is probably preferred is a prepositional construction such as einen Abschnitt an den Text anhängen (a paragraph onto the text hang-at, ‘to add a paragraph to a text’).

57 The curious consequence of this statement, namely that verbs may have more basic lexical components and less basic components, has already been addressed in chapter 2. There, the realization of the verbs geben, verleihen, and spenden (give, grant) in certain prepositional constructions activated semantic components which are not lexicalized when used in the bare dative construction.
are obligatory here, and the role is lexicalized in the verb: y is the non-agentive haver of z, and may simply be fulfilled by having one proto-agent-property, a 'holding' property, more than the other argument: independent existence.

However, most dative verbs are different. Some dative verbs have meaning components which cannot be 'stripped' so easily when their caused-have entailment is realized. These components generally refer to qualities which only animates have and therefore restrict their dative argument to animates. The verbs schenken (give generously, free of charge) (vs. geben) and versprechen (promise) (vs. wünschen (wish)) are examples. I do not claim that the following semantic description includes an exhaustive list of appearances of these verbs, but it does demonstrate the general tendency.

Ditransitive schenken entails generosity. It is usually the external argument that is generous while causing the HAVE relation. There must be a reason for this generosity, a recipient of the generosity, and the reason is usually a prevented capability on the part of the recipient to establish the HAVE relation on his/her own, and/or potential gratitude on his/her part. The child in (212) is therefore a perfect recipient, being potentially grateful for the present. A present to a story does not have a reasonable context. Inanimate arguments appear, but in the majority of examples I found they are a metonymy of animate beings (212b). One interesting example is (213). It shows that there is no general restriction to animate arguments if a dative argument is selected. This is in contrast to the non-selected dative arguments below in the discussion of (ii). If the semantic requirements are otherwise satisfied, here generosity and/or benefit, which are usually, but perhaps not exclusively, associated with animates or institutions of animates, inanimates can appear, again in a part-whole HAVE-relation. (213) should be interpreted that the time of the founders was a lavish time, so the house benefitted from them. The combination of two inanimates makes the non-human interaction of generosity-benefit possible, even though it is usually awkward, see (213b and c).

(212) a. Er schenkte dem Kind ein Buch/ *der Geschichte eine Überschrift.
   He gave.generously the child.DAT a book/ *the story.DAT a title.ACC
   ‘He gave the child a book as a present/ the story a title as a present.’
He gave generously the museum.DAT/ the monastery.DAT/ the archive.DAT his art-collection.ACC
'He gave the museum/ the monastery… his collection of art as a present.'

The founders-time gave generously the house.DAT a generous restaurant-hall.ACC and a typical East-sea-veranda.ACC
'The time of the founders gave the house a generous restaurant hall and a typical East Sea veranda.'

(http://www.lohme.com/unser_haus.htm)
The founders gave generously the house.DAT a generous restaurant-hall.ACC
'The founders gave the house a generous restaurant hall.'
The founders-time gave generously the landlord.DAT a beautiful house.ACC
'The time of the founders gave the landlord a beautiful house.'

Versprechen (promise) does not only mean willing to establish a future HAVE-relation, but entails in a sense the presence of a speech act. This connotation probably comes from the still-present stem sprechen (speak). The dative DP must be a potential partner of this speech act and thus must be animate. The interpretation aimed at in (214a) with versprechen (promise) can actually only be expressed by (214b).

(214) a. Sie wünscht /*verspricht dem Buch eine breite Leserschaft.
She wishes / *promises the book.DAT a broad readership.ACC
'She wishes/ *promises the book a broad readership.'

b. Sie verspricht dem Publikum, dass das Buch eine breite Leserschaft haben wird.
She promises the audience.DAT that the book a broad readership have will
'She promises the audience that the book will have a broad readership.'
Frequently, but not always, abstract external and theme arguments ease the grammaticality of inanimate dative arguments. In a way they are the best candidates for ‘stripping’ the additional meaning components, or at least for decreasing them semantically to a minimum. Thus, the semantics of schenken assumed above (similar to the case of spenden (donate)) ‘cause generously a HAVE-relation’, is minimized to ‘cause a HAVE-relation of something positive’.


   The form lends / gives generously/ donates/ promises the shoe.DAT
   stability.ACC
   ‘The form gives the shoe stability.’

   b. Die Form verleiht /*schenkt/ *spendet/ *verspricht dem Schuh Instabilität.

   The form lends/ gives generously/ donates/ promises the shoe.DAT
   instability.ACC
   ‘The form gives the shoe instability.’

(ii) Event-related havers must be experiencers

The second factor which minimizes inanimate dative DPs is the discovery of (at least) two different dative types: a dative DP related to an entity and a dative DP related to an event. This finding follows the lines of Pylkkänänen (2002) who assumes two applicatives crosslinguistically, Cuervo (2003), who finds similar types of dative in Spanish, and finally McIntyre (2006), who analyses the dative case in German in this manner. The dative type of the possessive or part/whole HAVE-relation discussed in the previous subsection, Ich gebe dir ein Buch/ der Geschichte eine Überschrift (I’m giving you a book/the story a headline), is a relation between a ‘haver’ and one entity. The datives of most verbs which appear with dative DPs will be shown to be a relation between a ‘haver’ and (at least part of) an event.

The majority of verbs which appear with a dative argument do not lexicalize the HAVE-relation themselves, and thus do not select dative DPs. These are the dative DPs whose denotee is interpreted as a bene/maleficiary, possessor or deprivee, or an interested person. However, this dative DP is still encoded as a seemingly regular argument of the verb, and therefore the exceptional semantic connection between the verb and the dative argument has to be licensed. As the verb alone does not provide information regarding the kind of involvement of the new argument, it has to be possible to infer the involvement from other
semantic knowledge. The basic involvement on which the other roles are built is that of the observer of the event happening, which only animate beings can do. I will illustrate this using the verb *schreiben* (write). It has been shown above that *schreiben* cannot take an inanimate dative argument; however, it is a perfect ‘dative verb’ with an animate one.

(216)  

a. Ich gebe der Geschichte eine Überschrift.  
I give the story.DAT a headline.ACC  
'I am giving the story a headline.’  
b. Ich schreibe dem Lehrer einen Brief.  
I write the teacher.DAT a letter.ACC  
‘I am writing the teacher a letter.’

In the following section I take the *bekommen* paraphrase as an expression of the resulting HAVE-relation, and thus as a possibility to make the semantic role, the involvement, of the dative DP transparent. In (a) the event schema is undoubtedly cause (*I* [have (*story*, *headline*)]). What happens to *the story* is that it gets *a headline*. What happens to *the headline* is that it gets part of *the story*. Both *story* and *headline* are semantic arguments of the verb. The resulting HAVE relation between them is entailed.

(217)  

a. Ich gebe der Geschichte eine Überschrift.  
I give the story.DAT a headline.ACC  
‘I give the story a headline.’  
b. Die Geschichte bekommt eine Überschrift.  
The story.NOM gets a headline.ACC  
‘The story is getting a headline.’

In b the resulting entailed HAVE-relation is different:

(218)  

a. Ich schreibe dem Lehrer einen Brief.  
I write the teacher.DAT a letter.ACC  
‘I am writing the teacher a letter.’

+bekommen paraphrases are seen by many authors, including Wegener, as the passive of a dative construction. I prefer, however, to follow McIntyre’s (2006) view that *bekommen* is an inchoative of the HAVE-relation predicated by a dative DP. He points out that the English *get*-constructions can be literal translations of the *bekommen*-passive’, even though English may lack the corresponding ‘active’ dative construction.

---

58 *Bekommen* paraphrases are seen by many authors, including Wegener, as the passive of a dative construction. I prefer, however, to follow McIntyre's (2006) view that *bekommen* is an inchoative of the HAVE-relation predicated by a dative DP. He points out that the English *get*-constructions can be literal translations of the *bekommen*-passive’, even though English may lack the corresponding ‘active’ dative construction.
The teacher does not come to have a letter, but is having a letter written to him by me. Whether the letter reaches him in the end is an open question. It is not entailed, but a HAVE-relation between the teacher and a construct of letter and at least parts of the verb write is entailed. It is therefore a HAVE-relation between the dative argument and (at least parts of) the whole event.

Wegener (1985, p. 85f) defines the HAVE-relation of many dative verbs as a (close or loose) relation between two DPs, and would therefore (correctly) reject Er öffnete mir die Tür (He opened me.DAT the door.ACC, ‘he opened the door for me’) as a HAVE-relation between he and the door. However, she interestingly describes the relationship of a dative DP to its context by including the verb in its participle form (p. 67). The relevant result for the dative denotee, the person 'concerned', would be for (219a) ein geschriebener Brief (a written letter), and not just ein Brief (a letter). A possible result could also be ein in die Garage gefahrenes Auto (a into the garage driven car ‘a car that has been driven into the garage’) or auf dem Regal gelassene Bücher (on the shelf left books, 'books that have been left on the shelf') for the following sentences (referring to Wegener, p. 66):

(219) Er fuhr mir das Auto in die Garage
He drove me.DAT the car.ACC into the garage.
'He drove the car into the garage for me'

(220) Er liess mir die Bücher auf dem Regal
He left me.DAT the books.ACC on the shelf
'He left the books on the shelf for me'
Assuming that a HAVE-relation in a more abstract sense can occur between an entity (a person) and an event, in this case the coming about of a result state, which is a kind of an event, a HAVE-relation can be seen as occurring not only in the majority of these dative constructions, but in all of them. Interestingly, Wegener does mention that benefactive datives do not appear in a bekommen (get) passive (paraphrase), but in an etwas verändert bekommen (something.ACC changed get, ‘to have something changed for one (by someone)’) passive (paraphrase) (p. 95). This is also true, at least in German, for benefactives with no HAVE-relation in Wegener’s strict sense:

(221) a. Er öffnete mir die Tür.
    He opened me.DAT the door.ACC
    ‘He opened the door for me’

b. Ich bekam (von ihm) die Tür geöffnet.
    I.NOM got the door.ACC opened
    ‘I had the door opened for me by him.’

Finally, I will illustrate that dative constructions such as these can even be paraphrased using the actual German predicate haben (have). Theoretically, this does not have to be so, as the verb ‘haben/have’ cannot underlie the ditransitive construction for historical reasons. In all Indo-European languages 'have' is a relatively new verb, much newer than the prototypical dative verb geben/give (Wegener, p.149, citing Meillet (1924), Benveniste (1966, p. 187f) and van Ginneken (1939)). However, the paraphrase does indicate that a HAVE-relation is the correct semantic analysis. As can be seen in the English translations, and as pointed out by McIntyre (2006), English can use the predicate have, the so-called experiencer-have, to express sentences such as the German dative constructions in (219-221):

---

59 Wegener (pp. 69-77) indeed argues that resultativity is a semantic component which increases the chances for a dative DP to appear. Unlike the English benefactive DO constructions (as indicated below), it is however not a necessary component. The second component which Wegener mentions, activity, might be enough. Speaker variation exists, particularly a greater acceptance of dative DPs in southern vs. northern German. In general Wegener concludes that as soon as there is a clear inference about how the event affects the added participant, the ‘person which the event concerns’, dative DPs are grammatical:

Er schob mir den Kinderwagen
He pushed me.DAT the carriage.ACC
‘He pushed the carriage for me’(*He pushed me the carriage, cf. He baked me a cake)

60 The English experiencer-have reading is subjected to a ‘link requirement’ (Belvin and den Dikken (1997)). It is most felicitous if the subject is represented somewhere in the complement of have:

(i) He had/got students walking out of his, lecture.
    John had/got his, camera {in the water/smashed}.

---
(222) The teacher had a letter written to him
(223) I had my car driven into the garage
(224) I had the door opened for me.

Haben is apparently restricted to nominal complements; it does not have a correlating form to the sentences above. Without an additional ‘agent-by phrase’ such as von mir, it bears a different meaning in which hat is understood as the auxiliary hat of the present perfect form, but with an additional von-phrase it is ungrammatical:

(225) ≠Der Lehrer hat (an ihn) einen Brief geschrieben
The teacher.NOM has a letter.ACC written
Means only: ‘the teacher had written a letter (to him=somebody else’

(226) *Ich habe von ihm eine Tür geöffnet
I.NOM have from him a door.ACC opened
Should mean ‘I have a door opened for me by him’

However, this situation only holds for the present tense, and is probably caused by the resemblance of the structure to the very common present perfect structure (which in spoken German is the usual past tense form and therefore very common), with respect to the participle verb form and the word order: einen Brief schreiben (write a letter), hat einen Brief geschrieben (has a letter written, ‘has written a letter’). English can differentiate between an auxiliary-have and an experiencer-have via a change in word order: had written a letter vs. had a letter written. However, when the German ‘experiencer-haben’ is disambiguated from

He, had people {throw rocks at him/destroy his, car}
A lack of linking makes an experiencer-have unavailable, and leaves only the causer-have interpretation:

(ii) The piano teacher had/got the student practicing octaves.
McIntyre (2006) argues that German non-selected datives, such as bene/malefactsives, possessors, and ethical datives have a type of pragmatic link requirement, at least to the direct object and therefore a non-selected dative is easily licensed when a direct object is present in the syntactic structure. The dative denotee is then interpreted as having some relation to it. This thought is an interesting one which may provide the key as to why any additional linguistic item improves felicity for free datives: *Er läuft mir (He walks me.DAT) vs. ? Er läuft mir schon (He walks me.DAT already, ‘He walks already, to my surprise’), and the truly felicitous Er läuft mir schon alleine in die Schule (He walks me.DAT already alone into-the school, ‘He walks already alone to school, to my delight.’)
the present perfect form by embedding it in another verb or auxiliary, an experiencer reading is possible\(^6^1\) (though it might need a special context to seem natural):

\[(227)\] Der Lehrer will dringend (von mir) einen Brief geschrieben haben
The teacher.NOM wants urgently from me a letter.ACC written have
‘The teacher urgently wants to have a letter written (to him) by me’

\[(228)\] Ich möchte so gern (von ihm) die Tür geöffnet haben
I.NOM would like so much (from him) a door.ACC opened have
‘I wish I had a door opened for me (by him)’

In the present tense, there is no semantic restriction requiring \textit{haben} to refer only to entities, even though the lexical category of its complement must be a DP; events can also be \textit{had} when the nominal complement refers to an event,\(^6^2\) as in the following example:

\[(229)\] Der Lehrer \textbf{hatte} ein Erlebnis: Jemand/ich schrieb ihm einen Brief.
The teacher \textbf{had} an experience: Someone/I wrote him a letter.

The ethical dative (which is however constrained in German to its pronominal form), the one dative which is undoubtedly a dative related to the whole event, and also bene/malefactive- possessor datives which appear with stative (but nevertheless affecting) VPs, can be paraphrased with \textit{haben}, indicating the underlying HAVE-relation between the ‘haver’ and the event (see also Wegener’s discussion and examples on p. 215f.)

\(^{61}\) Without the additional \textit{von mir} (from me) an ambiguity again exists in the future perfect form (\textit{Übermorgen wird er einen Brief geschrieben haben}) (‘The day after tomorrow he will have written a letter)). It is still unclear to me why this ambiguity does not prevent an experiencer reading in the same way that the ambiguity with the present perfect prevents a present experiencer reading. The reason could be that the future perfect itself is context dependent. It does not appear in a neutral context, and therefore the context itself may indicate which construction is realized.

\(^{62}\) However, only in an event in which the role of the 'haver' is clearly understood to be non-agentive, which correlates nicely with the role of a dative DP:

(i) *Ich hatte ein Erlebnis: ich schrieb einen Brief
I had an experience: I wrote a letter

(ii) *Ich hatte einen Unfall, bei dem ich klar der Verursacher war
I had an accident in which I was clearly the causer

(iii) Ich hatte eine Operation (ich = Patient, nicht der Arzt)
I had an operation, I=patient, not surgeon

(iv) *Ich hatte eine Aktion (‘ich unternahm eine Aktion/ war bei einer Aktion beteiligt)
I had a mission (for I launched a mission or participated in a mission)
I have established that there indeed exists a HAVE-relation between an entity, the denotee of the dative DP, and an event. These datives appear with verbs which do not lexicalize HAVE-relations themselves, but which have, possibly together with their other arguments, rich enough semantics to allow the inference of a certain HAVE relation, a certain kind of participation of the added, non-selected dative DP. What remains is to draw the connection to why a ‘haver’ of an event can only be an experiencing animate being. First, there is evidence from the semantic roles of the dative DPs for the range of semantic functions of the dative case. ‘Havers’ of events usually become beneficiaries, i.e., they get benefit out of the event. The ‘havers’ may also be interpreted as maleficiaries, and then they have trouble. In addition to being a beneficiary or a maleficiary, they may be interpreted as the external possessors of the item involved in the event. Possessors are surely ‘havers’. If they remain bystanders, they are having a good or bad time, or at least in German, sie haben Interesse an der Sache (They have interest at the issue, ‘they are interested’). In any event it has become clear that what unites all these ‘havers’ is that they are experiencers of the event.

Second, concerning the special semantic role of the dative DP as the dominant argument of the HAVE-relation to its ‘havee’, the event itself, but still bearing a lower role than the agent, there must exist a proto-agent property lower than the agent. The decisive property for such a dative is ‘sentience’. In a relationship to more than one other item, e.g., the construct [letter written]/[letter written by me], or [headline (given) by me], the dative...
argument is thus not only related to the [letter], but also to the action of [writing]. How can one be a holder, a controller, in a non-agentive way, of the whole event? The most plausible answer is by being (at least potentially) sentient of the event, conscious of it, perceiving it. In this manner, the role of the experiencer is explained as one result of an underlying HAVE-relation.

3.5.4 Non-intentional causer, judger, and experiencer (narrow sense) datives

I have not yet considered most of the datives on which I based my initial isolation of the role of the experiencer: the judger, the experiencer (narrow sense), and the non-intentional causer datives. These datives do not have a bekomen paraphrase and thus cannot be easily accounted for as bearing an underlying HAVE-relation. However, they are never entity-related, and therefore the dative DP must be an animate experiencer. When the concept to which the denotee of the dative is related to is eventive, it must be an experiencer, if the role of the dative DP is to be interpretable.

Non-intentional causer datives have been shown by Cuervo (2003) for Spanish to be high applicatives, related to the whole event. German datives of the same kind can be analyzed in the same way. A paraphrase with ‘Da hatte ich es, …. (there I have it, …. is straightforward, and has been shown above to be a typical paraphrase for ethical datives which are related to the whole event:

(232) a. Mir ist die Vase zerbrochen.
   Me.DAT is the vase.NOM broken
   ‘I broke the vase unintentionally’
   b. Da **hatte** ich es, die Vase ist zerbrochen
      There I **had** it, the vase is broken.

The agent is missing, but the predicate invites the inference that there is an initiator of the action, and so the dative is understood as a causer. However, the denotee of the dative DP is never necessarily the causer, though it is always an experiencer. The role of the causer is only an inference created by the lack of a clear higher role. Therefore, the construction is ungrammatical for inanimate causers, and is reserved for the animate, experiencing participant, who is possibly also the causer of the action. Here again, the role of a sentient
experiencer is decisive for licensing, as it makes the role of this added participant interpretable.

(233) *Dem Sturm ist der Ast vom Baum abgebrochen
   The storm.DAT is the branch of the tree.NOM off-broken
   Should be ‘The branch of the tree broke off by the storm’.

Unfortunately I do not yet have a substantial analysis of experiencer and judger datives. Experiencer datives are related to an event, which can be minimal, containing only a tensed property, as in Mir [ist kalt] (Me.DAT [is cold], ‘I am cold’), or containing more: Mir [scheint, dass es schon Morgen ist] (Me.DAT [seems that it is already dawning].) Sometimes experiencer datives are lexically selected by a verb which relates an event to an entity; only an animate being can appear, again because event-relatedness requires animacy to be interpretable: Mir ist der Aufsatz gelungen (Me.DAT the article became-managed, ‘I managed the (coming about of) the article.’). Some experiencer datives have been shown to have a paraphrase with haben, as in Ich habe Angst – mir ist angst (‘I have fear’ to ‘me.DAT is fear), ich hatte ein Erlebnis, (I have an experience) to mir is etwas passiert (Me.DAT is something happened). More examples can be found in Wegener, p.192: Mir genügt (Me.DAT is enough) – Ich habe genug (I have enough), mir missglückt (Me.DAT fails, ‘I am unlucky’– Ich habe Pech (I have bad luck). Moreover, in languages without experiencer datives, the predicate have (i.e. its equivalent) sometimes replaces the dative construction, as in the French J’ai froid (I have cold, ‘I am cold.’ = Mir.DAT ist kalt), indicating that the semantics of have plays a central role.

Judger datives are related to an ‘event’ which consists of the construct of a theme and a tensed value ([the soup is too hot] related to me, in Die Suppe ist mir zu heiss, [the issue is important] related to him, in Ihm ist die Sache wichtig). The role of the dative is as the constant of comparison, but unlike datives of resemblance, which have been analyzed above as playing a higher role than the theme argument, which might have triggered the realization of the argument with the dative case, judger datives must be animate. The reason for this requirement may be that datives of resemblance are lexicalized by the governing verbs, and therefore their role is specified, while the role of a judger dative has to be inferred from the context.
Even though these ideas remain speculative, I think to have shown the crucial point that as soon as a dative is related to some kind of event the denotee of the dative has to be an experiencer to make its role interpretable.

3.6 Summary

This chapter focuses on the semantic contribution of the dative construction. I The first section has shown that the dative case can be described as encoding a range of semantic roles such as recipient, deprivee, bene/maleficiary, possessor, experiencer, interested person, and judge. These roles have been shown to be created compositionally by combining the meaning of the verb with its arguments and a basic semantic feature of the dative case. The role of the experiencer has been filtered out, and proposed to be the basic role of the dative.

The last two subsections have shown that the dative case is strongly associated with animacy. It has a strong tendency to encode the animate participant in possible case constellations, and inanimate items encoded in dative case are usually understood as personified. Even so, the claim that the dative case has an inherent /animate/ feature, supported by the above-mentioned findings, does have a drawback; there are inanimate dative DPs which are neither personified nor metonymies of animate beings.

Following McIntyre (2006), I have proposed an underlying HAVE-relation as the basic semantic feature of the dative case; it is the key to the puzzle. Inanimate datives, which hold a part-whole relation to the referent of the theme argument, and datives which are necessarily animate experiencers can both be accounted for by a HAVE-relation, either between two entities or between an entity and an event (here following the influential study of Pylkkänen (2002)). The verbs which can appear with inanimate dative arguments – non-experiencers – are quite restricted. They merely establish an unadorned HAVE relation and lexicalize nothing else. However, I assume that most concrete contexts and events are not just ‘establishing a HAVE-relation or a not-HAVE-relation’, which license non-experiencing dative DPs, but are more complex events with rich semantics. If such events have a ‘secondary subject’, e.g., another, non-agentive controller, or if a controller is added to the event, the decisive semantic role property for this controller is sentience, which allows experiencing. Only animates have sentience and are therefore suitable to be assigned the dative case, and thus the dative case is primarily associated with animate beings and plays the role of denoting
the experiencer, even though no semantic feature such as /animate/ is directly inherent in the dative case. This accounts for the fact that the dative case is not a case of animates, but still strongly associated with animacy.

3.7 Conclusions for the dative DP of transfer verbs

In this last section I narrow the focus once again to transfer verbs, the topic of this dissertation. The dative DP of transfer verbs does not seem to be the typical underspecified experiencer dative like many of the datives discussed in this chapter, but has the relatively clear determined role of the recipient. At least in the case of *geben*-type and *verkaufen*-type verbs, this role is semantically determined by the verb itself. Nevertheless, the results of the investigation into the general semantic contribution of the dative case do highlight some interesting semantic properties which set the dative variant of these verbs apart from their prepositional variant.

The question whether the dative variants of transfer verbs bear some semantic uniqueness is not a trivial one. Given that transfer situations in general can be very well expressed by prepositional constructions, as shown in Chapter 2, the question becomes why the German language needs two constructions. Indeed, some (Moser (1970), Wegener (1985)) have speculated that the dative case, like the genitive, may slowly disappear from the German language, driven by the principle of linguistic economy, which prefers analytic, semantically transparent, constructions over synthetic ones. Even so, the dative case has not vanished yet, but seems to be as stable as ever, and is surely a productively used case, e.g., when new transfer predicates arise (*einem eine Nachricht simsen*, ‘to text someone (DAT) a message (ACC)’).

The basic semantic feature of the dative case is the denoting of the dominant argument of a HAVE-relation (embedded under a verbal head), and thus verbs which lexicalize a kind of HAVE-relation or describe an event in which a HAVE-relation is established, assign the dative case to one of their arguments. Possessive verbs, *geben*-(give) type and *verkaufen*-(sell)-type verbs, which lexicalize a resulting HAVE-relation, and *schicken*-(send) type verbs, which do not lexicalize a HAVE-relation on their own, but surely can, together with their theme argument, describe such an event, all behave in this way.

The verbs of the *geben*-type, which do not have a prepositional variant, show best that, in German, the dative case is still semantically the most precise realization of an embedded HAVE-relation. It has been shown in the discussion of inanimate datives that
geben-type verbs only lexicalize the establishment of a HAVE-relation, some with some aspectual modifications, but some, such as geben itself, without. No preposition seems to be able to encode the pure ‘haver’ of a HAVE-relation. The prepositions which appear in transfer events need a further specification, at least a transfer component, some prior HAVE-relation that is cancelled, for the preposition an, and spatial motion for zu. Even though the dative DP of geben does not seem to carry the role of an experiencer, it is clearly entity-related, and is the dative which helps to isolate the HAVE-relation, the essential semantic basis of the dative case, which ultimately creates the experiencer role for so many other datives.

The question whether the dative variant bears some unique semantic features when compared to prepositions is relevant for verkaufen-type, schicken-type v, and stehlen-type verbs. These verbs have additional semantic components which license both a dative DP and a prepositional construction. Let us start with verkaufen-type verbs. I assume that the dative DP is selected by the possessive semantics of these verbs: they lexicalize a recipient. However, unlike the dative DP of geben-type verbs, the ultimate possessive verbs, the realization of this argument is optional. This behavior can be explained following Heuer (1977, p. 68f) who shows that the degree of obligatoriness of the realization of a verbal complement is inversely proportional to the verb’s ‘completeness of meaning’. The more a verb lacks additional information (other than its information concerning the argument) necessary to convey a semantic idea, the more obligatory the realization of the complement. The more the verb itself has a fully-determined meaning, the more optional the realization of the complement. The semantics of verkaufen-type verbs is arguably complete, at any rate rich enough to allow the reconstruction of the recipient argument; the complement does not necessarily have to be realized. Verkaufen-type verbs can thus license both types of the dative: an entity-related dative (the recipient) and an event-related dative, a beneficiary or possessor dative. The result is an interesting semantic effect; the dative DP of such verbs is ambiguous and may combine the interpretations of entity-related and event-related datives:

(234) Oli verkauft ihr das Auto.

Oli sold her.DAT the car.ACC

a. ‘Oli sold the car to her.’ (entity-related interpretation)
b. ‘Oli sold the car for her/ in her interest/ instead of her.’ (event-related)
c. ‘Oli sold her car (to her annoyance/ to her joy).’ (event-related)
d. ‘Oli sold the car to her, to her great joy.’ (entity and event-related)
The *an*-variant of *verkaufen*-type verbs can denote (a), a prepositional construction with *für* can denote (b), but neither a prepositional construction, nor anything else, as the genitive can denote (c) with all its semantic components, and certainly not the combined interpretation (d).

A similar phenomenon is found with *schicken*-type verbs, which do not select a recipient, but a goal. I have proposed that the dative is event-related, but the open goal position binds it (in the absence of an overt goal) to be the recipient. See also Chapter 4 for details. With an overt goal PP, the dative is again ambiguous between both types of datives, and can also combine the interpretations assigned to each type:

(235)  
Oli schickte ihr den Brief nach London.

Oli sent her.DAT the letter to London

a. ‘Oli sent the letter to her to London.’ (entity-related)
b. ‘Oli sent the letter for her to London.’ (event-related)
c. ‘Oli sent her letter to London (to her annoyance/joy).’ (event-related)
d. ‘Oli sent the letter to her, to her great joy, to London.’ (entity and event-related)

Interestingly, both options (d) above blur the distinction between the two kinds of dative DPs and raises the questions whether, at least in German, all datives are event-related, and whether the recipient and part-whole interpretations are inferences based on the combination of the HAVE-relation and the semantics of the event. ‘Events’ which only allow a part-whole HAVE-relation semantically entail exactly this scenario, so the event itself establishes or describes an entity-to-entity relation. However, I will have to leave this question for further study.63 What can be captured as a semantic uniqueness of the dative case is that its interpretation, and thus the semantic information about this recipient, can be complex. One can express simultaneously that the recipient experiences the event in one or another way. In Chapter 5 it will be discussed in detail whether this phenomenon is strong enough to be a factor governing the choice between the dative and the prepositional variants. It is not yet possible for me to prove objectively that this factor creates a preference for the dative-variant

63 McIntyre (2006, section 7.2) has asked the same question about the status of the dative DP of *verkaufen*- and *schicken*-type verbs. He claims however that these datives are nevertheless entity-related datives. The test which should support his analysis is the *wieder* (again) test (cf. Stechow 1996, Beck and Johnson 2004). The scope differences of *wieder* should show whether the dative DP is lower or higher than the VP, which in turn should indicate whether the dative is an entity or an event-related dative. As far as I follow his reasoning and the judgments of his examples, I think he did not consider the benefactive interpretation of a dative DP with at least *verkaufen*. The topic is surely still a promising challenge.
over the prepositional variant, e.g., with recipients who are more likely to benefit from and enjoy the item they receive, such as friends and family members, but I will show that in some instances the reversal of this phenomenon motivates the preference of a prepositional variant over the dative variant. If a recipient is not capable of experiencing the event, as is the case with mailboxes, addresses, and electronic receivers, the situation cannot be expressed by a dative variant of *schicken*-type verbs.

For *stehlen*-type verbs, the dative is clearly an event-related dative (see also McIntyre (2006, section 6). It is not selected, and without context its interpretation can be either a deprivee or a beneficiary:

(236)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oli stahl seinem Freund ein Fahrrad.</th>
<th>Oli stole his friend.DAT a bike.ACC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. ‘Oli stole a bike for his friend.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. ‘Oli stole a bike from his friend.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The deprivee interpretation is therefore, like the benefactive, a specified experiencer role created by combining a dative DP with a verb which entails removal or loss of possession. A negative context will disambiguate the deprivee from the benefactive. In Chapter 5 I will show in detail how this phenomenon represents a governing factor of the choice between the dative variant and the *von*-variant. Deprivees who are necessarily experiencers of the event, such as someone who is consciously deprived of an item that had been valuable to him, will preferably be expressed in a dative DP.

The dative DP of the remaining class of transfer verbs, the *werfen* (*throw*), with its particle construction *zuwerfen* (particle ‘to’- *throw*), will be the topic of the next chapter.
Chapter 4: On the particle-\(zu\) construction of werfen-type verbs

This chapter deals with the dative argument in the particle-\(zu\) construction of werfen-type verbs. As introduced in Chapter 1, werfen-type verbs have a different range of argument realization options available to them than schicken-type verbs, unlike the equivalent verbs in English, send and throw, which behave alike in the dative alternation. While schicken-type verbs are grammatical in all variants associated with transfer events (the dative variant, the an-variant, and the \(zu\)-variant), werfen-type verbs are only grammatical in a transfer situation in the \(zu\)-variant. The addition of a particle such as \(zu\) makes these verbs compatible with a dative argument. I will address the semantic and syntactic peculiarity between schicken and werfen in this chapter, which will involve (1) illustrating that werfen-type verbs differ in what they lexically encode from schicken-type verbs, and an exploration of this fact; (2) analyzing the dative argument of the particle-\(zu\) construction as an entity-related free dative. I will show that this analysis explains a wide range of facts concerning these verbs which have not yet received adequate analysis.

Chapter 3 shows that there are two major types of dative arguments: an entity-related dative and an event-related dative (cf. Pylkkänen (2002)). I suggest that the two types differ in their selectional restrictions. The former is selected by the semantics of the verb (+ context). It denotes the dominant argument of a have-relation between two entities, and may be inanimate if the verb lexicalizes a bare have-relation with no other specifications or if the verbal semantics can be ‘stripped’ to denote only this relation. Therefore, verbs such as geben (give) or verleihen (grant, give) appear with animate and inanimate dative arguments: Stahl
verleiht Beton Stabilität (Steel gives concrete.DAT stability.ACC). Nevertheless, this kind of dative argument arguably denotes a relation to an entity which is often animate, as animate beings fulfill many more requirements of ‘holders’ than other entities. Requirements that restrict the dative argument to animates are, in addition, often lexicalized in the verb itself, as in verkaufen (sell), which needs an animate partner to interact with, versprechen (promise), which needs an animate partner who can hear what is ‘spoken’ (versprochen), or widmen (dedicate), which denotes an action that only animate beings can perform. In this role, the denoted person is a recipient.

The second type of dative arguments, the event-related dative, is productively added to the verb phrase, and is licensed by a large number of verbs; in its clitic form as a personal pronoun it may possibly work with all verbs (the ethical dative). This dative denotes the ‘haver’ of the whole event. S/he can only be an animate being, and his/her precise role is inferred from the semantics of the verb and other complements. Generally ‘havers’ are experiencers, and their specific interpretation depends on the meaning of the verbs and other aspects of the context. The most superficial involvement – caused by lack of information concerning the involvement of the experiencer – is the ‘person interested’.

In this chapter, the status of the dative argument in the particle-zu construction of werfen-type verbs will be discussed:

(237) Oli warf/schleuderte/schmiss/kickte dem Kind den Ball zu.
    Oli threw/catapulted/threw/kicked the child.DAT the ball.ACC to-
    ‘Oli threw/etc. the child the ball.’

Like the role of the datives related to an entity, the role of these dative DPs is that of recipient. However, like datives related to events, they are restricted to animate beings, which is surprising, as werfen (throw) does not seem to have any semantic components which would restrict its goal to recipients.64

(238) *Oli warf dem Tor den Ball zu (cf. Oli warf den Ball zum Tor).
    Oli threw the goal.DAT the ball.ACC to- (Oli threw the ball.ACC to-the goal)
    ‘*Oli threw the goal the ball, cf. Oli threw the ball to the goal.’

---

64 This fact would also exclude an analysis in which the dative DP is the complement of zu as a postposition, as in non-colloquial expressions such as dem Bahnhof zueilen, (the train station.DAT to-hurry, ‘to hurry to the train station’)
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I will argue in this chapter that the dative argument of *zuwerfen* is indeed a dative argument of the second type, an event-related dative. Its initial role is that of experiencer, a beneficiary of the event; however, by merging this benefactive interpretation with directional semantics provided by the particle *zu* (to/towards), a recipient role is created. As a recipient, inanimate goals are no longer acceptable. In the end it will be shown that this role makes the dative of *zuwerfen* similar to the dative of the *schicken*-type class.

The discussion will shed light on why German seems to have a stronger constraint on the distribution of its ditransitive construction than e.g. English:

(239) a. ENGL: Oli threw the ball to Peter.
     GERM: Oli warf den Ball zu Peter.

b. ENGL: Oli threw Peter the ball.
     GERM: #Oli warf Peter den Ball.

This chapter will show that German ditransitives with a caused possession interpretation have stricter licensing conditions than English ditransitives, namely salient directionality. If this semantic element is not lexically encoded in the verb, it has to be added, as in the case of *werfen* (throw). I speculate that this addition stems from the need to disambiguate the recipient interpretation (the unexpected entity relatedness) of such dative DPs from other possible interpretations, such as bene/malefactives and possessors, which German, unlike English, licenses quite freely.

### 4.1 The directional component and the interpretation of a dative DP

*Werfen*-type verbs denote 'the instantaneous imparting of force in some manner causing ballistic motion' (Pinker (1991, p. 110)). The manner of *werfen* (throw) and *schleudern* (catapult, fling) is by certain movements of the hands, *schießen* (shoot) with a weapon, or in a weapon-like manner, *schmettern* (dash) with force. Some verbs which appear in this class (e.g., Pinker (4.13)) actually only denote the manner, and receive the interpretation in which some object is set into motion in combination with a theme argument. For example, the verb *kicken* (kick) on its own denotes movement with the feet. Thus you can *gegen den Tisch kicken* (kick against the table) without anything being set into motion. With or without the denotation of the forceful release of an object, these verbs do not specify the direction the
object is moving in. A goal argument would give direction, but it is not lexicalized. Thus, if a salient goal argument (in the form of a PP) is missing, the verb is seemingly without direction. This point distinguishes *werfen*-type verbs from *schicken*-type verbs. Even though, as Beavers (2011) points out for English, *send* (cf. *schicken*) and *throw* (cf. *werfen*) are similar in that they denote (at least with a theme argument) a 'leaving event' and require motion, *schicken* differs from *werfen* in that it does have an encoded goal argument. If you send an item, there must be a destination it is sent to. This goal argument specifies the direction, which makes *schicken* an inherently directional verb. Evidence for this claim can be seen in the following sentences, to which I added the prefix ‘*(he)rum*’ (around). This prefix can be added to almost any verb with the semantic effect of turning the verbal meaning into a (often careless), continuing action.

(240)  
Er warf den Ball im Zimmer rum.  
He threw the ball.ACC in-the room around  
‘He threw around the ball in the room.’

(241)  
Er schickte den Brief in Hamburg rum.  
He sent the letter.ACC in Hamburg around  
‘He sent the letter around Hamburg.’

In sentence (240) the denoted event is a ball being carelessly thrown in any direction in a room. The ball can change direction when it hits a wall. The path of the ball does not have a specified direction if no salient goal phrase is present in the sentence. In sentence (241), however, the letter has to return to its sender before it goes in another direction. Even though no goal phrase is mentioned, the verb implies a goal which specifies the direction. If the event which *schicken* denotes is now understood as a durative event, it can be seen as a repetitive sending each time toward a separate goal. Sketching the event with lines, the two events would look like:

---

65 Beavers (2011) does not mention this difference for English *send* and *throw*. In his analysis, this difference is indeed irrelevant, as they (unlike *schicken* and *werfen*) behave alike regarding the dative alternation (see below (5, 6)). Beavers (2011) does mention that the English *send*, unlike *throw*, does not entail a source point from which something is sent. For German *schicken*-type verbs I do not think this is true. If the source point of the item sent is not the location of the ‘sender’, one does not use *schicken* alone, but rather *etwas schicken lassen*, *s.th.ACC send let*, (to let something be sent).
This observation is important for the interpretation of an added dative argument. A dative argument added to schicken is usually understood as the recipient; it is automatically bound by the empty goal slot\textsuperscript{66}. With werfen-type verbs, the denotee of the dative DP is not the recipient, an important difference between German and English, as introduced above. In English, throw-type verbs may denote caused possession realized by a to-variant or a DO variant, while German werfen-type verbs are at first glance ungrammatical in a bare dative, a DO construction, see (239), repeated here.

\[(242)\]
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
  \text{a. ENGL: Peter throws the ball to Oliver.} \\
  \text{GERM: Peter wirft den Ball zu Oliver.}
  \\
  \text{b. ENGL: Peter throws Oliver the ball.} \\
  \text{GERM: #Peter wirft Oliver den Ball.}
\end{array}
\]

However, the bare dative construction is only ungrammatical in a recipient interpretation. Werfen (throw) is a verb that implies activity and an agent, a good condition for licensing a dative, as mentioned in Chapter 3. It does appear as a grammatical construction in the interpretation of the denotee of the dative DP as a bene/maleficiary/possessor or interested person. This use is rare, but can be found, e.g., in fetching games with dogs:

\[\text{Ich schickte meiner Mutter den Brief an die Bank (I sent my mother.DAT the letter.ACC to(AN) the Bank, ‘I sent the letter to the bank for my mother’)}\]

From the point of view of a dog: [...] Today we went on a walk. I had great fun in the snow and Janina has me.DAT the stick.ACC thrown.

‘[…] and Janina threw the stick for me.’

(http://www.sheltie-tico.de.tl/M.ae.rz-2O1O.htm)

The goal of the fetching game is not the dog; it is away from the dog. The dog becomes the recipient after he fetches the stick, but not from the throwing event. He is therefore not the recipient, but the beneficiary as realized in this sentence. Similarly, the dative DP in the following example (from the text of a German Schlager by Jörg Maria Berg) does not mean that the teddy bear is shot to you, but that it is shot for you, and given to you afterward.

(244) Baby, ich schieß dir einen Teddybär.

Baby, I shoot you.DAT a teddybear.ACC

‘Baby, I will shoot a teddy bear for you.’

This form is unlike the dative DP of the particle-zu construction. The particle zu adds a goal argument and thus inherent directional semantics toward this goal which werfen alone does not have. The new directional semantics provided by the particle and the special morphosyntax of these particle verbs create a dative slot in their syntax which is interpreted as the recipient of the event. Clear evidence for this interpretation is the fact that, even though the dative DP is also the spatial goal of the event, similar to the denotee of a zu-PP (245c), it has to be animate. Inanimate goals are ungrammatical in this construction (245b):

(245) a. Oli warf ihm das Päckchen zu.

Oli threw him.DAT the package.ACC to

‘Oli threw him the package.’

b. *Oli warf dem Tor den Ball zu.

Oli threw the goal.DAT the ball.ACC to-

‘Oli threw the ball to the goal.’
c. vs. Oli warf den Ball zum Tor.
Oli threw the ball.ACC to-the goal
‘Oli threw the ball to the goal.’

The directional semantics of the particle-\textit{zu} construction seems to be responsible for a grammatical recipient interpretation. The remainder of this chapter will discuss how the recipient role of this dative is created. Unlike \textit{geben} and \textit{verkaufen}-type verbs which naturally assign a recipient role to their dative arguments, neither \textit{werfen} nor the additional direction \textit{zu} has possessive semantics. In the case of \textit{schicken} chapter 2 proposes that the semantics of the theme argument, e.g., a letter (vs. a student), triggers the possessive interpretation of the verb. Similar solutions are difficult to construct for \textit{werfen}-type verbs, as the type of the theme argument is restricted to something which can be thrown, and usually something which can be thrown can also be caught, i.e., be the recipient of. An abstract theme argument is rarely found, as in the expression ‘\textit{jm etwas an den Kopf werfen} (s.o.DAT s.th.ACC onto the head throw, ‘to insult/attack s.o. with s.th.’), as exemplified below in (246b). However, this kind of theme argument cannot appear in a \textit{zuwerfen} sentence, as it cannot be caught, thus showing that the person denoted by the dative DP with \textit{zuwerfen} is intended to catch, i.e., be the possessor of, anything that is ‘to-thrown’ to him. A semantic interpretation triggered by the semantics of the theme argument seems to be the wrong track for the analysis of \textit{zuwerfen}-datives.

(246) a. *Sie warf ihm ihr Argument zu
She threw him.DAT her argument.ACC to-
‘*She threw him her argument’
b. As in: Sie warf ihm ihr Argument an den Kopf
She threw him.DAT her argument.ACC onto the head
Literally: ‘She threw her argument onto his head.’,
meaning ‘She attacked him with her argument.’

Before I continue the discussion, a short background on particle verbs in German is needed.
4.2 Excursus: Particle verbs in German

A particle verb consists of a base verb and a particle, which can be an adverb (*hin* (hither), *her* (hence), *ein* (in)), an adverb that is also used as a preposition (*auf* (onto)), *zu* (to)), or, possibly, a short adjective (*voll*-full)).

(247) einschenken (in-pour, ‘pour’)
    volltanken (full-fill_up, ‘fill up the tank completely’)
    aufpassen (up-watch, ‘pay attention’)
    anhängen (onto-hang, ‘attach’)

Particle verbs show non-transparent semantics to a greater or lesser degree. The semantics of the typical particle-based verb cannot be compositionally derived from the meanings of the verb and the particle. I assume that all particle verbs are derived from a phrase which historically did have a compositional meaning. Often the meaning of one of the constituents became extinct, thus blurring the semantic transparency of the complex verb (e.g., *aufpassen* (pay attention): *passen* is no longer used in the meaning ‘to watch what passes by’, only in the meaning ‘to fit’). Syntactically, Henzen (1965), based on Paul (1920), calls these constructions “unstable verb compositions” because a particle verb behaves on the one hand like a single word, but on the other the particle can be separated. For example, particle verbs undergo productive word formations, such as nominalization (suffix *–er*) or suffixation with *–bar* (-able). The particle behaves here like a prefix (like *–ver* in (248b)):

(248) a. Aufkleber
    On-stick-er (‘sticker’)

b. Verkäufer
    Forth-deal-er (‘seller, salesman’)

The particle is physically separated from the base verb when the verb is finite. This property is shared by other verb-adverb constructions (*schnell fahren* ‘drive fast’), resultative (*rotstreichen* ‘paint red’), and depictive adjective constructions (*verschlafen küssen* ‘kiss while being sleepy’) (see (250)):
(249)  
a. Ich klebe den Aufkleber auf / Ich schenke dir Saft ein / Ich passe gut auf.
   I stick the sticker.ACC on/ I pour you.DAT juice.ACC in/ I watch well up
   ‘I stick the sticker on/ I pour you some juice/ I pay good attention.’
   vs.

   b. Ich verkaufe den Aufkleber.
   I forth-deal the sticker
   ‘I sell the sticker.’

(250)  
Ich fahre zu schnell/ Ich streiche die Wand rot/ Ich küsste meinen Sohn
verschlafen.
   I drive too fast/ I paint the wall.ACC red/ I kissed my son.ACC sleepy
   ‘I drive too fast/ I’m painting the wall red/ I kissed my son sleepily.’

Lüdeling (2001) points out that there is no clearly-defined class of particle verbs, as verb-
preverb constructions perceived as particle verbs have overlapping properties with verb-
preverb constructions perceived as created ‘online’ in the syntax, like the examples in (250).
Nevertheless, she asserts that German speakers have a clear intuition about what they call
particle verbs67, and therefore ‘defines’ particle verbs as phrasal expressions which are to a
greater or lesser degree lexicalized.

4.3 Zuwerfen – a lexicalized possessive phrasal expression?

Similarly to the analysis of particle verbs such as aufpassen (pay attention), the verb
zuwerfen may be seen as gaining possessive semantics via a lexicalization process as a result
of the semantic blurring of the original components werfen and zu, or via semantic narrowing.
There are indeed particle zu-verbs where semantic narrowing has taken place: zugeben (to
‘to-give’) now means to adjust one’s opinion to the opinion of another, i.e., ‘to admit’, and
zunehmen (to ‘to-take’) now means to take on more weight, i.e., to ‘gain weight’. In this
context there are also verbs which have a possessive interpretation, such as zusprechen (to
‘to-speak’), meaning to give something to someone by virtue of a court decision (which is
spoken in court). In the following example the verb zuwerfen is used without the dative
recipient, but still carries the semantics of throwing an object (here the ball) to animate

67 Lüdeling (2001) points out that all the researchers she is aware of naturally attempt to analyze ‘particle
constructions’ without trying to define this curious group of verbs.
recipients who are supposed to catch it, and not to some place else in the field, such as the goal; it may support this analysis:

(251) Der Ball wird geprellt und zugeworfen, bis er durch geschicktes Spiel [...] im Gegentor landet.
The ball.NOM is bounced and ’to-thrown’, until it by clever playing […] in the opposite-goal lands.
‘The ball is bounced and passed between the players, until it reaches the goal of the opponents by a clever play.’

Sentence (251) supports the fact that at least in the context of ball games the verb zuwerfen is
to a great degree lexicalized for the action of passing the ball from one person to another.
However, a single sentence cannot provide evidence that a possessive interpretation is
lexicalized for zuwerfen in all contexts. At least three arguments oppose a lexicalization
analysis:

First, the phenomenon where a dative DP as the argument of such a particle zu-construction is interpreted as a recipient also appears with other verbs of setting an object into
motion which are much less frequently associated directly with a ball game, such as
zuschmettern (to ’to-dash’) and zuschleudern (to ’to-fling’), and also not exclusively in the
context of ball games (see (252)). In fact, even in the case of a nonsense verb, e.g., jemandem
etwas zuopsen (to opse someone.DAT s.th.ACC to-) the person denoted by the dative DP will
be interpreted as the recipient of the theme argument on which he had been acted in a certain
way, e.g. by opsing. In addition, the phenomenon also appears with other directional
particles, e.g., zurück- (back) and weiter- (forth) (see (253)):

(252) Sicherheitshalber wandte ich mich zu Menasche um und schmetterte ihm ein fröhliches »Gute Nacht« zu.
As-a-precaution turned I me to Menashe around and dashed him.DAT a happy “Good night”.ACC to-.
‘As a precaution I turned around to Menashe and dashed him a happy “Good night”.

(www.ephraimkishon.de/Der_Erfolgsmesser.htm)
(253) Trifft er ihn nicht, wirft man ihm den Ball zurück. Er muß sein Glück aufs neue versuchen.

Hits he him.ACC not, throws one him.DAT the ball.ACC back-. He must his luck onto the new try.

‘If he [the person who has the ball] doesn’t hit him [one of the other players], one throws him the ball back. He has to try his luck again [to throw the ball and try to hit other players].’

(www.jungschar-schaetze.de/Sommerspiele.htm)

Second, the semantic components do not seem to be blurred. In the context of ball games, the simple verb *werfen* with a PP headed by *zu* also means ‘passing the ball from one person to another’. In fact, the two constructions can be used interchangeably in this context, as the following example shows, even though in other contexts, such as in contexts with inanimate goals, the particle construction with a dative DP cannot be used interchangeably with a PP construction. Thus, the particle construction cannot be seen as bearing semantics which the simple verb plus the preposition cannot also have:

(254) Sprechen Sie dann die erste Silbe und **werfen** gleichzeitig den Ball **Ihrem Kind zu**. Das Kind fängt den Ball. Ihr Kind spricht die zweite Silbe und wirft gleichzeitig den Ball zurück. Sie sprechen die dritte Silbe und **werfen** gleichzeitig wieder den Ball **zu Ihrem Kind**.

Speak you then the first syllable and throw simultaneously the ball.ACC your child.DAT to-. The child catches the ball. Your child speaks the second syllable and throws simultaneously the ball back. You speak the third syllable and throw simultaneously again the ball.ACC [to your child]pp

‘Then speak the first syllable and, simultaneously, throw your child the ball. The child catches the ball. Your child will speak the second syllable and, simultaneously, throws the ball back. You speak the third syllable and, simultaneously, throw the ball to your child again.

(http://www.abc-der-tiere.de/eltern/silbenmethode/voruebungen/)

Third, the semantics of *zuwerfen* does not seem to have been narrowed to a possessive interpretation. The verb *zuwerfen* and other *werfen*-type verbs, here *schmettern* (dash), also exist in non-possessive environments, ones with inanimate spatial goals. In contrast to the
**zuwerfen** examples above, however, these are not realized as dative DPs, but as PPs headed with the preposition *auf* (onto).

(255) Einer nach dem andern warf den Totenschädel **auf das Ziel zu**.
One after the other threw the skull.ACC onto the aim to-.  
‘One after the other threw the skull towards the aim.’

(http://www.sagen.at/doku/Andreas_Hofer/Wipptal_Volkskunde_1809.html)

(256) Roger Davies holte zum Wurf aus und **schmetterte den Quaffel auf das Tor zu**.
Roger Davies fetched to-the throw out and dashed the quaffle.ACC onto the goal to-
‘Roger Davies set up for a shot and dashed the QuaffleACC towards the goal.’

(http://www.fanfiktion.de/s/4487d37d0000304d067007d0/8)

(257) Das bedeutet, dass **der Rückkehrer - gerade auf das Ziel zugeworfen** - in einem elliptischen Kreisflug um eben jenes herumflöge.
This means that the returner [the boomerang].NOM- straight onto the aim to-
thrown - in an elliptic circle-flight round just that-one around-flew.
‘This means that the ‘returner’ – after it has been thrown straight towards the aim – would fly around this aim in an elliptic circle.’

(http://home.arcor.de/tobias-pinner/docs/kyliebumerang.html)

Examples of inanimate goals of particle-*zu* constructions with verbs of setting an object into motion are admittedly rare. They exist much more naturally with verbs of continuous transmission of force onto an object, such as **zutreiben** (drift, here, drive something) and **jagen** (chase, here, drive something).

(258) In starkem Sturm brach der Anker aus, **der Wind trieb das Schiff auf die Küste zu**, wo es schließlich strandete.
In the heavy storm, the anchor broke loose, the wind caused the ship ACC onto the coast to-, […]
‘The anchor broke loose in the heavy storm, the wind caused the ship to drift towards the coast, where it was finally stranded.’

(http://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Zhen_Hua_10)
Greywolf jagte das Boot mit Höchstgeschwindigkeit auf die Küste zu.
Greywolf chased the boat.ACC with maximum-speed onto the coast to-
‘Greywolf drove the boat towards the coast with maximum speed.’
(tululu.ru/read43725/52/ )

However, these examples do not support a lexicalization of particle-zu constructions of werfen-type verbs, but only illustrates the fact that inanimate goals are inconvenient for this construction for semantic reasons. Consider the following example of a similar auf-PP denoting the goal with werfen without the particle. It has the same interpretation of toward as in examples (258) and (259) above.

(260) die ASC Mädel warfen 31 mal auf das Tor, davon 23 Treffer.
The ASC girls threw 31 times onto the goal, thereof 23 hits.
‘The ASC girls threw 31 times onto the goal, 23 times they hit.’
(http://tus-handball.npage.de/spielbericht_81596002.html)

The directional particle zu (toward) seems to be superfluous, but not ungrammatical, with verbs that denote setting an object into motion, and therefore it usually does not appear. An object that is e.g., thrown, is very unlikely to change its direction on its path toward a goal, once the goal point is mentioned, and so it is not necessary to use additional semantics to provide a path element. The same does not apply to verbs which continuously move an object, nor to verbs which denote a movement of one’s own body (go, walk, run). The mover in the latter case does not necessarily remain on a straight path once the movement has begun. A path element has to be provided together with a goal point, e.g., by a PP headed with zu or by a particle zu:

(261) a. Loraine Hellriegel [...] lief alleine auf das Tor von Hollenstedt zu.
Loraine Hellriegel [...] ran alone onto the goal of Hollenstedt to-
‘Loraine Hellriegel ran alone toward the goal of Hollenstedt’
(http://www.union-
halle.net/magazin/artikel.php?artikel=1368&menuid=14&topmenu=6)
b. *Lorain Hellriegel lief alleine auf das Tor.
Lorain Hellriegel ran alone on the goal
‘Lorain Hellriegel ran alone toward the goal.’
The additional *zu*-particle in examples (255 to 257) above conveys a semantic effect: the object is not flying in a straight line. In (255) the explanation might be of the abnormal state of the soldiers (drunken with victory?), in (256) because of the huge game field of Harry Potter’s Quidditch games, where rain and wind may push the quaffle in another direction. Interestingly, in (257) the nature of the boomerang triggers the unusual particle, as boomerangs typically do not fly straight toward the goal intended by the thrower, but, as described in the example itself, fly around it. The combination of the *toward*-phrase with *auf* and the directional particle *zu* conveys exactly this meaning. In a way, it resembles the semantics of the path of verbs denoting continuous imparting of force, namely that the direction of the path is not determined at the outset of the event, as in (258) and (259). The crucial point arising from this discussion is that the particle *zu* is an emphasis of the goal of *werfen*-type verbs with inanimate goal-phrases headed with *auf*, but is not a necessary semantic requirement. Examples are rare because they require a specific context, but the construction is not ungrammatical. Thus, the analysis of *zuwerfen* as a lexicalized, semantically narrowed expression which selects a recipient based on new possessive semantics, does not hold.

The following subsection will analyze *zuwerfen* in a compositional manner and show that a recipient interpretation arises from combining directional semantics and an animate, beneficiary participant.

4.4 Zuwerfen decomposed

Olsen (1997)’s analysis of the verb constructions with *zuwerfen* as (237), repeated below, is based on a semantic composition between the base verb *werfen* and, in her opinion, the preposition *zu*, which has become incorporated into the semantic form of *werfen*.

(262)    Oli warf dem Kind den Ball zu
         Oli threw the child.DAT the ball.ACC to-
         ‘Oli threw the child the ball’

The particle *zu* bears the same semantics as the preposition *zu*, namely ‘into the vicinity of’, in her decomposition BECOME (LOC AT). She works in the framework of LDG, in which the decomposition and the following analysis are represented as follows:
From Olsen’s decompositional analysis it can be seen that the dative DP, such as *dem Kind* (the child), is not a regular realization of the goal complement, which the verb *zuwerfen* inherited from the incorporated preposition *zu*. First, concerning the order of the three arguments as to *zuwerfen*, it would not get marked as the dative case, but as the accusative, at it is the lowest argument which is marked as [-lr] (has no lower roles). Olsen argues that this argument has to be lexically marked as [+lr] in order to be realized in the dative case. Only then would the decomposition be linked to the actual syntactic realization of *dem Kind* marked with the dative case.

(264)  \[ \text{zuwerfen} \quad \lambda z \quad \lambda y \quad \lambda x \quad \lambda s \quad \text{WERF}(x,y) & \text{BECOME}(\text{LOC}(y, \text{AT}^*[z])))(s) \]

The analysis is read as follows: according to the default features of the arguments, \( z \) and \( y \) (the child and the ball) both have higher roles, whereas \( x \) (the thrower) has no higher roles, but only lower ones. Both the theme and the goal arguments are then candidates for accusative marking (for arguments that have higher but no lower roles), and the \( x \) argument for nominative marking. The structural middle argument, the theme argument, would automatically be marked dative. By stipulating a lexical marking of the \( z \) argument as having a lower role, the feature of ‘no lower role’ for \( y \) would be triggered. These features are now linked to the dative case for \( z \), the accusative case for \( y \), and the nominative case for \( z \), correlating with the grammatical case marking of *Oli* NOM, *den Ball* ACC and *dem Kind* DAT, as illustrated in (263).

I interrupt Olsen’s analysis at this stage with an important observation. Olsen did not consider *zuwerfen* with inanimate spatial goals in her decomposition. I have exemplified and discussed such sentences above and I think that they should be mentioned in an analysis of *zuwerfen*. Therefore, instead of positing a stipulated lexical marking of a case feature, I do not see why it cannot just be argued that the regular realization of the \( z \) argument is an
oblique\textsuperscript{68}, leaving the correct accusative marking for the theme argument y. The correlating sentence with a usual spatial goal realization headed with \textit{auf} (onto) would be:

\begin{equation}
(265) \quad \text{Oli warf den Ball \textbf{auf das Kind} zu} \\
\quad \text{Oli threw the ball.ACC onto the child to-} \\
\quad \text{‘Oli threw the ball towards the child’}
\end{equation}

Olsen herself rejects the stipulated lexical marking analysis, as the result is still not sufficient: the dative DP \textit{dem Kind} does not appear in the expected syntactic position of the goal argument \( z \). The correct syntactic position is illustrated by the positions of the oblique above, after the accusative theme argument. Tests for the unmarked word order of \textit{dem Kind den Ball zuwerfen}, such as the ‘focus test’ and VP fronting,\textsuperscript{69} show that the unmarked order of the complements of \textit{zuwerfen} is not, as the functional composition would give us, ACC-DAT-V, but DAT-ACC-V:

\begin{equation}
(266) \quad \text{Focus test (Olsen(29)):\ } \\
\quad \text{Was ist passiert? What happened?} \\
\quad a. \text{Ich glaube, dass er dem Kind den Ball zuwarf. \textbf{max focus}} \\
\quad \quad \text{I think that he.NOM the child.DAT the ball.ACC to-threw} \\
\quad b. \text{Ich glaube, dass er den Ball dem Kind zuwarf. \textbf{min focus}} \\
\quad \quad \text{I think that he.NOM the ball.ACC the child.DAT to-threw} \\
\quad \quad \quad \text{‘I think that he threw the ball to the child/ the child the ball.’}
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
(267) \quad \text{VP topicalization:\ } \\
\quad a. \text{Den Ball zugeworfen hat er dem Kind ja nicht.} \\
\quad \quad \text{The ball.ACC to-thrown has he.NOM the child.DAT not} \\
\quad \quad \quad \text{‘It surly wasn’t the ball that he threw to the child’}
\end{equation}

\begin{footnotes}
\textsuperscript{68} There are many three-place particle verbs which have obliques as their goal argument: \textit{Sie hängte das Bild über ihrem dem Bett auf} (She hanged the picture.ACC above the bed on-, ‘She hanged the picture above her bed’).
\textsuperscript{69} In the focus test, the unmarked word order results in a ‘maximal focus’, the whole VP is focused, whereas in a marked order, the constituent that is moved to the closest position before \( V \) is the only focused element (minimal focus). In the second test, only one complement of \( V \) is topicalized together with \( V \), and it is grammatical only with the closest complement.
\end{footnotes}
b. *Dem Kind zugeworfen hat er den Ball ja nicht.
the child.DAT to-thrown has he.NOM the ball.ACC not
‘It surely wasn’t the child that he threw the ball to’

The word order DAT ACC V would result if *zuwerfen were not decomposed with
BECOME(LOCy AT*[z]) as its second part, but with BECOME(POSS(z,y)), turning the
verb into a benefactive. Here, the arguments y and z are reversed to (z,y). Furthermore, z is
now the naturally-assigned dative case, as it is now the true middle argument, and the
semantic fact that the dative DP of zuwerfen is interpreted as a recipient, and not as an
inanimate goal, would also be accounted for, as POSS requires z to be animate. However, this
decomposition is that of the base verb werfen with a non-selected dative experiencer, a
beneficiary of the throwing event, and not of the particle verb with the additional directional
component. This kind of sentence has been exemplified in (243) and (244) above, repeated
here:

(268) Janina hat mir das Stöckchen geworfen.
Janina has me.DAT the stick.ACC thrown
‘Janina threw the stick for me’

In order to account for the fact that the dative DP is not only the beneficiary of the event,
but also its spatial goal, Olsen posits that *zuwerfen is a two-layer construct of both the
incorporation of zu and the benefactive for the base verb werfen. The compositional goal-
template with BECOME(LOC AT) is overlaid by a benefactive reading which reverses the
arguments and restricts the goal arguments to animates. Olsen explains this motivation by the
fact that the 8 different zu-verbs she mentions behave differently in the focus and word order
tests, which means that sometimes the goal interpretation is stronger (the arguments are still
in the order of a goal template realization), and sometimes the benefactive. Olsen thus
analyzes three-place zu-verbs with datives as first created by a regular functional composition
of zu and verb, and then by adding a benefactive component as a semantic and conceptual
extension.

70In this article, Olsen does not say much about which verbs have a stronger tendency toward the benefactive
and which toward the goal interpretation. This would be an interesting issue for future study.
Olsen’s analysis is very interesting because it shows that a recipient interpretation is created by merging directional semantics with a benefactive reading. Without directional semantics, a dative DP receives only the benefactive or possessor interpretations. However, she leaves open to speculation the way in which the process of overlaying works in the lexicon, and the exact reason why the realization of the goal template (be it a stipulated dative marking or an oblique, according to my approach) is suppressed in favor of the benefactive template. In other words, there is no answer to the question what triggers the benefactive reading, the benefactive extension which overlays and is realized in morphosyntax.

I speculate that the answer can be found in the choice of an animate goal. As Kittilä (2008) shows in his cross-linguistic study, choosing an animate goal participant in a transfer situation often triggers a differential marking of the argument. Crosslinguistically there exists a clear tendency to avoid marking animate goals using the normal marking for a goal. In the present case, when the verb *werfen* appears with the particle *zu*, it would seem that the usual oblique realization is suppressed if the chosen goal is an animate. Kittilä assumes that the different degree of affectedness of an animate is the motivation for the differential expression (p. 261f). Human beings are naturally more affected by the transfer event than inanimate items or places. For example, the person can remain affected even after the event is completed, as an animate being can do something with the item which has reached its goal, or have some feelings about it, even afterward. It seems that mentioning an animate being in linguistic context cannot occur without making an inference about possible mental involvement. Animate beings want to be expressed as experiencers. Unlike spatial goals, animate beings have enough self-evident properties for the hearer to figure out their semantic role, and thus they can be very well expressed in the form of a ‘free’ dative DP. This prominence in the event might also be the reason why animate arguments tend to be mentioned before inanimate ones (*Mir tut der Bauch weh, ?der Bauch tut mir weh* (Me hurts the tummy/ the tummy hurts me)). The word order is reversed to that of benefactive constructions, triggering the realization of the animate goal as a dative DP, as an experiencer to the event more than as an oblique goal.
4.5 Recipients and directionality

The dative recipient of *zuwerfen* is thus analyzed equivalently to other non-selected datives. This analysis makes sense, as *werfen* does not select a dative argument either. These datives have been discussed in the previous chapter, and it has been argued that they all carry a basic role of the experiencer, the ‘haver’ of the event, and additional semantics may specify the exact way of experiencing, e.g., in a benefactive way, or as an affected possessor, or both. The exact role of the experiencer of *zuwerfen* is determined by the unsaturated goal semantics of the particle *zu*, which turns it into a recipient of the theme argument.

The role of the recipient is therefore the most salient one that animate experiencers are assigned in an event that is directed toward a goal. *Zuwerfen* and similar particle-*zu* verbs thus show what arguably happens with other directional verbs which do not have a lexicalized recipient argument, such as *schicken* (send)-type verbs. In the case of these verbs, the recipient interpretation is the most salient one for the dative DP, perhaps because the verb has a goal argument that is left open, left unsaturated, similar to the argument slot that the transparent particle *zu* in *zuwerfen* creates. The goal may otherwise become saturated once another endpoint of the direction is given by a preposition with transparent endpoint semantics. Here, the role of the dative may be ‘reduced’ to a mere benefactive:

(270) Oli warf dem Kind den Ball (auf das Tor) zu
     Oli threw the child.DAT the ball.ACC (onto the goal) to-
     a. ‘Oli threw the ball to the child’
     b. ‘Oli threw the ball towards the goal for the child’

(271) Oli schickte seinem Vater das Päckchen (nach Bolivien)
     Oli sent his father.DAT the package.ACC to Bolivia
     a. ‘Oli sent the package to his father’
     b. ‘Oli sent the package to Bolivia for his father’

As seen above, and now even more strikingly, *schicken*-type verbs seem to be similar to *zuwerfen*-type verbs. *Schicken* has been introduced in chapter 2 as having a mere spatial reading, as in *die Schüler zum Direktor schicken* (to send the pupils to the principal) and a

---

71 Even though I think that the first interpretation (without context) is that the dative is the recipient, the saturation of the goal, and the PP a further description of the location, in an adjunct-like manner.
possessive + spatial reading, as in die Briefe an Oli schicken (to send the letters to Oli). This view might lead to a position which states that schicken has two lexical entries, one with an additional possessive component. Instead, it can now be perfectly argued that schicken has one lexical entry, a spatial directional semantics. A recipient argument can easily be enabled by realizing the goal/endpoint of the directional component as a dative DP denoting an animate experiencer, which binds the unsaturated position. In addition, schicken-type verbs (but not geben- or verkaufen-type verbs) have a grammatical particle-zu version as well:

(272) Oli schickte dem Kind eine Einladung (zu)
Oli sent the child.DAT an invitation.ACC (to-)
‘Oli sent the child an invitation.’

I cannot find a semantic difference between schicken (to a recipient) and zuschicken. It seems to be merely an emphasis of the directionality toward the goal. One semantic effect is that by making the directional semantics clear by using the particle, the role of the dative is exclusively bound to be the role of the recipient. The interpretation of the dative DP as a benefactive of the schicken event, for example in a sentence in which the goal is given otherwise, is no longer possible:

(273) a. Ich schickte ihm die Briefe nach London (Er sitzt neben mir/ Er ist in London)
I sent him.DAT the letters.ACC to London
‘I sent the him letters to London (he is next to me/ he is in London)
b. *Ich schickte die Briefe nach London zu.
I sent the letters.ACC to London to-
Should mean: ‘I sent the letters to London’

72 The grammatical inanimate goal phrase would again be auf x (onto x). While I did find (quite rarely) inanimate goals with zuwerfen. I did not find a real data example of zuschicken with an inanimate goal phrase. I assume, however, that sentences like the following are possible, with the slight connotation that they should be careful in approaching the goal (again, like in the examples with auf etwas zuwerfen, it calls for a context in which the goal is not necessarily reached straightforwardly).

Ich schickte die Journalisten auf die Gruppe der Demonstranten zu
I sent the journalists.ACC onto the group of demonstrators to
‘I sent the journalists towards the group of demonstrators’
c. Ich schickte ihm die Briefe nach London zu (*Er sitzt neben mir/ =Er ist in London)
   I sent him.DAT the letters.ACC to London to-
   ‘I sent him the letters to London (he is in London)

Concerning the realization pattern of *schicken*-type and *werfen*-type verbs, a last question should be asked. Why does *zuwerfen* not have an *an*-variant, if it is now so similar to *schicken*?

(274) *Oli warf den Ball an das Kind zu
Oli threw the ball.ACC onto(AN) the child to-
Should mean: ‘Oli threw the ball to the child’

It seems that the reason is connected to the grammaticality of combining prepositions and particles, but I do not yet know what the exact reason is. As it is not grammatical to realize the goal as a PP headed by *zu* or *nach*, but only by *auf*, it is not grammatical to realize it as a PP headed by *an*. Thus, *zuschicken* does not have an *an*-variant, unlike the simple base verb *schicken*.

(275) Oli warf den Bumerang auf das Ziel/ *zu dem Ziel zu
Oli threw the boomerang.ACC on the goal/to the goal to-
‘Oli threw the boomerang toward the goal’

(276) Oli schickte eine Einladung an das Kind (*zu)
Oli sent an invitation.ACC onto(AN) the child to-
‘Oli sent an invitation to the child’

However, if the particle is changed from *zu* to *zurück* (back) or *weiter* (forth), both a *zu*-variant and an *an*-variant are possible, no matter the base verb, quite in accordance with the paradigm of the *schicken*-class.
(277) Der Frisbee wird gefangen und zur nächsten Person weitergeworfen.
The frisbee is caught and to-the next person forth thrown
‘The Frisbee is caught and thrown on the next person’
(http://www.praxis-jugendarbeit.de/spielesammlung/spiele-ultimate-frisbee.html)

(278) Lehrer/in gibt das Thema an und wirft den Ball einer Person zu, diese sagt ihre Meinung dazu. Der Ball wird an eine andere Person weitergeworfen, die jetzt die entgegengesetzte Meinung vertreten muss.
Teacher/ess introduces the subject and throws the ball.ACC a person.DAT to-,
this one says her opinion there-to. The ball is onto(AN) another person forth-
thrown, who now the opposite opinion support must.’
‘The teacher introduces the subject and throws one of the persons the ball. This person adds his/her opinion to it. The ball is then thrown on to another person, who now has to support the opposite opinion.
(http://lehrerfortbildung-bw.de/bs/bsa/bej/englisch/uebung/five.htm)

Finally, I will add an example which shows that the same semantic effect of combining dative DPs and directionality is also true for reversed transfer. Verlangen (desire, demand) is a verb that does not lexicalize a source argument, but is easily associated with one. A dative DP added to the base verb verlangen is at most understood as a benefactive, probably only as an ethical dative. However, if the directional particle ab (off) is added, which creates an empty source position, the dative is understood as the deprivee (the responding role to ‘recipient’ above). In the prepositional construction, the deprivee role is possible with or without the particle.

(279) a. Er verlangte mir eine Antwort ab.
He demanded me.DAT an answer.ACC off-
‘He demanded from me an answer.’

b. ? Er verlangte mir eine Antwort.
He demanded me.DAT an answer.ACC
if possible, then ‘He demanded an answer for me/ to my annoyance.’

c. Er verlangte von mir eine Antwort (ab).
He demanded from me.DAT an answer.ACC (off)
‘He demanded from me an answer.’
4.6 Summary

This chapter has shown that werfen-type verbs and their particle-zu construction such as zuwerfen differ semantically in a way which affects the interpretation of an additional dative DP. The particle zu, like other particles such as zurück (back) and weiter (forth), adds directionality to werfen-type verbs. This directionality is shown to be the reason why the dative DP is not only understood as a beneficiary, but as a recipient, even though the verb does not encode any possessive semantics. An analysis has been refuted according to which zuwerfen, like a few other particle-zu verbs such as zunehmen (to gain weight) and zugeben (to admit), has undergone semantic drift accruing a possessive component through a lexicalization process based on semantic blurring or narrowing. The only plausible solution is a compositional analysis. Using the illustration of Olsen (1997)’s analysis I show how a recipient interpretation arises from combining directional semantics and an animate participant which has been realized as a dative DP. The dative recipient of zuwerfen is thus analyzed in the same way as other non-selected event-related datives carrying the role of the experiencer, the haver, of the event. The exact role of this experiencer is bound by the unsaturated directional semantics, which turns it into a recipient of the theme argument.

4.7 German on the Ditransitivity Hierarchy

The above discussion sheds light on the reason why German seems to put a stronger constraint on the distribution of its ditransitive construction than English. German behaves differently than English regarding the grammaticality of ditransitives according to the implicational hierarchy which Croft et al. (2001) have established for the distribution of ditransitive and oblique constructions cross-linguistically:

Ditransitivity Hierarchy: ‘give’<‘send’<‘throw’

The hierarchy is read as follows: If not all verbs of a language can form DOCs, the verbs which can will be associated with the right end of the hierarchy; if not all verbs of a language can realize a theme-recipient situation with an oblique construction, the verbs which can will belong to the left end.

German certainly has a ditransitive construction with give- and send-type verbs (see Chapter 3), but, as detailed in this chapter, it does not allow werfen (throw)-type verbs to
directly participate in the dative alternation. That is, it does not allow a recipient to be expressed in the usual morphosyntactic expression for recipients, the dative variant, in contrast to English *throw*-type verbs:

(280)  

a. ENGL: Oli threw the ball to Peter  
GERM: Oli warf den Ball zu Peter  
b. ENGL: Oli threw Peter the ball  
GERM: #Oli warf Peter den Ball

For some reason, German places stricter licensing conditions on the use of ditransitives with a caused possession interpretation than English. In particular, the German ditransitive construction is licensed by the salient directional semantics of the verb, which is, if not lexicalized by the verbal stem, compositionally added by a directional particle. Since *werfen* -type verbs on their own do not have a lexicalized path argument, the particle *zu* renders them compatible with a caused possession ditransitive. One possible reason is that German, unlike English, is very permissive in licensing ‘free datives’, event-related datives, whose interpretation is dependent on the context and show several facets of meaning. According to an analysis in which the dative DPs of verbs which do not lexicalize a caused *HAVE* event, including *werfen* and strictly speaking also *schicken* (send), are such ‘free datives’, recipient datives may need a stricter environment to disambiguate them from other possible interpretations, the bene/malefactive, possessor, or interested person interpretations. If Pylkkänen (2002) is correct in her analysis of English as a low applicative language, it would not need disambiguation, as the English dative of *throw* can only be an entity-related dative, a recipient dative, unaffected by benefit, annoyance, items to be possessed, or any other kind of interest for a human being that the rest of the verbal context denotes.
Chapter 5: What governs dative-prepositional alternations?

5. 1 Recapitulation and overview

In the last four chapters the semantics of the constructions which appear in German dative alternations have been discussed and a number of semantic analyses and issues have been addressed. The semantics of the prepositions an, für, von, and zu and the components of the verbs which select them have been addressed in Chapter 2. It has been shown that the concepts of spatial vs. non-spatial transfer and direct and indirect transfer are central to a comparison of the semantics of these prepositional constructions. In Chapter 3, the semantic contribution of the dative case has been isolated and the interaction of the semantics of the VP and the dative case has been demonstrated. It has been shown that causing a HAVE-relation is the basic semantics of a VP involving a dative argument, in which, for the majority of events, the entity denoted by the dative DP has to be animate, and play the minimal role of an experiencer of the event. Further verbal and VP semantics determine the specific kind of the experiencer as the recipient/deprivee, bene/maleficiary, possessor, 'judger', or interested person. In Chapter 4 it has been shown how, in the particle construction used with verbs of ballistic motion, a recipient is created by combining directional semantics with the semantic role of the dative, the experiencer.

In the remaining chapter of this dissertation I want to pull the threads together. The question still remains as to what governs the choice of a particular realization in a given context. I will embed my discussion in a framework in which the different constructions are possible realizations of the event schemata ‘caused motion’ and ‘caused possession’. An event which involves movement of some objects to a spatial goal will be seen to trigger the
realization of the transfer event in a prepositional construction headed by *zu*, while an event in which some kind of change of possession takes place is realized in the dative construction, the *an*-variant, or the particle-*zu* variant depending on the semantics of the verbs. The rules governing the choice of constructions that are considered semantically identical will be addressed, and it will be seen that not all semantic differentiations which influence grammaticality or felicity in certain situations can be captured with these two event schemata. In particular, as was shown in Chapter 2, ‘caused possession’ events are separated into events which do or do not have a specified ‘transfer of possession’, which motivates the appearance of the *an*-variant. Moreover, the semantic ‘flavor’ of the dative case also plays a role. The factor +/- necessary experiencer in the type of participation of the recipient or deprivee respectively, is important for dative/*von* alternations and to some extent influences also dative/*an* alternations.

5.1.1 Root, event schema, and argument realization alternations

As introduced in chapter 1, argument alternations are different morphosyntactic realizations of event schemata with which a verbal root can be associated. The linguistic motivation for an argument alternation can be explained along the following two lines (terms adopted from Sadler & Spencer (1998), based on Ackerman (1990, 1992)):

(iii) **morphosemantic**: driven by the need to appropriately express different semantic contents syntactically.

(iv) **morphosyntactic**: driven by different syntactic needs, or by pragmatic or phonological needs which affect the syntax of the construction.

The following figures illustrate the two kinds of alternations in the framework of root and event schema, as laid out by Levin (2008).

---

73 Even though my observations could be translated into other root and event type frameworks, too, I adopt Levin’s framework as it has been developed to explicate the approach that will also suit best to account for the German data, the ‘verb-sensitive’ approach (see below).
Figure 9: morphosemantic alternation, multiple meaning options for verb:

In a morphosemantic alternation, the basic semantic components of a root can be associated with more than one event schema. The choice of the event schema depends on the semantic environment in which the root is used, which itself is primarily determined by the semantic type of the selected complement, and secondarily by the broader semantic context. Each event schema may have its own characteristic and language specific morphosyntactic realization. The result is two constructions that are similar, as they involve the same verb, but are distinguished both semantically and syntactically.

Figure 10: morphosyntactic alternation, single meaning option for verbs:

In a morphosyntactic alternation, the root of the verb is only associated with one event schema. However, language has rich morphosyntactic resources and allows the event schema to be realized in more than one way. The choice of the particular realization is determined by syntactic, phonological, or pragmatic needs, such as discourse structure or the phonological weight of the constituents. The result is two constructions that are semantically identical, true paraphrases, but differ in their morphosyntactic realization.
Certain verbs may show both morphosemantic and morphosyntactic alternations. Figure 11: morphosemantic and morphosyntactic alternations combined:

An account of these alternations raises the additional questions if not all morphosyntactic realizations are different, and if the realization of two different event schemata happens to be the same.

In the next subsection I will show how this framework is applied to the analysis of argument realization alternations. German dative-related alternations of transfer verbs show all the different realization options illustrated here.

5.1.2 The verb-sensitive view

The adoption and adaptation of the root-event schema – argument realization framework by Levin (2008) is connected to her analysis of the English dative alternation together with Rappaport Hovav, proposed in their joint paper of (2008). They term their approach ‘the verb-sensitive view’, as the association with an event schema is determined by the root of the verb, and the verbal semantic components influence the final appearance and meaning of the argument realizations. With this view, Rappaport Hovav and Levin challenge the prevalent approach to the English dative alternation, ‘the uniform multiple meaning approach’. In the latter approach, the morphosyntactic realization which involves a to-phrase (the to-variant) is uniformly (not dependent on the semantics of the verb) analyzed as a realization of the caused motion event schema, whereas the morphosyntactic realization, in which both arguments are encoded as direct complement of the verb (the DO variant), is uniformly a realization of the caused possession event schema (Pinker (1989), Pesetsky (1995), Harley (2002), Krifka (2003), see Chapter 1). In a uniform multiple meaning approach, the
Alternation is always a morphosemantic alternation governed by the semantic factors of the context.

Figure 12: the uniform multiple meaning approach:

The uniform multiple meaning approach arose as a refutation of ‘the single meaning approach’ following Larson (1988), who claims that both constructions are truth conditionally equivalent and should be transformationally derived from each other. Again, the semantics of the verbs which participate in the dative alternation is not considered. In addition, there are approaches from a pragmatic angle (Erteshik-Shir (1979), Arnold et al. (2000), Wasow (2002), Bresnan and Nikitina (2007)) which, similarly to the single meaning approach, propose that the alternation between the to-variant and the DO variant is morphosyntactically motivated; Unlike the single meaning approach, these authors do mention semantic differences, but, if they exist, or at least if an initial bias of some verb to appear in a certain realization exists, they are overridden by the needs of the discourse structure, the heaviness of the constituents, and pronominalization effects.

In the verb-sensitive approach, both the to-variant and the DO variant can appear as morphosemantic and morphosyntactic alternations. The verbal root determines the possible options. The relevant verb classes of dative verbs that appear in Rappaport Hovav and Levin’s studies are the give-type, the send-type, and the throw-type classes. Give-type verbs can only have morphosyntactically motivated alternations. They do not associate with the caused motion schema. Rappaport Hovav and Levin (2008) show that they do not lexicalize a path element, an element naturally required by the caused motion schema. The preposition to in a realization of the caused possession schema is analyzed as a dative marker, similar to the French à. Send-type and throw-type verbs, on the other hand, show both morphosyntactic and a morphosemantic alternation types depending on the semantics of the context, especially the choice of goal and choice of theme argument. The to-variant is shown to be ambiguous between being a realization of the caused motion and the caused possession schemata, due to
the semantic nature of the preposition *to*, as either a dative marker or as denoting a true spatial direction. Rappaport Hovav and Levin (2008)’s findings can be summarized as follows (p. 132):

- **give-type Verbs:**
  - *to*-variant: caused possession
  - DO variant: caused possession

- **send- and throw-type Verbs:**
  - *to*-variant: caused motion or caused possession
  - DO variant: caused possession

**Figure 13: the verb-sensitive approach:**

In the literature dealing with German, the prevalent account of the dative-prepositional alternation also follows a uniform multiple meaning approach. Wunderlich (2005) proposes that the dative variant is decomposed into a semantic form (SF) which contains the primitive predicate POSS, arriving at a recipient interpretation, while the prepositional construction is decomposed into the SF with the primitive predicate LOC, denoting the goal.

\[
\text{ACT}(x) \& \text{BECOME POSS}(y,z) \ y
\]

\[
\text{ACT}(x) \& \text{BECOME LOC}(z, AT(y)) \ y
\]

Meinunger (2006) also proposes a multiple meaning analysis, assigning a possessional meaning to the dative variant and a locational meaning to the prepositional variant. Both researchers exemplify their approach using the verb *senden* (send), which I see as having both a spatial goal and a recipient interpretation. Other verbs which take part in the dative-prepositional alternation, such as *verkaufen* (sell), and *verleihen* (lend, grant), are not taken into consideration. In addition, they do not distinguish between different prepositions.
Prepositions such as an or von are supposedly in their view analyzed identically along a spatial change interpretation, a caused motion event schema.

The uniform multiple meaning approach to dative-related alternations in German seems to be based on a long tradition which claims that the two constructions convey meaning differences, much like the modern distinction between ‘caused possession’ and ‘caused motion’. Wilmanns (1909, p. 660) seems to have paved the way when he drew a distinction between “initially referring only to a local destination” (the PP-variant) and “denoting a closer personal relation” (the dative variant). However, a closer examination of Wilmanns' discussion and those of linguists following his tradition shows a great deal of incongruity between this basic assumption and the actual semantic description of the examples. In the present case, the dative/an alternation does not seem to fit a simple local/personal distinction, or any distinction at all.

Wilmanns successfully illustrates his assumed local/personal distinction using the verb bringen (bring) with the dative/preposition zu (to) alternation. Spatial goals cannot be expressed with a dative, whereas human, personal goals are grammatical in both constructions. The meaning difference is that in the dative construction the person denoted is the recipient, whereas the prepositional construction refers to the spatial goal:

(281) a. Man brachte *dem Hofe das Pferd / das Pferd auf den Hof.
   one brought the yard.DAT the horse.ACC/ the horse.ACC onto the yard
   ‘One brought the horse into the farmyard.’

   b. Er brachte mir einen Strauss/ einen Strauss zu mir. (Wilmanns, p.660)
   He brought me.DAT a bunch (of flowers)ACC / a bunch(of flowers)ACC to me
   ‘He brought me flowers/ brought flowers to me.’

Bringen undoubtedly has a basic spatial interpretation and provides a good example; in the case of other alternating verbs, however, which Wilmanns sees as having lost their local meaning (e.g., einem glauben, vs. an einen glauben (believe onto(AN), ‘in’), or einem zürnen vs. auf or über einen zürnen (be angry at s.o.)) the point remains vague. He assumes an essential difference in meaning, but does not demonstrate how it can be referred back to the personal/local distinction of the constructions. He even assumes that often the meaning context allows both constructions to be used, letting the reader conclude for himself that the
initial local/person distinction often remains marginal, if not absent. Erben (1972, pp. 147-148) states that Wilmanns' generalization remains true, but illustrates the point with a dative/an alternation using schicken (send):

(282) Er schickt dem Vater sein Zeugnis, schickt sein Zeugnis an den Vater. (Erben, p.147)

He sends the father.DAT his report.ACC, sends his report.ACC onto(AN) the father

‘He sends his report card to his father.’

The dative variant should denote the real recipient and the an-variant only the addressee. The interpretation of the prepositional variant is not along the typical local destination or spatial goal, but is still in a possessive context of a type of recipient, but not a personal one, here correctly following Wilmanns. The distinction thus seems to be more a personal/impersonal alternation than a personal/local one, as assumed at the beginning. Furthermore, Erben states that the prepositional construction often does not carry essential meaning differences, but is primarily a stylistic variant. Here he lists as one of his examples the dative/an alternation of schreiben (write), which leads me to assume that even a personal/impersonal distinction would not exist here. Matzel (1976, pp. 177-178) considers the dative and zu-variants to convey different meanings; he demonstrates his claim using inanimate goal phrases, which are possible in the zu-variant, but ungrammatical in a dative variant. On the other hand, he states that the dative and the an-variant are identical and gives a list of verbs, including both verkaufen (sell), which does not necessarily imply spatial motion, and schicken (send), which denotes local movement. Unfortunately, Matzel does not further elaborate on or support his claims.

Wegener (1985, pp. 224-231), in her comprehensive study of the German dative, shows successfully that the dative construction and the prepositional variants with zu and für differ in their semantics because the former but not the latter construction requires animate arguments, which has consequences for the semantic range and mental involvement of the third participant. However, her discussion of an remains more intuitive, as her evidence is in my opinion problematic. She claims that the person denoted by the dative DP should be more a participant of a ‘transaction’, while the person denoted by the an-PP more a goal of a transport. Evidence should give the following: Denoting the recipient with an an-PP is ungrammatical in the bekommen (get)-paraphrase (in her opinion the bekommen-passive; see
(283) below). This result would show that the person denoted by the an-PP is not a real recipient. She accounts for this difference by referring to a semantic difference: transports should be impossible to ‘see from the end’, from an end point perspective, as they should not contain the goal, only the direction to the goal. (I assume that Wegener draws here the distinction between successful transfer inference, which can be ‘seen from the end’, and intended transfer inference, as discussed in Rappaport Hovav and Levin (2008, sec.5)

(283) a. Er hat ihr ein Buch geschickt – ein Buch an sie geschickt.
   He has her.DAT a book.ACC sent – a book.ACC onto(AN) her sent
   ‘He has sent her a book/ a book to her.’

b. Sie hat das Buch geschickt bekommen
   She has the book sent got
   ‘She got book sent to her.’

c. *Sie hat das Buch an sie geschickt bekommen. (Wegener (174), (174’))
   She has the book.ACC onto(AN) her sent got
   ‘She got the book to her sent.’

However, this test is problematic in two ways. Wegener should be consistent in her assumption that the bekommen-phrase is a regular (syntactic) passive of a dative construction, and then the an-PP as subject is ruled out, as PPs cannot be passivized. The bekommen passive test is therefore not available for the an-variant. (283c) would be the passive of the sentence Er hat ihr ein Buch an sie geschickt (He has her.DAT a book.ACC onto(AN) her sent (‘He has sent her a book to her’,) and sounds strange in both the active and passive versions. On the other hand, the bekommen phrase may be assumed to be only a paraphrase (e.g., in accordance with McIntyre (2006)). The test would then be whether (283b) is a paraphrase for both the variants exemplified in (283a). I think it is, as I do not see a semantic difference concerning the role of the person once denoted in the an-variant and once the subject of the bekommen-phrase. Both the dative variant and the an-variant can be ‘seen from the end’, can denote a successful transfer of her getting the book. (Cf. Rappaport Hovav and Levin's (2008, section 5) discussion of the successful transfer inference, which they claim is again influenced by the verbal semantics and context, but not by the construction).

In the case of animate/inanimate DPs, Wegener admits that there are hardly any differences between the dative and the an-variant and concludes that the preposition an is the most dative-like preposition in German.
The question thus has to be asked whether the categorization of the dative – possession vs. preposition – location is really the analysis which can capture the actual factors which motivate dative-prepositional alternations in German. Moreover, the incongruities in the reflections of meaning differences in the above linguistic descriptions indicate that analyzing dative and prepositional constructions is a much more subtle issue which also has to include semantic descriptions of the verbs and the contexts. A clear account is additionally difficult as, unfortunately, the analyses of Wilmanns, Erben, Matzel, and Wegener, together with recent linguists such as Wunderlich and Meinunger, rarely support their reflections on the meaning differences of the various constructions with actual data. In this field, intuitions seem to have been enough to support semantic claims. As a result, I feel that this topic still lacks a thorough analysis which will account for the actual use and the actual range and limits of the semantic covering of these constructions.

The following discussion of the rules governing argument alternations with German verbs of transfer and the respective prepositions which appear as alternations has been inspired by Rappaport Hovav and Levin’s verb-sensitive approach to English and Wagner’s (2003) unpublished paper on German discussing similarities and differences in the argument alternations of geben (give), senden (send) and aussetzen (expose) with respect to the English variants. German shows a similar pattern of alternation involving transfer verbs to English, and my findings regarding the motivations of the alternations support Rappaport Hovav and Levin’s position. In German, the semantics of the verbs involved and sometimes their immediate semantic environment, the first complement, determines the grammaticality of the various constructions. Events as either caused motion or caused possession play a central role. However, as a result of richer morphosyntactic resources, German makes finer semantic distinctions in the semantics of the various dative-related constructions. The semantics of the prepositions and the semantic role of the dative case, as discussed in chapter 3, further influence the alternation within the event schemata given. The dative variant is in some instances discouraged because the role of the third participant is not or cannot be an experiencer. This finding in some sense completes the circle back to the old description of the dative case as the personal case of the German language.
5.1.3 Overview of the constructions discussed in this chapter and preview of the results:

Table 12:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geben-type class: no alternation:</th>
<th>Stehlen-type class: the dative/von alternation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a. Oli gab Peter das Buch</td>
<td>5a. Oli stiehlt Peter das Buch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Oli gave Peter the book.’</td>
<td>5b. Oli stiehlt das Buch von Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarly, schenken (give ‘free of charge’), widmen (dedicate), lassen and überlassen, (leave s.t.h. to s.o.).</td>
<td>Similarly, nehmen (take), entwenden (take away), rauben (rob)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verkaufen-type class: the dative/an alternation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2a. Oli verkaufte Peter das Buch</td>
<td>5a. Oli stiehlt Peter das Buch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b. Oli verkaufte das Buch an Peter</td>
<td>5b. Oli stiehlt das Buch von Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Oli sold the book/the book to Peter’</td>
<td>‘Oli stole the book from Peter’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarly, überweisen (transfer money), vermieten (rent), vererben (bequeath), ab-/übergeben, weiterleiten (forward, give over)</td>
<td>Similarly, nehmen (take), entwenden (take away), rauben (rob)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schicken type class: the dative/an/zu alternation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3a. Oli schickte Peter den Brief</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b. Oli schickte den Brief an Peter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c. Oli schickte den Brief zu Peter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3d. Oli schickte Peter den Brief zu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Oli sent Peter the letter/the letter to Peter’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarly, senden (send), faxen (fax), mailen (email), funken (cable).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bringen: the dative/zu alternation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4a. Oli brachte Peter das Paket</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b. Oli brachte das Paket zu Peter</td>
<td>‘Oli brought Peter the package/the package to Peter.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Werfen-type class: the PP zu/ particle-zu alternation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5a. Oli warf den Ball zu Peter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. Oli warf Peter den Ball zu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Oli threw Peter the ball/the ball to Peter’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarly, schleudern (fling), kicken (kick), stoßen (toss), schießen (shoot)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following table shows the alignment of the constructions with the event schemata ‘caused possession’ and ‘caused motion’. The additions in brackets indicate special meanings resulting from the semantics of the verb or the prepositions themselves, or from the conventional implicatures of a construction. As discussed below, they also influence grammaticality and govern the alternation in specific cases. These factors cannot be captured by a mere event schema alignment. Especially for stehlen (steal)-type verbs, in the alternation between the dative/von-variant the event schemata caused possession and caused motion do not seem to play a role, but rather a +/- necessary experiencer role of the third participant, as will be introduced and illustrated below.
Even though the für-variant, which, among all the prepositions not included in my investigation, most resembles the transfer event, does appear in various sections in this dissertation, I will not include it in this final discussion, but will leave it, together with other dative-prepositional alternations appearing in German, for further study.

Table 13:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>dative</th>
<th>in</th>
<th>zu</th>
<th>particle-zu</th>
<th>von</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>geben</td>
<td>Caused possession</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verkaufen</td>
<td>Caused possession (transfer) (experiencer)</td>
<td>Caused possession (transfer)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schicken</td>
<td>Caused possession (transfer) (experiencer)</td>
<td>Caused motion (with or without caused possession)</td>
<td>Caused possession (with motion) (experiencer)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>werfen</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Caused motion (with or without possession)</td>
<td>Caused possession (with motion) (experiencer)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stehlen</td>
<td>Caused loss of possession (experiencer)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Caused motion or Caused loss of possession (with or without motion)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

74 The dative construction is not ungrammatical, but the dative DP does not denote a recipient or goal. It denotes the bene/maleficiary of the throwing event.

75 Not necessarily, but often the default use. As the dative argument is not selected by the verb, it can also denote the bene/maleficiary, the possessor of the theme argument, or an ethical dative.
5.2 Governing factor 1: Caused possession vs. caused motion events

5.2.1 Geben (give)-type and verkaufen (sell)-type classes

5.2.1.1 Association with the caused possession schema only

Both geben- and verkaufen-type verbs can be distinguished from other verbs participating in dative related alternations in that the third participant, the recipient, is lexicalized in the semantics of the verb. There cannot be a geben- or verkaufen-type event without the existence of a third participant, and the third participant must be understood as a recipient. These events lexicalize a HAVE relation, which need a subject of x have y, x being different from the agent. These verbs therefore associate naturally with the caused possession schema, which will always have a recipient, even if it is not realized in the morphosyntax. I propose that these verbs are not associated with the caused motion schema, as they do not lexicalize a path element and can denote non-spatial events. The test of this claim is that the recipient of these verbs cannot be realized as a spatial goal with PPs headed by zu and nach. The latter prepositions, as analyzed in Chapter 2, lexicalize a path element. These verbs are not grammatical in a particle-zu construction either, which was shown in Chapter 4 to lexicalize a path.

(284) *Oli gibt/ schenkt/verkauft/vermietet/ vererbt/ das Buch zu seinem Freund.

Oli gives/grants/sells/rents/bequeaths the book.ACC to(ZU) his friend
‘Oli is giving/… the book to his friend.’

(285) *Oli gibt/schenkt/verkauft/vermietet/vererbt seinem Freund das Buch zu.

Oli gives/grants/sells/rents/bequeaths his friend.DAT the book.ACC to-
‘Oli is giving/… his friend the book.’

Some of these verbs, such as verkaufen, can have an additional spatial goal phrase, as in (286) below. However, this goal is not understood as the recipient. As the recipient argument of verkaufen can easily be left unrealized (Oli verkauft seine Produkte (Oli sells his products)), sentences such as (286) are grammatical. The interpretation is simply that the products reach France/the North Pole, but the recipient is left open (it can be realized by an
additional an-phrase or a dative DP). I use the bekommen (get)-paraphrase as a construction to make the recipient argument transparent.

(286)  

a. Oli verkauft seine Produkte zum Nordpol/ nach Frankreich.
Oli sells his products.ACC to-the north-pole/ to France
‘Oli sells his products to the North Pole/ to France.’
b. *Der Nordpol / Frankreich bekommt Olis Produkte.
   The north-pole/France.NOM gets Oli’s products.ACC
   ‘The North Pole/ France gets Oli’s products’

(287)  

a. Oli verkauft seine Produkte an die Kunden.
Oli sells his products.ACC onto (AN) the clients
‘Oli sells his products to the clients.’
b. *Die Kunden bekommen Olis Produkte.
   The Clients.NOM get Oli’s products.ACC
   ‘The clients get Oli’s products.’

This situation contrasts with a true goal/recipient alternation using the verb schicken (send). The location central office is understood here as a metonymy, and thus may be a recipient.

(288)  

a. Oli schickt die Dokumente zur Zentralstelle.
Oli sends the documents.ACC to the central office
‘Oli is sending the documents to the central office.’
b. →Die Zentralstelle bekommt die Dokumente.
   The central-office.NOM gets the documents.ACC
   ‘The central office gets the documents.’

5.2.1.2 Contrasting geben-type and verkaufen-type verbs

Geben- and verkaufen-type verbs differ in that the latter show the alternation between a bare dative construction and the prepositional construction headed by an (the an-variant), while the former are ungrammatical in this construction:
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As shown above and elaborated on in chapter 2, this difference in realization is not caused by spatial semantics that *geben*-type verbs lack and *verkaufen*-type verbs possess. Both types lexicalize a change in possession but not in location, but the type of change is different. Whereas the former only lexicalize causing a HAVE relation, the latter also involves causing a not HAVE relation or at least a kind of release of possession on the part of the agent. In Rappaport Hovav and Levin (2008, p. 140) this kind of event is termed *transfer* of possession, as compared to a mere *change* of possession. This property can be clarified by the fact that *verkaufen*-type verbs, in both the dative and *an*-variants, are ungrammatical with abstract external arguments, which are usually incapable of forwarding and/or losing possession. The following paradigm is especially illustrative as it involves two related verbs, *schenken* and *verschenken* (give generously vs. give away generously). The prefix *ver-*, which appears in several *verkaufen*-type verbs such as *verkaufen*, *vermieten*, and *vererben*, once had the semantically transparent meaning of *away*. It is etymologically related to the still productive particle *fort* (as in *fortfahren*, *fortgehen*, drive away, go away). *Verschenken* is thus a *verkaufen*-type verb with the special semantics of ‘caused transfer of possession’, whereas *schenken* is a *geben*-type verb.

(291) a. Peter (ver)schenkte Oli seine Briefmarkensammlung.

Peter gave (away) Oli.DAT his stamp collection.ACC

‘Peter gave Oli his stamp collection/ gave his stamp collection away to Oli.’

b. Das Schicksal/ sein einzigartiges Talent schenkte Oli ein langes Leben.

The fate/ his unique talent gave Oli.DAT a long life.ACC

‘Fate/ his unique talent gave Oli a long life.’
The fate/ his unique talent gave away Oli.DAT a long life.ACC

d. *Das Schicksal/ sein einzigartiges Talent verschenke ein langes Leben an Oli.  
The fate/ his unique talent gave away a long life.ACC onto(AN) Oli.DAT  
‘Fate/ his unique talent gave a long life away to Oli’

As can be seen in (291), schenken, but not verschenken, can have an abstract subject such as das Schicksal (fate). This constraint on the selection of the subject is connected to the semantics of the verb, but not to the choice of construction, and therefore it can be concluded that as soon as a verb is a verkaufen-type verb, it has the same semantic kind of caused possession, namely transfer of possession, in both its dative and an-variants, as exemplified in (291c), a dative variant, and (291d), the corresponding an-variant.

This additional semantics of verkaufen-type verbs licenses the selection of the an-phrase, as elaborated in chapter 2.

(292)   Peter *(ver)schenkte seine Briefmarkensammlung an Oli.  
Peter gave-away-generously his stamp-collection.ACC onto(AN) Oli  
‘Peter gave away his stamp collection to Oli.’

It is important for the present discussion on what governs the alternation between the dative variant and the an-variant that geben- and verkaufen-type verbs are both associated with the caused possession schema. If a VP allows an an-variant, then both its dative variant and the an-variant specify its denoted event as a transfer of possession event. Verkaufen-type verbs do not lose this specification in the dative variant, and the specification is realized in the an-variant. I thus assume that verkaufen-type verbs are not associated with two different schemata, one ‘caused possession’ and the other ‘caused transfer of possession’, with each schema leading to a different realization.
Figure 14: *geben* and *verkaufen*:

Both constructions can be used in the same context, as the following examples shows:

(293) Schon 1894 füllte Joseph Biedenharn, […], die fertige Limonade in Krüge um und *verkaufte* diese Behälter dann an Feldarbeiter. Er *verkaufte den beiden* die Lizenz zum Coca Cola Abfüllen für einen Dollar.

Already in 1894, Joseph Biedenharn […] filled the ready lemonade into jars, and sold these containers onto (AN) field workers. He sold the both the license to the Coca Cola bottling for one dollar.

‘Already in 1894, Joseph Biedenharn, […], filled the ready lemonade into jars and sold these containers to field workers. He sold the two of them the license to bottle Coca Cola for one dollar.’

(http://www.lerntippsammlung.de/Coca-Cola.html)

I will leave the question open as to whether 'caused transfer of possession' is a distinct event schema from 'caused possession', i.e., whether the loss of possession component that *verkaufen*-type verbs have and *geben*-type verbs lack is only expressed in the root or also in the event schema. At any rate, some verbs are underspecified concerning the type of caused possession event with which they associate, a fact which supports the view that 'caused transfer of possession' is the same event schema, or at most a subtype, of 'caused possession', but not an entirely different event schema. As presented in chapter 2, the joint semantics of the verb and theme argument is sometimes decisive in providing the semantic conditions for (not) licensing an *an*-phrase. Here, the theme argument provides the necessary information to complete the meaning of the verb. Illustrating is the following example:
(294) a. Die Universität verlieh einen Preis/ die Lehrbefugnis an den Forscher.
The university granted a prize/ the teaching-authority.ACC onto (AN) the researcher
‘The university granted a prize/ the teaching authority to the researcher.
b. Die Lichter verliehen einen festlichen Glanz *an die Stadt.
The lights granted a festive glitter.ACC onto(AN) the city
‘*The lights granted a festive glitter to the city.’
c. Die Lichter verliehen der Stadt einen festlichen Glanz.
The lights granted the city.DAT a festive glitter.ACC
‘The lights gave the city a festive glitter.’

The theme argument prize or authority in (a) triggers a release of possession meaning, while glitter in (b) refutes this meaning and leaves the kind of HAVE relation underspecified, meaning only causing the HAVE relation, and nothing more. Clearly, the lights do not lose the glitter they are creating in the city. As elaborated in Chapter 3, the dative DP of such a V(P) can be inanimate, as in (c).

The semantics of the complement indicates whether verleihen will act like a geben-type verb or a verkaufen-type verb. Einen Preis verleihen (‘to grant a prize’) would, like verkaufen-type verbs, describe a transfer of possession event, whereas Glanz verleihen (‘to grant glitter’) would, like geben-type verbs, describe a caused possession event. However, there is again no semantic difference between the dative and the an-variant concerning the two types of caused possession events. As soon as the semantics of the verb is completed with the joint semantics of verb + complement, both the dative and the an-variant denote the same kind of caused possession event. See Chapter 2.2.5 for a detailed discussion of these verbs in comparison with verbs which do not behave in this manner.

5.2.1.3 Morphosyntactic motivation for the dative/an alternation

Following the above proposal that not just geben-type verbs, but also verkaufen-type verbs only associate with the caused possession schema, the alternation between the bare dative and the an-variant should be found to be morphosyntactically motivated. Even though a thorough analysis of the morphosyntactic behavior of the two constructions turned out to be beyond the scope of this dissertation, I will present some guidelines for further study. Three facts
concerning the syntactic behavior will be illustrated, which lead to the proposal of three motivating factors:

(i) The *an*-variant (like all prepositional constructions discussed) is syntactically more flexible than the dative variant; it appears in many more syntactic configurations. Thus, in some instances the *an*-variant may be the syntactically-preferred variant as it violates fewer prosodic or other constraints.

(ii) The *an*-variant is semantically more transparent than the dative variant. Choosing the *an*-variant may therefore be motivated by the need to disambiguate it from other dative DPs in the VP or from other possible roles of the dative.

(iii) The unmarked order of theme and recipient in the dative variant is in reverse order (recipient – theme) compared to the unmarked order of the arguments in the *an*-variant (theme – recipient). Thus, the choice of the variants may be dependent on the information structure of the context.

(i): Syntactic flexibility and choosing the construction with the fewest violations:
German allows the scrambling of the two internal arguments, and therefore there are two grammatical versions for each variant.

(295) Oli verkauft dem Kunden das Auto/ das Auto dem Kunden
Oli sells the client.DAT the car.ACC/ the car.ACC the client.DAT
‘Oli is selling the client the car’

(296) Oli verkauft das Auto an den Kunden/ an den Kunden das Auto
Oli sells the car.ACC onto(AN) the client/ onto(AN) the client the car.ACC
‘Oli is selling the car to the client’

However, as Wegener (1985, pp. 221-222) shows, the dative construction is more sensitive than the prepositional construction to the syntactic form of the arguments. If the recipient argument is a personal pronoun or an indefinite NP, the prepositional construction still allows scrambling without impeding the interpretation or intonational constraints. However, the dative construction is more constrained and cannot be scrambled in these cases. (I want to point out that Wegener did not take information structure into account. The
The following constructions are in principle grammatical, but may hardly ever appear, as discussed in (iii.).

The first example suggests that a pronoun does not appear in a stressed position. Embedded into a PP, pronouns can appear anywhere.

(297)  

DAT: Oli verkaufte ihr das Auto / *das Auto ihr (cf. Wegener (155))

Oli sold her.DAT the car.ACC / sold the car.ACC her.DAT

‘Oli sold her the car’

PP: Oli verkaufte das Auto an sie / an sie das Auto

Oli sold the car.ACC onto(AN) her / onto(AN) her the car.ACC

‘Oli sold the car to her’

The second example shows that arguments expressed in indefinite noun phrases without a determiner cannot be scrambled, most probably because of a lack of overt case assignment. Embedded in a PP, they can appear in both positions. Presumably it might be enough to turn one of the noun phrases into a DP to render the dative variants felicitous again.

(298)  

DAT: Sie schickte [Eltern und Verwandten] [Ansichtskarten]/

*[Ansichtskarten] [Eltern und Verwandten] (Wegener (206))

She sent parents and relatives.DAT postcards.ACC/

She sent postcards.ACC parents and relatives.DAT

PP: Sie schickte [an Eltern und Verwandte] [Ansichtskarten]/

[Ansichtskarten] [an Eltern und Verwandte]

She sent onto(AN) parents and relatives postcards.ACC/

She sent postcards.ACC onto(AN) parents and relatives.

‘She sent postcards to parents and relatives.’

(299)  

DAT: Er liefert Großhändlern Waren/

*Waren Großhändlern

He delivers goods.ACC wholesale dealers.DAT /

*wholesale dealers.DAT goods.ACC

‘He delivers goods to wholesale dealers.’
The next example is not Wegener’s original example; the verb that appears in her example is *kaufen* (buy), which alternates with the preposition *für* (for). I assume, however, that the contrast is also felt with the verb *schicken* (send).

(300)    DAT: Er schickt [dem Kind] [einen Brief] (cf. Wegener (153))
         *?[einen Brief] [dem Kind]
         PP:   Er schickt [an das Kind] [einen Brief]
                [einen Brief] [an das Kind]
         He sends the child.DAT a letter.ACC/ a letter.ACC onto(AN) the child
         ‘He is sending the child a letter/ a letter to the child.’

If in rare cases the theme argument can be left unexpressed, the recipient is preferably expressed by a PP than by a dative DP. Wegener's original examples again involve indefinite noun phrases which could be discouraged as above, but with a definite DP, the sentence sounds slightly better, but the PP is still preferred.

(301)    a. Er liefert nur an Großhändler / ?Großhändlern. (Wegener (156))
             He delivers only onto(AN) wholesale dealers/ wholesale dealers.DAT
             ‘He delivers only to wholesale dealers.’
             He delivers only onto(AN) the king/ the king.DAT
             ‘He delivers only to the king.’

The PP is also preferred as an argument to a participle in nominal phrases:

(302)    die *ihn vermietete Wohnung / die an ihn vermietete Wohnung (Wegener (162))
             The him.DAT rented apartment / the to him rented apartment
             'the apartment that was rented to him'

These differences in the flexibility of the syntactic realization result in the important fact that the prepositional construction provides more syntactic possibilities for speakers than the dative construction. Still, proposing that the *an*-variant functions as the construction which compensates for an ungrammatical dative variant cannot be supported for all cases.
Concerning the contrasts between the dative variant and the *an*-variant so far, there is an interesting observation to be made. Wegener presented these examples to illustrate contrasts of grammaticality between the dative variant and prepositional variants in general. However, she does not take verbal semantics into account, and therefore the examples all make use of verbs which have a prepositional variant, such as *verkaufen*- and *schicken*-type verbs, and not verbs which are only grammatical in the dative construction, namely *geben*-type verbs. The phenomenon is however that if a verb does not have an *an*-variant in the first place, the above constructions are now grammatical:

\[(303)\] die *ihm* erlassene Strafe, der *ihm* gereichte Becher, der *ihm* zugeworfene Ball  
the him exempted punishment, the him handed cup, the him to-thrown ball  
'\(\text{the punishment from which he was exempted, the cup handed to him, the ball thrown to him}'

Examples with non-expressed theme arguments are rare, but possible:

\[(304)\] Er gab nur den Reichen  
He gives only the rich.DAT  
'He only gives to the rich'

The contrasts illustrated in (298), (299), and (300) are less important because the dispreferred constructions are naturally unusual because of information structure requirements. In (300), for example, new information, indicated by the indefinite DP, is usually placed after given information (the definite DP), and in (288) and (299) both arguments are indefinite and can only appear in situations in which both of them are new. However, two new discourse items do not usually provoke a scrambled structure. Nevertheless, I also consider the *geben*-type verbs more felicitous in this construction with an accented theme argument (see also the discussion below (iii)):

\[(305)\] Er widmete einen ganzen Vortrag seinen Eltern.  
He dedicated a whole lecture.ACC his parents.DAT  
'He dedicated a whole lecture to his parents'
Concerning pronouns in stressed positions, there is again an interesting contrast between *verkaufen*-type and *geben*-type verbs. If the verb does not have an *an*-variant, pronouns do appear in this position:

(306) Eine liebe Krankenschwester schenkte ihr dann *Harry Potter und die Kammer des Schreckens*... leider liest meine Schwester überhaupt nicht gerne und *schenkte das Buch mir*...

[...] and gave the book.*ACC mir*.*DAT*

‘And then a friendly nurse gave her *Harry Potter and the Chamber of Secrets*....Unfortunately my sister doesn’t like reading at all... and gave the book to me.’

(http://forum.harrypotter-xperts.de/thread.php?postid=534894)

This example allows me to conclude that the *an*-variant is preferred over the dative variant not because the dative variant is ungrammatical, but because the *an*-variant violates fewer prosodic and intonational constraints. The choice of the *an*-variant is therefore motivated by the linguistic principle of finding the construction that has fewer violations of constraints, in the spirit of the Optimality Theory (Prince and Smolensky (1993)).

To illustrate, (306), for example, would have triggered an *an*-variant if the verb had been a *verkaufen-* or *schicken*-type verb:

(307) …Leider liest meine Schwester nicht gerne, deshalb *verkaufte sie das Buch mir*/*an mich*.

[...] therefore sold she.*ACC mir*.*DAT/ onto(AN)* me

‘Unfortunately, my sister doesn’t like reading at all, therefore she sold the book to me.’

Another example is exemplified in the Coca-Cola sentence above (293). The indefinite plural noun phrase *Feldarbeiter* (field workers), which lacks a determiner, would be less felicitous in this position as a scrambled dative DP, thus providing a motivation to use the *an*-variant:
Er verkaufte diese Behälter dann *Feldarbeitern/ an Feldarbeiter
He sold these containers.ACC then field-workers.DAT / onto (AN) field-worker
'Then he sold these containers to field workers.'

The only case where a dative DP cannot appear at all is recipient complements of nominalized phrases. Here, the an-phrase functions as the only grammatical realization of this kind of argument for ‘verkaufen-type derived nouns’ and ‘geben-type derived nouns’

a. Der Verkauf (also: das Verkaufen, der Verkäufer) des Autos an die Frau
The sale (the selling, the seller) the car.GEN onto(AN) the woman
‘the selling/ seller of the car to the woman’

b. *Der Verkauf der Frau des Autos / des Autos der Frau
the selling-of the woman.DAT the car.GEN/ the car.GEN the Frau.DAT
‘the sale of the car to the woman’

Interestingly, this situation creates uses of prepositions which would be ungrammatical in the corresponding verbal phrase:

[das] Schenken des Lebens an eine neue menschliche Person
The giving the life.GEN onto(AN) a new human person
‘The giving of the life to a new human person’

*Sie schenkten das Leben an eine neue menschliche Person.
They gave_generously the life.ACC onto(AN) a new human person
‘They gave the life to a new human person.’
(ii): Semantic transparency and disambiguation

The PP construction, and not the dative, is much preferred in a four-participant event (Wegener, p. 222). Two datives in one clause are discouraged in German, unless one of them is a pronoun (Wegener, p. 276). The greater semantic transparency of PP constructions, such as the *an*-phrase, plays to their advantage, as it disambiguates similar roles which could in theory both be encoded with a dative DP.

(312) a.*? Oli verkaufte *dem Wagenhändler der Frau* das Auto. (cf. Wegener (157))

Oli sold the car-dealer.DAT the woman.DAT the car

Should be ' Oli sold for the car dealer the car to the woman.'

b. Oli verkaufte *dem Wagenhändler das Auto an die Frau.*

Oli sold the car dealer.DAT the car.ACC onto(AN) the woman

‘Oli sold, on behalf of the car dealer, the car to the woman.’

c. Oli verkaufte *für den/ anstelle des Wagenhändlers der Frau das Auto.*

Oli sold for the/ instead-of the car-dealer the woman.DAT the car.ACC

‘Oli sold the woman the car instead for/ instead of the car dealer.’

d. Oli verkaufte *für den Wagenhändler das Auto an die Frau.*

Oli sold for the car-dealer the car.ACC onto(AN) the woman

‘Oli sold the car to the woman for the car dealer’

Another motivation for the *an*-variant can therefore be claimed to be the need to disambiguate if the respective dative DP would be too vague or ambiguous.

(iii): Reversed unmarked word orders and information structure:

The syntactic difference between the two constructions is that the recipient argument and theme argument appear in a reversed unmarked word order.

(313) ..weil Oli seinem Freund das Auto verkaufte.

...because Oli.NOM his friend.DAT the car.ACC sold

[Subj][dative object][acc object] verb

[agent] [recipient][theme] verb

‘…because Oli sold his friend the car.’
These word orders are preferred by speakers over their scrambled variants in a neutral context (as I tested on my informants with clear results). In addition, there are two tests for unmarked word orders, already applied to particle construction in Chapter 4.4, the VP fronting test and the minimal/maximal focus test. In the focus test, an unmarked word order can display maximal focus, including arguments of the verb, while a marked word order would only display a minimal focus of the closest verbal argument. In the VP fronting test, only a split VP of an unmarked word order can be fronted, while fronting a part of the VP of a marked word order creates an ungrammatical sentence.

(315) **Focus test** (cf. Olsen (1997) (29)):

Was ist passiert? What happened?

a. Ich glaube, dass er dem Kunden das Buch verkauft hat  **max focus**
   I think that he.NOM the client.DAT the book.ACC sold has
   'I think that he sold the client the book'

b. Ich glaube, dass er das Buch dem Kunden verkauft hat  **min focus**
   I think that he.NOM the book.ACC the client.DAT sold has
   'I think that he sold the client the book'

(316) Was ist passiert? What happened?

a. Ich glaube, dass er das Buch an den Kunden verkauft hat  **max focus**
   I think that he.NOM the book.ACC onto(AN) the client sold has
   'Surely it wasn’t the book that he sold to the client.'

b. Ich glaube, dass er an den Kunden das Buch verkauft hat  **min focus**
   I think that he.NOM onto(AN) the client the book.ACC sold has
   'Surely it wasn’t the book that he sold to the client.'

(317) **VP topicalization**:

a. Das Buch verkauft hat er dem Kunden ja nicht.
   The book.ACC sold has he.NOM the client.DAT surely not
   'Surely it wasn’t the book that he sold to the client.'
In the following section I propose that in actual discourse two factors interact in the choice of the variants:

(I) The discourse structure requirement of given before new information

(II) Easier processing of base word order than scrambled word order

Experiments testing reading time and eye movement provide empirical evidence for (II) (Rayner and Sereno (1994), Haberlandt (1994), Sekerina (2003)), and discourse structure requires that new information follows given information (cf. Halliday (1967), Chafe (1976), Prince (1981), Foley and Van Valin (1985), etc.); thus supporting the assumption that the variants are chosen according to whether recipient or theme is discourse given and should be mentioned first. In discourse with a given recipient, the dative variant is predicted to be preferred, and in discourse with a given theme argument, the an-variant.

Differences in the information structure of discourse are a known motivation for scrambled word order. For geben-type verbs, which do not have a prepositional variant, the two word orders which interchange are the unmarked DAT ACC word order, and the marked ACC DAT word order. Lenerz (1977) points out an asymmetry in the use of the constructions. The DAT ACC word order is felicitous in a given recipient context, and also, by deaccenting the ACC argument, in a given theme context. The ACC DAT word order, on the other hand, is only felicitous in a given theme context. As posited for verkaufen-type verbs below, this
situation is probably the result of a preference on the part of German speakers to use, whenever possible, constructions in unmarked base word order. However, the ‘deaccenting device’ is only possible if the theme argument is expressed with a full DP, not with a pronoun. It is much more common to replace given information with proforms, and therefore one seldom finds the deaccented DAT ACC version in natural conversions, especially written texts, where one cannot mark unusual prosody.

(319)  a. Was macht Oli mit dem Buch? (→ Buch (theme) given information)
   ‘What does Oli do with the book?’
   - Er gibt es/ das Buch seinem Freund
     He gives it.ACC/the book.ACC his friend.DAT
   - Er gibt seinem Freund das Buch
     He gives his friend.DAT (accented) the book.ACC
     ‘He is giving it/the book to his friend’

   b. Was gibt Oli seinem Freund? (→ Freund (recipient) given information)
   ‘What does Oli give his friend?’
   - Oli gibt ihm/ seinem Freund ein Buch
     Oli gives him.DAT/his friend.DAT a book.ACC
     ‘Oli is giving him a book’

The following examples are taken from the internet, and show the behavior of geben-type verbs. In (320), the word order ACC DAT of widmen (dedicate) is triggered by a given theme argument, the fact that he won the match. DAT ACC (as in 320 b) would be infelicitous here (unless unusually accented, as discussed above). (321) shows an example of widmen with a given recipient.

(320)  a. Darren Clark gewinnt British Open und widmet den Sieg seiner verstorbenen Frau.
   Darren Clarks wins British Open and dedicates the victory.ACC his late wife.DAT
   ‘Darren Clarks wins the British Open and dedicates the victory to his late wife.’

b. *Darren Clark gewinnt British Open und widmet seiner verstorbenen Frau den Sieg.
Darren Clark wins British Open and dedicates his late wife the victory.

‘.... and dedicates to his late wife the victory.’

(321) a. Er malte nie die Glienicker Brücke. Auch das Brandenburger Tor oder die Mauer reihen sich nicht in seine Werke ein.
‘He did never paint the Glienicker Brücke. Also the Brandenburger Tor or the Wall join his works.’

But nevertheless dedicates the Villa Schöningen, the German-German museum on the border between Potsdam and Berlin, Andy Warhol (1928-1987). from Tuesday a big show.

‘But nevertheless, the Villa Schöningen […] dedicates Andy Warhol a big show starting Tuesday.’

(http://www.bz-berlin.de/archiv/jetzt-ist-warhol-ein-potsdamer-article1173116.html)

b. *Und dennoch widmete die Villa […] eine Show Andy Warhol.

And nevertheless dedicates the Villa […] a show. Andy Warhol.

‘And nevertheless, the Villa […] dedicates a show to Andy Warhol.’

The next example has already been mentioned above. It shows that, with geben-type verbs, even a pronoun (mir, me) which cannot usually be placed after a full NP due to prosody constraints may become scrambled if the information structure requires it.
Eine liebe Krankenschwester schenkte ihr dann *Harry Potter und die Kammer des Schreckens*... leider liest meine Schwester überhaupt nicht gerne und schenkte das Buch mir...

A friendly nurse gave her. **DAT** then ‘Harry Potter and the Chamber of Secrets’. **ACC**…Unfortunately my sister doesn’t like reading at all… and gave the book. **ACC** **DAT**…

‘And then, a friendly nurse gave her *Harry Potter and the Chamber of Secrets*. …unfortunately, my sister doesn’t like reading at all and gave the book to me.’

(http://forum.harrypotter-xperts.de/thread.php?postid=534894)

Unlike *geben*-type verbs, *verkaufen*-type verbs have four grammatical constructions which can be used in discourse: the dative variant in its base and scrambled word orders, and the *an*-variant in its base and scrambled word orders. I use different verbs in the question sentences to prevent priming effects in the answer sentences (see Melinger and Dobel (2005) for priming effects concerning the use of the constructions):

(322)  

(323) Was macht Oli mit dem Buch? (*Buch* (theme) given information)

‘What does Oli do with the book?’

- a. Er verkauft es/ das Buch seinem Freund.
- He sells it/the book. **ACC** his friend. **DAT**
- b. Er verkauft es/das Buch an seinen Freund.

He sells it/the book onto(AN) his friend, ‘He is selling it to his friend.’

(324) Was passiert mit Olis Freund da gerade? (Freund (recipient) given information)

‘What is happening with Oli’s friend over there?’

- a. Oli verkauft ihm/ seinem Freund ein Buch.

Oli sells him/his friend. **DAT** a book. **ACC**

- b. Oli verkauft an ihn/ an seinen Freund ein Buch.

Oli sells onto(AN) him/ onto(AN) his friend a book. **ACC**

‘Oli is selling him a book.’
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The interesting question now arises: which of the possible constructions is chosen in actual discourse? As scrambled word orders have been shown to involve a higher processing cost than canonical word orders⁷⁶, this cost could in theory motivate the choice of a base order variant over a scrambled variant in the correct information structure.

The intuitions of my informants as measured by an informal simple questionnaire were not as unambiguous as I had hoped. For some people, the dative variant was generally preferred over the *an*-variant, a choice probably influenced by stylistic preferences or by dialect variations. Wegener (1985, p. 77) points out that the dative is used much more in southern Germany (the origin of my informants) than in other parts of the country. One observation was however unambiguous: the canonical order dative variant was to a great extent preferred over the scrambled *an*-variant. If an *an*-variant was chosen, it was always a base order variant replacing a scrambled dative variant, especially a dative variant with two full DPs. The tendency was therefore as follows (list does not present ranking):

(325) a. Was macht Oli mit dem Buch? 'What does Oli do with the book?'
   - Er verkauft das Buch an seinen Freund.
     He sells the book.ACC onto(AN) his friend
   - Er verkauft es an seinen Freund/ es seinem Freund.
     He sells it.ACC onto(AN) his friend/ it.ACC his friend.DAT
     'He is selling it/the book to his friend.'

b. Was passiert mit Olis Freund da gerade? 'What happens with Oli's friend over there?'
   - Oli verkauft ihm/seinem Freund ein Buch
     Oli sells him.DAT/ his friend.DAT a book.ACC
     'Oli is selling him/his friend a book'

The following counting experiments in Google show the same tendency:
Concerning the discourse situation of a given theme, a simple count of dative variants or *an*-variants following an obvious given theme phrase, namely the pronoun *es* (it.ACC), shows a clear tendency to an *an*-variant.

⁷⁶ See Sekerina (2003) for an overview of psycholinguistic studies on the topic of scrambling and processing.
Table 14: Counts for the phrase "verkaufte es" (sold it.ACC)  
(first 100 out of 80,900):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Followed by dative recipient</th>
<th>Followed by <em>an</em>-phrase recipient</th>
<th>Irrelevant (e.g. without recipient)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second question, whether a given recipient triggers a canonical order dative variant or a scrambled *an*-variant is more difficult to answer based on a simple Google count. However, the following results indicate that it triggers a base order dative variant.

Results for the phrase 'verkaufte ihm' (sold him.DAT), which is most likely followed by an accusative theme argument: 19,100
Results for the phrase 'verkaufte an ihn' (sold onto(AN) him), which is most likely followed by an accusative theme argument: 101
Results for the phrase 'verkaufte ihr/ihnen' (sold her/them.DAT), 16,970
Results for the phrase 'verkaufte an sie' (onto(AN) her/ them) 57

Examples of discourse structures showing the typical choice of construction:

(326) Naja das Design ist noch etwas schlicht, allerdings ist mir das beim Lose(Ver)kauf auch relativ egal. Ich werde demnächst mal einige Lose *an dich* verkaufen.

‘Ok, the design is still kind of simple, but I don’t really care about this when buying or selling lottery tickets.’

I will soon some lottery-tickets.ACC onto(AN) you sell…

‘I will soon sell some lottery tickets to you.’

Am Montagnachmittag gegen 14.30 Uhr klingelte ein unbekannter Obsthändler an der Wohnungstür eines älteren Mannes an der Straße Spanische Schanzen und verkaufte dem Rheinberger eine Kiste Äpfel. ‘On Monday afternoon at around 2.30 P.M. an unknown fruit dealer rang the doorbell of an elderly man on Spanische Schanzen Straße [in Rheinberg] and sold this citizen of Rheinberg a box of apples.’

Doch dieses Fahrzeug blieb nur 3 Monate in meinem Besitz. Ich verkaufte es an einen Bauern nach Simonswald. ‘But this vehicle remained in my possession only for 3 months. I sold it to a farmer to Simonswald.’

Schon 1894 füllte Joseph Biedenharn, […] die fertige Limonade in Krüge um und verkaufte diese Behälter dann an Feldarbeiter. Er verkaufte den beiden die Lizenz zum Coca Cola Abfüllen für einen Dollar. Already in 1894, Joseph Biedenharn […] filled the ready lemonade into jars, and sold these containers. He sold the two of them the license to bottle Coca Cola for one dollar.
5.2.1.4 Summary

This subsection shows that *geben*-type and *verkaufen*-type verbs only associate with caused possession schema, and are therefore both realized in a dative variant. *Verkaufen*-type verbs have an additional realization option (the *an*-variant) because of the further specification of a particular type of caused possession, namely transfer of possession. This specification usually does not cause a semantic difference between the variants; *verkaufen*-type verbs denote this kind of caused possession in both their dative and *an*-variants. Following these generalizations, the dative/*an* alternation is proposed to be a morphosyntactically motivated alternation. Three types of motivation for the preference of one variant over the other have been presented. First, the greater syntactic flexibility of the *an*-variant motivates *an*-variants in syntactic configurations in which a dative variant is less felicitous. Second, the greater semantic transparency of the *an*-variant motivates *an*-variants if more than one dative is present in the syntactic structure, or presumably if the context blurs the specific interpretation of the dative. The phenomenon that the dative and *an*-variants show reversed canonical word orders of recipient and theme argument provides the basis for the third motivation. Canonical word orders are more easily to processed than scrambled ones, it has thus been proposed that different information structures of the context motivate the appearance of one or the other variant in accordance with the principle of given before new information.

5.2.2 *Schicken* (send)- and *werfen* (throw)-type verbs and *bringen* (bring)

5.2.2.1 Association with the caused motion schema

*Schicken* (send), *werfen* (throw), and *bringen* (bring) are all verbs that denote events which include some spatial change. Specifically, when they denote a three-participant event, some entity necessarily changes location. All the verbs are grammatical in the *zu*-variant, including animate and inanimate goals alike, and other spatial prepositions are also grammatical and associate with the caused motion event schema.

(330) Oli schickte das Buch zu Rina/zum Nordpol/ nach Italien.
Oli sent the book.ACC to(ZU) Rina/ to(ZU)-the north-pole/ to Italy
‘Oli sent the book to Rina/ to the North Pole/ to Italy.’
(331) Oli warf den Ball zu Rina/ zum Pfosten/ in den Korb.
Oli threw the ball.ACC to(ZU) Rina/ to(ZU)-the post/ into the basket
‘Oli threw the ball to Rina/ to the post/ into the basket.’

(332) Oli brachte die Kleider zu Rina/ zur Reinigung/ auf den Speicher.
Oli brought the clothes.ACC to(ZU) Rina/ to(ZU)-the drycleaner’s/ onto the attic
‘Oli brought the clothes to Rina/ to the drycleaner’s/ onto the attic.’

These verbs also associate with the caused possession schema in the case of theme arguments which can change possession and animate goals which can receive. However, they differ in the realization options for the caused possession schema because of the different semantic information they encode concerning an endpoint of the path the object traverses and the manner in which the object traverses the path.

5.2.2.2 Association with the caused possession schema

*Schicken*-type verbs, as compared in Chapter 4 to *werfen*-type verbs, have an encoded goal and are therefore directional. If the theme argument can be possessed, a dative DP is grammatical and is usually connected to the open goal position, and interpreted as the recipient. I use the *bekommen* paraphrase as a countercheck for the recipient role. In addition, the *an*-variant is also grammatical, as *schicken* lexicalizes a loss of possession and a release of the theme argument. In addition, *schicken*-type verbs are grammatical with a particle *zu*, if the caused possession event includes caused motion. The preposition then underlines the directionality.

(333) a. Oli schickte Rina das Buch/ das Buch an Rina/ Rina das Buch zu.
Oli sent Rina.DAT the book.ACC/the book.ACC onto(AN) Rina/
Rina.DAT the book.ACC to-
‘Oli sent Rina the book/ the book to Rina.’

b. = Rina bekam (von Oli) das Buch
Rina.NOM got (from Oli) the book.ACC
‘Rina got the book from Oli.’
The difference between the realization of a caused motion schema and caused possession schema is especially clear if the theme argument is abstract, as in the case of *Gruß* (regards) below. In this case, the dative and the *an*-variant are felicitous, the *zu*-variant much less so. Interestingly, the particle-*zu* variant is more felicitous, but renders the ‘regards’ less abstract; it seems to traverse the path spatially in form of a letter. The particle *zu* thus still encodes a spatial goal.

(334)  
      Oli sent Rina.DAT a greeting.ACC/ a greeting.ACC onto(AN)
      ‘Oli sent Rina his regards/ his regards to Rina.’

      Oli sent a greeting.ACC to(ZU) Rina/ Rina.DAT a greeting to-
      ‘Oli sent his regards to Rina’

On their own, *werfen*-type verbs are not directional. A dative DP added to a bare *werfen*-type verb would be interpreted as the bene/maleficiary, indicating that there is no transfer of possession associated with the verb (see the discussion in Chapter 4). Examples are therefore rare, but can be found in the context of dogs:

(335)  
Aus der Sicht eines Hundes: [...]Janina hat mir das Stöckchen geworfen.
      From the point of view of a dog: [...]Janina has me.DAT the stick.ACC
      thrown.
      ‘[...] and Janina threw the stick for me’

(http://www.sheltie-tico.de.tl/M.ae.rz-2O1O.htm)

The goal of the fetching game is not the dog; it is *away* from the dog. The dog is therefore the beneficiary, not the recipient. After the addition of a directional particle, however, the dative DP is, similarly to *schicken*-type verbs, associated with the open goal position and interpreted as the recipient. Inanimate goals are ungrammatical as dative DPs in this construction, which clearly supports the fact that this construction realizes a caused possession event. The *an*-variant is not found with the particle *zu*. However, it is found if the particle is changed to other directional particles as *weiter* or *zurück* (338):
(336)  a. Oli warf Rina/ *dem Türpfosten /*an Rina den Ball zu.
    Oli threw Rina.DAT/ the door post.DAT /onto(AN) Rina the ball.ACC to-
    ‘Oli threw Rina/ the door post/ to Rina the ball.’
   b. = Rina bekam (von Oli) den Ball.
     Rina.NOM got (from Oli) the ball.ACC
     ‘Rina got the ball from Oli.’

(337)  Der Ball wird an eine andere Person weitergeworfen, [...] 
    The ball.NOM is onto(AN) an other person on-thrown
    ‘The ball is thrown on to another person’
    (http://lehrerfortbildung-bw.de/bs/bsa/bej/englisch/uebung/five.htm)

It will be shown later in detail that zuwerfen, but not werfen zu, is found with theme arguments that are more associated with recipients than with spatial goals, such as Kuss (kiss) or Stöckchen (blog stick) thus making the realizations of the different event schemata clear.

(338)  Oli warf Rina einen Kuss/ ein Stöckchen zu.
    Oli threw Rina.DAT a kiss.ACC/ a blog-stick.ACC to-
    ‘Oli blew Rina a kiss/ threw Rina a blog stick.’

    Oli threw a kiss.ACC/ a blog-stick.ACC to(ZU) Rina
    ‘Oli blew a kiss to Rina/ threw a blog stick to Rina.’

Bringen has quite idiosyncratic semantics; I have (yet) not found a verb which has the same argument pattern. It lexicalizes a goal like schicken. The dative variant is therefore grammatical and the dative DP is interpreted as the recipient, similar to schicken and zuwerfen. Unlike these two verbs, however, bringen entails a continuous imparting of force, like schieben (push) and tragen (carry) (cf. Pinker (1991)) The latter verbs, on the other hand, do not have a lexicalized goal and are ungrammatical in a recipient-dative variant. The agent and the theme argument must together traverse the path to the goal. The agent is therefore the vehicle of the movement, but is not lexicalized as a previous possessor or as the initiator of a change of possession event. I assume that bringen does not lexicalize a loss or release of possession because the agent never leaves the item brought until it reaches the goal.
destination. Therefore, the an-variant is ungrammatical with *bringen. The bekommen paraphrase is therefore felicitous concerning the recipient (*Rina), but not concerning the previous possessor (*Oli). *Oli seems to be only the vehicle of transfer.

(340) a. Oli brachte Rina das Buch /*das Buch an Rina.
   Oli brought Rina.DAT the book.ACC/ the book.ACC onto(AN) Rina
   ‘Oli brought Rina the book/ the book to Rina.’

b. = Rina bekam (?* von Oli) das Buch.
   Rina.NOM got (from Oli) the book.ACC
   ‘Rina got the book (but not ‘from Oli’).’

Again, the association with a caused possession schema, but not with a caused motion schema, can be made clear with an abstract theme argument which cannot traverse a path, such as Glück (luck). This kind of theme argument cannot be realized in a zu-variant.

(341) Das Buch brachte Oli Glück/ Glück zu Oli.
The book brought Oli.DAT luck.ACC/ luck.ACC to(ZU) Oli
‘The book brought Oli luck.’

Figure 15: Schicken, werfen and bringen:
5.2.2.3 The zu-variant in a caused possession event

Even though the zu-variant has briefly been shown to be ungrammatical with some theme arguments, it is nevertheless highly associated with a possessive event, as long as the change of possession is combined with a caused motion event. Thus it has been shown in Chapter 2 that in ball games it is even infelicitous to use a zuPP if the person is not supposed to catch the ball. In the following sentence the connector cannot be aber (but) because the presupposed result is Rina catching the ball:

(342) *Oli warf den Ball zu Rina, *aber/ und sie fing ihn.
Oli threw the ball.ACC to(ZU) Rina, but/ and she.NOM caught him.ACC
‘Oli threw the ball to Rina, but she caught it.’

This sentence raises the question whether the zu-variant should be counted among the realization options for caused possession events, like the to-variant in English, which can realize both a caused motion and a caused possession event with send-and throw-type verbs. Truly, with werfen-type verbs, the zu-variant appears interchangeably in ball game contexts with the particle-zu construction (see details below). Unlike English, however, in which the to-variant can also realize a ‘pure’ caused possession event of give-type verbs, the zu-variant in German can only be a realization option in caused possession events which also involve a change of location. If the caused possession event is simultaneously construed as a caused motion event, the zu-variant can also denote it, but only then.

The contrast with English aside, I decided not to consider the zu-variant to belong to the caused possession realization options, because even an animate goal, which triggers the possessive interpretation in the absence of more information, can be a non-receiving goal. It does not necessarily turn the construction into a caused possession construction. The interpretation in which the animate goal is the recipient can also be discarded, thus distinguishing the zu-variant from other, ‘authentic’ realizations for the caused possession schema. In a context in which the denoted person is not present, and therefore cannot receive the theme argument, the zu-variant is still perfectly acceptable, as it allows for a reinterpretation of the denotee of the complement of zu as a bare location, unlike the dative variant (for bringen) or the particle-zu-variant (for werfen):
Der Postbote brachte/ schickte das Paket zu mir/*mir das Paket, aber ich war nicht Zuhause. (cf. Olsen (1997, p. 312)

The postman brought/ sent the package.ACC to(ZU) me/ *me.DAT the package.ACC, but I was not home.

In a throwing event, it is more difficult to show the difference, as, especially in ball games, the location of the animate being cannot be separated from the animate being itself. However, the following sentence does show some difference between the \textit{zu}-variant and the particle-\textit{zu} variant with an animate goal phrase. Only the \textit{zu}-variant is grammatical in the scene where I was not present when the event happened:

(343) Oli warf das Paket \textit{zu} mir, in mein Baumhaus hoch /* mir das Paket \textit{zu}, in mein Baumhaus hoch, aber ich war gerade nicht da.

Oli threw the package to(ZU) me, into my tree-house high / me.DAT the package.ACC to-, into my tree-house high, but I was just not there

‘Oli threw the package to me high up into my tree house, but I was not there.’

There is, however, a distinction between a contrast which arises because of the two different event schemata, caused possession and caused motion, and a contrast arising from the entailment of the success of transfer and intended transfer. As in English, as pointed out by Rappaport Hovav and Levin (2008 p. 144ff), the dative of verbs which do not encode successful transfer, such as \textit{schicken}- and \textit{werfen}-type verbs, marks intended transfer of possession but not necessarily successful transfer, as opposed to \textit{geben}- and \textit{verkaufen}-type verbs, which entail successful transfer. The dative variants in the sentences above are ungrammatical, not because the intended transfer was interrupted, or simply did not succeed, but because the dative cannot encode a location without \textit{me} being there. The \textit{zu}-variant, however, can encode this information, independent of readings of unsuccessful transfer, as it is \textit{a priori} a realization of a caused motion schema. \textit{Zu mir} (to me) can mean ‘to my place’, but \textit{mir} (me.DAT) can only mean ‘to my person’.

To illustrate the contrast, a sentence with a dative DP which is grammatical in a non-successful intended transfer interpretation can be constructed with specific context and intonation and, more easily, with recipients other than \textit{me} (as the reading in which the recipient was not conscious of the event is much probable):
Was regst du dich auf, Oli hat dir den Ball zugeworfen, aber du bist halt plötzlich weggerannt!
What are you angry about, Oli has you.DAT the ball.ACC to-thrown, but you simply ran away suddenly
‘What are you angry about, Oli did throw you the ball, but you ran away suddenly!’

Below I illustrate in detail occurrences of werfen in other, non-ballistic contexts. The difference between the particle-zu variant and the zu-variant can be made transparent. Even though the account of the zu-variant as a realization of the caused possession event in special contexts cannot be completely ruled out, it seems more fitting to analyze it as compatible with possessive events in special contexts, but as realizing only a caused motion schema.

5.2.2.4 Morphosemantic motivation for schicken an vs. schicken zu

The alternation between schicken an (send onto(AN)) and schicken zu (send to(ZU)) can be shown to be morphosemantic. The semantic difference is clear when the choice is between two types of goals. A recipient goal (e.g., a person) will trigger the realization of the caused possession schema, whereas an inanimate location (such as the North Pole) the realization of the caused motion schema.

Er schickte den Brief zum Nordpol/*dem Nordpol/ *an den Nordpol.
He sent the letter.ACC to(ZU) the north-pole/ the north-pole.DAT/ onto(AN) the north-pole
‘He sent the letter to the North Pole /*the North Pole the letter.’

The same holds true for werfen-type verbs. The particle-zu variant (with a dative DP, see inanimate goal PPs in Chapter 4.3) is only grammatical with animate goals, which are understood as the recipient. If the goal cannot receive the theme argument, the zu-variant has to be used.
Er warf den Ball zum Pfosten.
He threw the ball.ACC to(ZU)-the post
‘He threw the ball to the post’

Er warf dem Freund/ *dem Pfosten den Ball zu.
He threw the friend.DAT/ the post.DAT the ball.ACC to-
‘He threw the friend/*the post the ball.’

As shown above, the presence or absence of the person denoted by the goal phrase can also be decisive for realizing a caused motion and not a caused possession schema:

The postman brought the package.ACC to(ZU) me/ me.DAT the package.ACC, but I was not home.
‘The postman brought the package to me, but I was not home.’

Oli warf das Paket zu mir, in mein Baumhaus hoch /* mir das Paket zu, in mein Baumhaus hoch, aber ich war gerade nicht da.
Oli threw the package.ACC to(ZU) me, into my tree-house high / me.DAT the package.ACC to-, into my tree-house high, but I was just not there
‘Oli threw the package to me high up into my tree house, but I was not there.’

The type of theme complement can also be a motivation for one or the other event schema. An animate theme argument, the students in the following example (cf. Rappaport Hovav and Levin 2008, p. 154), provides a context in which the caused possession schema is suppressed, despite the animate goal. The fact that the principal cannot possess the students sent to him is the motivation for realizing the verb in the caused motion schema (351). However, if a caused possession interpretation is intended, e.g., that the students should belong in the future to the teacher, to his study group, or to the students he supports financially, then a realization in the caused possession schema is possible: Sie schickte ihm ihren Doktoranten ( She sent him.DAT her PhD student.ACC) (ibid.):
With animate recipients, the choice between the two variants may also be motivated by the wish to emphasize the location of the recipient or the path the objects sent have to traverse.

5.2.2.5 Morphosyntactic motivation for zuwerfen vs. werfen zu

Even though the particle-\textit{zu} variant has been claimed to entail caused possession, and the \textit{PP}zu-variant only caused motion, \textit{zuwerfen} and \textit{werfen zu} do appear in the same contexts, namely, as mentioned above, those in which an event is simultaneously caused motion and caused possession. This finding is not surprising because in PPs headed by the preposition \textit{zu} animate goals are also interpreted as recipients. The use of both constructions in a caused
possession scenario (supported by the use of the preposition an in the following sentence) can be seen in the case of ball games:

Ball werfen zu:

(354) Die Leitung beginnt und wirft einen Ball zu einer Person. Die Person fängt und wirft den Ball weiter an eine dritte Person [...].
The leadership begins and throws a ball.ACC to(ZU) a person. This person catches and throws the ball.ACC forth onto(AN) a third person [...] ‘The leaders begin and throw a ball to a person. This person catches the ball and throws it on to a third person.’
(www.synthese.de/spielekartei_gruppe.html)

Ball zuwerfen:

(355) Lehrer/in gibt das Thema an und wirft den Ball einer Person zu, diese sagt ihre Meinung dazu. Der Ball wird an eine andere Person weitergeworfen, die jetzt die entgegengesetzte Meinung vertreten muss.
Teacher introduces the subject and throws the ball.ACC a person.DAT to-, this one says her opinion there-to. The ball is onto(AN) another person forth-thrown, who now the opposite opinion support must.
‘The teacher introduces the subject and throws one of the persons the ball. This person adds his/her opinion to it. The ball is then thrown on to another person, who now has to support the opposite opinion.
(http://lehrerfortbildung-bw.de/bs/bsa/bej/englisch/uebung/five.htm)

Both werfen zu and zuwerfen in the same context:

(356) Sprechen Sie dann die erste Silbe und werfen gleichzeitig den Ball Ihrem Kind zu. Das Kind fängt den Ball. Ihr Kind spricht die zweite Silbe und wirft gleichzeitig den Ball zurück. Sie sprechen die dritte Silbe und werfen gleichzeitig wieder den Ball zu Ihrem Kind.
[...] throw simultaneously the ball.ACC your child.DAT to-. [...] [..]throw simultaneously again the ball.ACC to (ZU) your child
Then speak the first syllable and, simultaneously, throw your child the ball. The child catches the ball. Your child will speak the second syllable and, simultaneously, throws the ball back. You speak the third syllable and, simultaneously, throw the ball to your child again.’

(http://www.abc-der-tiere.de/eltern/silbenmethode/voruebungen/)

The alternation between *Ball werfen zu* and *Ball zuwerfen* must therefore be motivated morphosyntactically. Examining the available constructions which match the information structure requirements of either recipient first or theme first order, the particle-*zu* variant is felicitous in both, but the *zu*-variant is only acceptable in a theme first order, the canonical word order of this variant, unlike *zu*-variants which denote spatial goals. This situation shows that even in ball games the particle-*zu* variant is the more accurate realization for the caused possession schema.

Much like the dative variant, the particle-*zu* construction shows a reversed unmarked word order of recipient and theme argument compared to the prepositional *zu*-variant. As was shown in Chapter 4, the focus test, in which the canonical word order displays maximal focus, and VP fronting, in which a part of the verb phrase of a canonical word order can be fronted, support this claim. In the particle construction, the recipient is followed by the theme, while in the *zu*-variant, the theme is followed by the recipient (actually the goal):

(357)  Focus test (Olsen(1997, p. 29)):
Was ist passiert? What happened?
  a. Ich glaube, dass er dem Kind *den Ball zuwarf* max focus
     I think that he.NOM the child.DAT the ballACC to-threw
  b. Ich glaube dass er *den Ball dem Kind zuwarf* min focus
     I think that he.NOM the ball.ACC the child.DAT to-threw
     'I think that he threw the child the ball'

(358)  Was ist passiert? What happened?
  a. Ich glaube, dass er *den Ball zu dem Kind geworfen hat* max focus
     I think that he.NOM the ball.ACC to(ZU) the child thrown has
  b. Ich glaube, dass er zu *dem Kind den Ball geworfen hat* min focus
     I think that he.NOM to(ZU) the child the ball.ACC thrown has
     'I think that he threw the ball to the child'
(359) VP topicalization:
  a. Den Ball zugeworfen hat er dem Kind ja nicht
     The ball.ACC to-thrown has he.NOM the child.DAT not
     ‘Surely it wasn’t the ball that he threw to the child’
  b. *Dem Kind zugeworfen hat er den Ball ja nicht
     the child.DAT to-thrown has he.NOM the ball.ACC not
     ‘Surely, it wasn’t the child that he threw the ball to’

(360) a. Zu dem Kind geworfen hat er den Ball ja nicht
    To(ZU) the child thrown has he.NOM the ball.ACC surely not
    'Surely it wasn’t to the child that he threw the ball'
  b. *Den Ball geworfen hat er zu dem Kind ja nicht
    The ball.ACC thrown has he.NOM to(ZU) the child surely not
    ‘Surely it wasn’t the ball that he threw to the child’

I will show now that the particle-\textit{zu} variant is felicitous in both canonical order and scrambled word order (see also the word order in (354) and (355), but the \textit{zu}-variant only works in canonical order. Thus, the particle-\textit{zu} variant will be more frequently used for a caused possession event than the PP\textit{zu}-variant. In the following illustration, I use definite DPs to indicate given information and indefinite DPs for new information:

Recipient/goal given, new theme (a ball):

(361) Er warf ihm einen Ball zu  (particle \textit{zu}-variant, base order)
    He threw him.DAT a ball.ACC to-
    ‘He threw him a ball’

(362) *Er warf zu ihm einen Ball (\textit{zu}-variant, scrambled)
    He threw to(ZU) him a ball.ACC
    'He threw him a ball'

(Results in Google: “warf/wirft/werfe zu ihm/ ihr einen/eine” no results,
„warf zu ihm den : 1 result, „wirft/werfe/ zu ihm/ ihr einen“ no results)
This case is unlike that of a zu-phrase which denotes a spatial goal. Here, the scrambled variant is the only option available:

(363)  Und dann wirft man zu dieser Stelle eine Kugel
And then throws one to(ZU) this point a ball.ACC
‘And then one throws to this point a ball’

Theme given (ball), new recipient/goal (a person):

(364)  Er warf den Ball zu einer Person  (zu-variant, base order)
He threw the ball.ACC to(ZU) a person
'He threw the ball to a person'

(365)  Er warf den Ball einer Person zu
He threw the ball.ACC a person.DAT to-
‘He threw the ball to a person’

The interchangeable use of werfen zu and zuwerfen can only happen in contexts in which the theme is given and the recipient/goal is new, which is precisely the natural context of ball games; the ball is given information, but the person catching the ball changes, and therefore this alternation, or the zu-variant for these caused possession situations, appears quite frequently in this context. Based on a frequency tendency of werfen zu and zuwerfen constructions in reports of ballistic games, I assume that the motivation for the alternation lies in the discourse. If the focus of the continuation of the discourse is on the ball, the game, or some other subject (apart from the players), the constructions are equally frequent. In (355) and (356) it seems that the focus is on the game itself. In (355), repeated here, for example, the sentence following the particle-zu variant starts with der Ball (the ball).

(366)  Lehrerin gibt das Thema an und wirft den Ball einer Person zu, diese sagt ihre Meinung dazu. Der Ball wird an eine andere Person weitergeworfen, die jetzt die entgegengesetzte Meinung vertreten muss.
Teacher/ess introduces the subject and throws the ball.ACC a person.DAT to-,
this one says her opinion there-to. The ball is onto(AN) another person forth-thrown, who now the opposite opinion support must.’
‘The teacher introduces the subject and throws one of the players the ball. This person adds his/her opinion to it. The ball is then thrown on to another person, who now has to support the opposite opinion.

(http://lehrerfortbildung-bw.de/bs/bsa/bej/englisch/uebung/five.htm)

If the following focus is on the person who receives the ball, or in general on the players of a game, the zu-variant seems to be more frequent than the particle-zu-variant. This situation can be seen in (354), repeated here, in which the focus following the zu-variant (which ends with a person) is on the participants of the game.

(367) Die Leitung beginnt und wirft einen Ball zu einer Person. Die Person fängt und wirft den Ball weiter an eine dritte Person [...].
The leadership begins and throws a ball.ACC to(ZU) a person. This person catches and throws the ball.ACC forth onto(AN) a third person [...] ‘The leaders begin and throw a ball to a person. This person catches the ball and throws it on to a third person.’

(www.synthese.de/ spielekartei_gruppe.html)

This phenomenon is even more illustrative in commentaries on ballistic games, e.g., on TV:

(368) A kickt den Ball zu B, B läuft auf das Tor zu, kickt ihn zu C, ...
A kicks the ball.ACC to B, B runs onto the goal to-, kicks it.ACC to C
‘A is passing the ball to B, B approaches the goal, passes it to C…’

Here, the particle-zu variant is rarely used. The person, often the name of the person, is the last word heard, and the connecting impulse is activated. A particle after the mentioning of the person would interrupt the chain.

5.2.2.6 Morphosemantic motivations between werfen zu and zuwerfen

Theme arguments which are not easily perceived as traversing a spatial path and semantic context such as in cyberspace, which is not easily perceived as a regular space in which objects move, create semantic contexts which favor the particle-zu variant over the (PP) zu-variant. I will show that the two constructions are indeed realizations of different event
schemata, even though the difference is blurred in the context of ball games, which involve a coexistence of both caused motion and caused possession events.

The expression *jmdm einen Blick zuwerfen* (to throw someone a look (‘to throw a glance/ a look at s.o.’) seems at first to be more natural in the particle-zu variant. My informants did not like the zu-variant when presented with an isolated sentence pair, but I did find enough examples of it on Google, often with spatial adverbials such as *hinüber* (over (to…)). The zu-variant is possible, probably because a look seems to traverse a spatial path until it ends at the goal point, similar to a ray of light. Interestingly, I found a tendency between the two constructions which can be accounted for straightforwardly by following the two event schemata. If the look is recognized by the person looked at, ‘received’, and even given back, the particle-variant is used, but if someone just looks at somebody, at the person as a goal, the zu-variant is used. In (91), the look is most probably not received, as Amanda stares in another direction, but in (92) the look is received and its message understood:

(369) Der Agent [...] warf einen Blick zu Amanda[,] die ebenfalls wie gebannt auf das Schiff starrte.

‘the agent threw a look at Amanda, who also gazed at the ship as if magnetized.

(370) Ich [...] warf meiner Schwester einen Blick zu [,] der ihr zu verstehen gab, sie solle das Gespräch weiter führen.

‘I threw a look at my sister, which let her understand that she should continue with the conversation.’

The fact that looks can be received is shown by the fact that they can be the complement of *bekommen* (get), which underlines the caused possession schema:
(371) „Sind wir ihre Lehrer oder du?“, lachte Leon, doch nachdem er meinen bösen Blick bekommen hatte wurde er ernst.
"are we your teacher, or are you our teacher“ laughed Leon, but after he.NOM my angry look,ACC got had, he became earnest.
‘…but after he got my angry look,…’

(http://www.myfanfiction.de/texte/eric-saade/eric-saade-fanfiction.169891.450391.html)

In contrast to throwing a look at somebody, the expression jmdm einen Kuss zuwerfen (to blow someone a kiss) is usually used in the particle construction and hardly ever in the zu-variant:

Google results of the phrases:

"warf ihm einen Kuss zu“ (particle variant) 7740 results
"warf ihr einen Kuss zu“ (particle variant) 7030 results
"warf einen Kuss zu“ 77 2 results
"wigf einen Kuss zu“ 3 results

(372) Ich warf ihm einen Kuss zu und schloss die Tür.
I threw him.DAT a kiss.ACC to- and closed the door
‘I blew him a kiss and closed the door.’

(http://mein-kummerkasten.de/96169/Verliebt-in-einen-Kollegen-der-verheiratet-ist.html)

I assume that this realization is allowed by the fact that blowing a kiss is directed to a recipient, but never to a spatial goal. A look, on the other hand, can very well be thrown at a spatial location or at an animate being as a location (without him/her receiving it, as illustrated above in (91). The animate participant of blowing a kiss may therefore trigger its realization as a dative DP, and with it the particle-zu variant (See Chapter 4 for details on the effect of animate participants on grammar).78

77 This phrase should require a zu-variant, but interestingly, the results indicated the use of particle variants which lack an overt recipient argument.

78 Concerning the spatial motion component of werfen, I think that the intention that the kiss should move to the recipient licenses the use of the verb. One does not really receive a kiss that has been blown at you and therefore the bekommen (get) paraphrase would be infelicitous without also mentioning the verb (a phenomenon which points out that the dative is a beneficiary of the event, as discussed in Chapter 3):
Er bekam einen Kuss *(zugeworfen)
He.NOM got a kiss.ACC/ look (to-thrown)
The most striking evidence that the two constructions are realizations of two different event schemata comes from a new use of the verb *zuwerfen* in the internet language of bloggers. A blog stick (*Stöckchen*), which is similar to a chain letter between bloggers, is thrown from one blogger to another, who can take it up and enter the discussion by answering it, or can ignore it (*liegenlassen*, let it lie on the ground). The form of *werfen* used in this context is almost never *werfen zu*, but *zuwerfen*. In addition, the stick is *thrown on* to other bloggers (*weiter werfen*) in the *an*-variant. In contrast to ball games, where both the *zu*-variant and the *an*-variant follow *weiter werfen*, depending on the context, I did not find a single example with the *zu*-variant in the context of blog sticks. The event seems to be much more associated with a caused possession schema than with a caused motion schema in which the blog stick really moves from one blogger to another, and the morphosyntactic form is the particle-*zu* variant *zuwerfen*.

Illustrative data are the following. In (373) *werfen* (bare form) and *zuwerfen* are both used in the context of blog sticks, but the verb form used with a recipient argument is *zuwerfen*. This usage is evidence for the assumption that even here, *werfen* and *zuwerfen* have the same lexical entry, *werfen*, and *zuwerfen* is a specific realization of the event schema needed in the three-participant context. This explanation refutes a possible account of *Stöckchen zuwerfen* (to throw a blog stick) where this expression became lexicalized as a whole and thereby blocked a possible a *werfen zu*-variant. Furthermore, *zuwerfen* followed by *weiter werfen* with the *an*-variant is used, supporting the possessive context.

(373) *Stöckchen werfen... Ich finde dieses Spiel irgendwie voll lustig, Liuna vom Bücherengel hat mir dieses Stö[ck]chen zugeworfen. [...] Wirf das Stöckchen an fünf Blogger weiter*  

Sticks throwing... I find this game somehow very funny, Liuna from the Bücherengel threw me this stick. [...] Throw the stick onto(AN) five bloggers forth

‘Throwing sticks... I find this game somehow very funny, Liuna from the Bücherengel threw me this stick [...] Throw the stick on to five bloggers.

(http://kiala-fantasyfreak.blogspot.com/2011/01/stockchen-werfen.html)

'He got a kiss blown to him.’ However, I often signal to my children in a playful way that I received a blown kiss on my cheeks, which shows that the kiss is intended to reach its goal.
In (374) the possessive character is illustrated by the use of the verb *bekommen* (get), the inchoative of a *have*-relation:

(374)  
Ray hat mir ein Stöckchen zugeworfen, welches er von Luisa *bekommen* hat,  
die hat es wiederum von Rufus aufgefangen.  
Ray has me.DAT a stick to-thrown, which he from Luisa got has, …  
‘Ray threw me a blog stick which he got from Luisa. She, in turn, caught it from Rufus.’

(http://www.chakrablog.de/2008/08/28/ein-indiskretes-stöckchen/)

The same effect of the loss of the caused motion event schema when something traverses cyberspace can be seen with the verb *mailen* (to e-mail). It seems to be a *schicken*-type verb, as it appears in the dative variant and in the *an*-variant, and also in the particle-*zu* variant, (making the verb different from *verkaufen*-type verbs, even though it can, like *verkaufen*, encode caused possession, as the dative variant shows), but it virtually never appears in the *zu*-variant (0 results in 3902 results for *mailen* in Cosmas).

(375)  
a. Ich mailte meinen Freunden die Einladung.  
I mailed my friends.DAT the invitation.ACC  
‘I emailed my friends the invitation.’

b. Ich mailte die Einladung an meine Freunde.  
I mailed the invitation.ACC onto(AN) my friends  
‘I emailed the invitation to my friends.’

c. Ich mailte meinen Freunden die Einladung zu  
I mailed my friends.DAT the invitation.ACC to  
‘I to-emailed my friends the invitation.’

d. ?? Ich mailte die Einladung zu meinen Freunden.  
I mailed the invitation.ACC to (ZU) my friends  
Should be: ‘I emailed the invitation to my friends.’
5.2.2.7 Summary

This subsection shows that *schicken*- (send), *bringen*- (bring), and *werfen*- (throw) type verbs are basically associated with the caused motion schema. The morphosyntactic realization is the *zu*-variant. With an animate goal which is capable of receiving and a theme argument which can be possessed, these verbs also associate with the caused possession schema. Here, the morphosyntactic realization is the dative variant for *schicken*-type verbs and *bringen*, with the particle-*zu* variant as the only option for *werfen*-type verbs and an additional option for *schicken*-type verbs. The dative/*zu* and the *an/*zu alternations for *schicken*-type verbs are thus shown to be morphosemantically motivated. Concerning the *zu*-variant, I propose that even though the preposition *zu* with an animate goal highly implies that the goal is a recipient, for example in ball games, the basic event schema that this variant realizes remains the caused motion schema. However, compatibility with the caused possession schema on the one hand, and the encoding of a caused motion event on the other give rise to morphosyntactic and morphosemantic alternations between the *zu*-variant and the particle-*zu* variant of *werfen*-type verbs. These verbs usually describe events with recipients who are also spatial goals, inviting the appearance of both constructions simultaneously. However, with theme arguments which are more exclusively associated with a recipient than with a spatial goal, such as *Blick* (look), *Kuss* (kiss) and *Stöckchen* (blog stick), a grammatical contrast between the two constructions, each one realizing a different event schema, can be made transparent.

5.2.3 Comparison with the English dative alternation

Until now, the different event schemata have been shown to be governing factors of the argument realization options of *geben*-., *verkaufen*-., *schicken*-, and *werfen*-type verbs. The results resemble in an interesting way the results of Rappaport Hovav and Levin (2008). *Give*-type verbs only associate with the caused possession schema, but *send*- and *throw*-type verbs associate with both the caused motion and the caused possession schemata. Morphosyntax motivates the different options for *give*-verbs, while morphosyntax and semantics motivate the options for *send*- and *throw*-type verbs. The German and English options and event schemata can be aligned:
Table 15:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>German alternation</th>
<th>English alternation</th>
<th>Event schema</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oli gab Peter das Buch</td>
<td>Oli gave Peter the book</td>
<td>Caused possession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oli gab das Buch Peter</td>
<td>Oli gave the book to Peter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oli verkaufte Peter das Buch</td>
<td>Oli sold Peter the book</td>
<td>Caused possession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oli verkaufte das Buch an Peter</td>
<td>Oli sold the book to Peter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oli schickte Peter den Brief</td>
<td>Oli sent Peter the letter</td>
<td>Caused possession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oli schickte den Brief an Peter</td>
<td>Oli sent the letter to Peter</td>
<td>Caused possession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oli schickte den Brief zu Peter</td>
<td>Oli sent the letter to Peter</td>
<td>Caused motion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oli warf Peter den Ball zu</td>
<td>Oli threw the ball</td>
<td>Caused possession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oli warf den Ball zu Peter</td>
<td>Oli threw the ball to Peter</td>
<td>Caused motion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oli threw the ball to the North Pole</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As introduced in chapter 1, aligning English and German alternations in this manner supports an interesting analysis of the preposition *to* in English, as a spatial preposition denoting a goal and as a dative-marker denoting a non-spatial recipient. Unlike German, English does not have case marking, which may be the reason for its relatively fixed word order. The syntactic position, rather than a specific case marking, signals the semantic relationship to the governing verb. To preserve semantic transparency, scrambling is disallowed in English. Consequently, according to the discourse preferences of given vs. newly-mentioned items, the *to*-construction serves as a grammatical version of the transfer denoted, in which the theme and recipient arguments are reversed. The alignment of the constructions used for the *give*-type class therefore shows that the preposition *to* can be simply a dative marker. German, which allows scrambling, does not need a different construction to provide a reversed order of theme and recipient. However, the discourse behavior of *sell*-type class verbs (exemplified in section 5.2.1 above) shows that the German PP-variant, in this case the *an*-variant, may behave like the English *to*-construction, as a possible and as a probably preferred variant in which theme and recipient are reversed.

On the other hand, the comparison of the *send*-type and *throw*-type class shows that the English *to*-construction can also resemble the truly spatial *zu*-construction in German. Thus, the semantic range of the preposition *to* is analyzed as including both a non-spatial dative marker and a spatial goal marker. This conclusion resembles Rappaport Hovav and Levin’s
analysis of the preposition *to*; my analysis provides independent evidence supporting the crosslinguistic significance and validity of their theory.

Returning to the rules governing German dative alternations, it will be shown in the following subsection that the different realizations of the event schema caused motion and caused possession on the one hand, and discourse structure on the other, are not the only attested governing factors of the alternations. An additional factor, the kind of participation of the third participant, whether or not he is a (potential) experiencer of the event, will be shown to also play a role in the choice of the alternations.

5.3 Governing factor 2: Necessary vs. possible experiencer role

In the remainder of this chapter it will be demonstrated that, apart from the semantic contexts of caused motion and caused possession, another factor governs dative-prepositional alternations in German, namely whether or not the third participant necessarily plays the role of the experiencer.

In chapter 3 I show that dative DPs play in the majority of their appearances a semantic role which can be isolated as a central semantic contribution of dative case marking: the experiencer role. Prepositions cannot assign such a role to their DP complements, but experiencing participation is not necessarily excluded; it can still be inferred from context. However, it is not entailed. Even though the role of the experiencer was primarily found with event-related datives, I show there in a discussion of the status of the dative DP of transfer verbs that also the arguably entity-related recipient dative DP of most transfer verbs is ambiguous between an entity and an event-related dative and can combine the semantics of both the recipient and of an experiencing event participant. The following figure, based on the semantic map of the crosslinguistic functions of the dative case and similar linguistic markings, is adapted from Haspelmath (1999). It summarizes the roles that the prepositions mentioned in this dissertation assign to their complement DP, compared to the roles of the dative case. Clearly, the experiencer role, together with the external possessor role, is solely expressed by the dative case:
Based on these findings, the precise kind of mental affectedness and participation should provide a semantic motivation also in the dative-prepositional alternations discussed here in the context of transfer events.

This claim is an old one. As mentioned earlier, the dative case was described as “the personal case” by traditional linguists. It accompanies the deepest intuitions of German speakers to such an extent that I had difficulty convincing educated non-linguists that inanimate dative DPs with no real animate attributes are possible. The examples in Chapter 3 which involved music, parties, houses, or lights all still allowed an association with a personal sphere, which was argued to license a dative DP, and only the sentence *Stahl verleiht Beton Stabilität*. (Steel gives concrete.DAT stability.ACC.) was finally convincing. However, even though the intuition is deep and seems to be correct, it is difficult to provide objective evidence for the subject of the present discussion, transfer events. To demonstrate this difficulty, I return to the differences between a judger dative and a für-PP (Chapter 3, repeated here), which clearly makes the role of consciousness, one facet of an experiencer, transparent:

(376) a. Das war ihm wichtig, *aber er selber war sich nicht davon bewusst.*
   This was him.DAT important, *but he didn't realize it himself
b. Das war wichtig für ihn, *aber er selber war sich nicht davon bewusst.*
   This was important for him, but he didn't realize it himself.
There does not seem to be equivalent solid evidence for data with transfer events in which the experiencer role for the dative variant can be isolated, as the spatial vs. non-spatial entailment blurs the results between the zu-variant and the dative variant below. Once the understood recipient is realized as a goal, the experiencer interpretation is naturally ruled out. Once it is realized as a dative recipient, it usually refers to a human being and human beings are experiencers *per se*. Thus it is difficult to point to a contribution of the notion experiencer above and beyond that of recipient.


The postman brought the packageACC to me/ meDAT the packageACC, but I knew nothing about-it.

‘The postman brought the package to me, but I did not take notice.

The alternation between the dative case and *an* may be useful in trying to isolate the contribution of the semantic component of experiencer, as here both the denotee of the dative DP and the one of the PP are recipients. However, due to the semantics of the verb, the roles of the two recipients are often identical. For *verkaufen* (sell), consciousness, which has been proposed in Chapter 3 as one of the essential properties of an experiencer (the other is his/her non-agentive participation or lack of intention concerning what is happening) is part of both constructions, as the verb itself requires it. Moreover, it is the *an*-variant that exclusively entails consciousness, as the dative can also be understood as a beneficiary, and as such possibly non-conscious when the actual event happens:


Oli had Anja.DAT/ onto(AN) Anja the Subaru.ACC sold, but she knew nothing about-it

‘Oli had sold Anja/ to Anja the Subaru, but she didn’t know anything about it.

b. Oli hatte Anja (beneficiary) den Subaru verkauft, aber sie wusste (noch nichts) davon.

Oli had Anja.DAT the Subaru.ACC sold, but she knew (not yet) nothing about-it

‘Oli had sold the Subaru for Anja, but she didn’t know anything about it (yet).’
Even situations in which agents sell something, such as stock, for someone without that person knowing it, end up giving similar results. The person denoted by the dative and the *an*-phrase, Anja, is the recipient and is conscious, even though the agent does the work, as indicated by the additional *über* (via) phrase. Anja can only be constructed as non-conscious with a *für*-phrase or with a benefactive dative, but here with context disambiguating it from the salient recipient interpretation.

(379) Oli verkaufte über ihren Agenten Anja/ an Anja Wertpapiere, *aber sie wusste nichts davon*  
Oli sold via her agent Anja.DAT/ onto(AN) Anja stocks, but she didn't know about it,  
'Via her agent, Oli sold Anja/DAT to Anja stocks, but she didn't know about it'

(380) Oli verkaufte über ihren Agenten für Anja Wertpapiere, aber sie wusste nichts davon.  
Oli sold via her agent for Anja stocks.ACC, but she didn't know about it,  
'Via her agent, Oli sold for Anja stocks, but she didn't know about it'

In the case of *schicken*-type verbs a simple 'consciousness-test' gives us irrelevant results. Such verbs have a path element in caused possession events as well. Traversing a path can be interrupted; the fact that the recipient did not take notice of such a caused possession simply creates the interpretation that the theme argument did not yet fully traverse the spatial path.

(381) Oli hatte Anja/ an Anja den Brief geschickt, aber sie wusste nichts davon  
Oli had Anja.DAT/onto(AN) Anja the letter.ACC sent, but she knew nothing about-it  
'Oli had sent Anja/DAT to Anja the letter, but she didn’t know anything about it.'

In the following section I will show that the experiencer role for dative DPs can be isolated using objective evidence (though admittedly not with a simple ‘consciousness-test’ as in (376)) in two instances: necessary vs. possible experiencing participation can be clearly shown to govern the alternation between the *von*-variant and the dative-variant for *stehlen* (steal)-type verbs. This alternation has not yet been discussed and will be introduced in the
following subsection. Furthermore, several semantic concepts of impersonal recipients, which are not capable of or not necessarily experiencing, such as mailbox, address, sender, and receiver are more often realized in the an-variant, and are sometimes even ungrammatical in the dative variant. Thus, the role of the experiencer can be isolated at least for some recipient of the dative/an alternation of schicken-type verbs. This last discussion will lead to the question of how much of the semantic ‘flavor’ of the dative case may influence all choices of the dative variant; a question I have to postpone for future study.

5.3.1 Morphosemantic motivation for the dative/von alternation

Stehlen)-type verbs denote a transfer event in which a direction from a source, but not a direction toward a goal is lexicalized. There are two possible morphosyntactic realizations of the argument structure: the PPvon variant and the dative variant. The dative variant is only possible with animate sources, but the von-variant can have inanimate and animate complements.

(382) a. Oli stahl die Bücher vom Regal.
    Oli stole the books.ACC from the shelf
b. *Oli stahl dem Regal die Bücher.
    Oli stole the shelf.DAT the books.ACC
    ‘Oli stole the books from the shelf.’

    Oli stole from his parents money.ACC
b. Oli stahl seinen Eltern Geld.
    Oli stole his parents.DAT money.ACC
    ‘Oli stole money from his parents.’

The question is whether the alternation between the von-variant and the dative variant is the reversal of the alternation between the zu- and the dative variants with verbs such as bringen. According to this paradigm, the von-variant would be the realization of the caused motion schema and the dative variant the realization of the caused possession schema, in reversed direction from the verbs discussed until now. According to such an approach,
sentence (383a) would mean that the money was stolen from the parents’ place, which has a close association to ‘from their possession’.

However, as already introduced in chapter 2, *von* is not a simple reversal of *zu*, but, unlike *zu*, is appropriate in clearly non-spatial contexts. In (384), the idea is clearly something that did not change its location, and in (385) and (386), memory and pressure cannot move.

(384) Sein Kollege Ueda behauptet jedoch, dass er die Idee von ihm gestohlen hätte.

[…] that he the idea.ACC from him stolen has
‘His colleague Ueda however claimed that he stole the idea from him.’
(http://detektivconan-wiki.com/wiki/Fall_032)

(385) Jeder Atemzug schürte die Erkenntnis und nahm von ihm die Erinnerung.

Every breath stoked the awareness and took from him the memory.ACC.
‘Every breath stoked the awareness and took the memory from him.’
(www.et-voila.de/design/sptnk-de)

(386) […] wollen Sie den Jungen wirklich vom Gymnasium nehmen er hat doch nur eine 4. Ja wir wollten das, um Druck von ihm zu nehmen.

[…] want you the boy.ACC really from the high school take,[…].Yes, we wanted that, in order to pressure.ACC from him take.
‘ […] do you really want to take the boy from the high school (to a less challenging secondary school), his grade average is only ‘satisfactory’ (and not worse). Yes, we wanted it, in order to take pressure from him.
(http://www.mysnip.de/forum-archiv/thema/2306/1125001/Ich+kann+nicht+mehr+--+-lang.html)

All three theme arguments appear as complements of *haben* (have) as illustrated in Chapter 2, repeated here, pointing to the fact that a *von*-variant realizes a (reversed) caused possession event.

(387) Er hatte eine Idee.

He.NOM had an idea.ACC
‘He had an idea.’
Accordingly, (383a) above is better analyzed as a change of possession, than as a change of location of the money. Concerning the two event schemata caused motion and caused possession with which the verb classes above have been analyzed, the alternation of the \textit{von}-variant and dative variant with \textit{stehlen}-type verbs would look like:

Figure 16: \textit{stehlen}:

This would mean that the non-spatial \textit{von}-variant is a morphosemantically-motivated alternation to the spatial \textit{von}-variant, but also a morphosyntactically-motivated alternation to the dative variant. One might assume that \textit{von} behaves similarly to the preposition \textit{to} in English. \textit{To} is a single morpheme which can mark a goal, whether it is possessionally interpreted or not. Similarly, \textit{von} denotes an underspecified part-whole relation which can be spatially interpreted in a directional event as a source, or possessionally interpreted as a deprivee.

The picture presented in the figure above, is, however, incomplete. There is a semantic difference between the \textit{von} and the dative variant, which cannot be captured by the event schemata caused motion vs. caused possession: the necessary vs. possible experiencer role of
the third participant. The von-variant does not entail information about whether its denoted person is mentally affected by the event, and therefore spatial sources can also be expressed with it. On the other hand, the dative variant has an affected third participant. The difference becomes clear in considering the licensing of the dative DP. Stehlen (steal)-type verbs do not select a dative DP, as these are verbs of removal of an object from a source, and sources, animate and inanimate alike, are grammatically realized by a von-PP. Like the great majority of verbs, stehlen-type verbs can be construed with an additional non-selected, free dative DP, whose interpretation is anchored in the semantic context.

The basic role of this dative DP is thus the experiencer, as the verb does not have more specific information encoded in its semantics. Depending on the context, the dative can be understood as the deprivee or the beneficiary, an inferred recipient. Stehlen-type verbs thus have both a von-variant and a für-variant. The dative variant is fundamentally ambiguous, and only the uses of the prepositions make the difference clear:

(390) a. Oli stahl seinem Freund ein Fahrrad.
    Oli stole his friend.DAT a bike.ACC
    ‘Oli stole a bike from/ or: for his friend.’
b. Oli stahl für seinen Freund ein Fahrrad.
    Oli stole for his friend a bike.ACC
    ‘Oli stole a bike for his friend.’
c. Oli stahl von seinem Freund ein Fahrrad.
    Oli stole from his friend a bike.ACC
    ‘Oli stole from his friend a bike.’

The same process can be illustrated with the reflexive of nehmen (take). A reflexive dative DP is very common in the absence of a source argument, but as the beneficiary, not as the deprivee.

(391) Du kannst (dir) ein Stück Kuchen nehmen
    You can you.DAT a piece-of cake.ACC take
    ‘You can take a piece of cake’

The presence or absence of the role of the experiencer is central to the alternation between the von-variant and the dative variant. Several semantic effects illuminate this distinction.
With *stehlen*, a *von*-variant (with an animate) bears the connotation that the deprivee did not take notice:

(392)  
\begin{itemize}
  \item a. Drei 13 Jahre alte Mädchen haben in Ulm nach Polizeiangaben etwa einen Monat lang ein gleichaltriges Mädchen psychisch und körperlich mißhandelt und so insgesamt 3500 Mark von ihr erpreßt. Das Geld hat sie von ihren Eltern gestohlen.
  
  ‘In Ulm, according to police sources, three 13-year-old girls abused a girl of the same age mentally and physically and extorted from her a total of 3500 Mark in this manner.’ The money.ACC has she from her parents stolen
  
  ‘The money she stole from her parents.’

  (CosmasII: M98/NOV.86567 Mannheimer Morgen, 07.11.1998; In Kürze:)
  
  b. *Das Geld hat sie ihren Eltern gestohlen.*
  
  The money.ACC has she her parents.DAT stolen
  
  ‘The money she stole from her parents.’
\end{itemize}

This form can also be used in the case of a dead person. The dative DP is infelicitous here, as the person denoted can no longer be an experiencer.

(393)  
\begin{itemize}
  \item a. Sie haben das Zahngold von Toten gestohlen und sind dafür verurteilt worden.
  
  They have the tooth-gold.ACC from the-dead stolen and had thereof convicted been
  
  ‘They stole the dental gold from the dead and had been convicted thereof.’

  (www.spiegel.de/panorama/justiz/0,1518,593689,00.html)
  
  b. *Sie haben das Zahngold den Toten gestohlen.*
  
  They have the tooth-gold.ACC the dead.DAT stolen
  
  ‘They stole the dental gold from the dead.’
\end{itemize}

In the following example the *von*-variant is preferred, as unlike man, God cannot be disturbed mentally when something is taken from Him.
(394) a. Drum wollen wir auch geben gern, wie wir von Ihm genommen,
       Und ähnlich werden unserm Herrn, und sein wie Er vollkommen.
       […], as we.NOM from Him taken. […].
       ‘Therefore we want to give with pleasure, too, as we [have] taken from Him,
       And become similar to our Lord, perfect, like He is.’

       (www.recmusic.org/lieberassemble_texts.html?SongCycleId=3390)-

b. *?Drum wollen wir auch geben gern, wie wir Ihm genommen
       […], as we.NOM Him.DAT taken
       ‘Therefore we want to give with pleasure, too, as we [have] taken from Him’

An example that illustrates a preference for a dative variant over a von-variant is the following:

(395) Die Hungersnot nahm ihm / *?von ihm alle Lebensfreude.
    The famine took him.DAT/ *from him all life-joy
    ‘The famine took away all his joy of life.’

In this context, the von-variant sounds awkward, not because the preposition von anticipates a spatial movement, as would be predicted in an account in which the prepositional variant refers to a spatial event, but because 'he' is most likely suffering from not having joy.

The last two examples show that whether the deprivee is positively or negatively affected by the event also plays a role. God in (394) is usually perceived as being a generous giver, so taking from Him (i.e. taking what He offers to be taken) does not affect Him negatively. On the other hand, taking away one’s joy of life can have a negative context. Using the von-variant in the former, but not in the latter context is according to a tendency that I have found for the verb nehmen, in which the dative variant is used primarily in contexts of negative affectedness. Examining the contexts of the dative variant in the first 100 Google results of the phrase “ihm genommen” without the word von, I noticed that the dative variant appears in contexts in which the denoted person is negatively affected by the event (e.g., by taking a positive item or property from him):
Table 16: Google counts of analyzed context of *ihm genommen* (him.DAT taken)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘Ihm’ is negatively affected</th>
<th>‘Ihm’ is positively affected</th>
<th>unclear what kind of affectedness</th>
<th>irrelevant results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The use of the dative variant is governed by the necessary experiencing participation of the denoted person, discouraging uses in a context where he/she is positively affected. It seems that the expected experiencer role of a (non-reflexive) *nehmen* event is the negative deprivee. If the denotee is positively affected, or if there is no experiencer participation at all, the *von-* variant must be used. As shown in Chapter 3.2.2 on similar, ‘stronger’ experiencers, if the event is negatively perceived, it is most probably connected to the phenomenon that something affects us most if it is against our expectations, against our inner image of how the world operates. Negative affectedness is therefore ‘felt’ and linguistically expressed as a stronger affectedness, as we usually picture a positive world. If we experience positive affectedness against our expectations, the dative variant would presumably be preferred.

I have found a difference between the prepositional and the dative variants which cannot be captured with the root-event schema analysis: the difference between a necessary and a possible experiencing denotee. In the following section it will be shown that this governing factor can also be isolated in the alternation between the *an-*variant and the dative variant, and between the *zu-*variant and particle-*zu* variant.

### 5.3.2 Impersonal recipients: Morphosemantic motivation for the dative/*an* alternation

Chapter 3 (3.7) presented the finding that the dative DP of verbs of most (positive) transfer verbs, as *verkaufen*, can be analyzed as ambiguous between a recipient (not necessarily experiencing) and a beneficiary (necessarily experiencing) interpretation. This could lead to the assumption that an increased motivation for a recipient to be expressed as the experiencer, for example recipients that are dear to the speaker, as relatives or friends, triggers a dative variant. However, one can imagine that objective evidence will be difficult to find. One spontaneous sentence of one of my informants illustrates that there is indeed something to such a claim. Arguably the speaker’s mother will be much more mentally involved in the receiving of the car than a car dealer, who experiences these things regularly.
This might have triggered the different realizations of the two recipients even thought the construction is a parallel one:

(396) Den Polo verkauf ich meiner Mutter, aber den Golf verkauf ich lieber an den Händler.

The Polo.ACC sell I my mother.DAT, but the Golf.ACC sell I preferably onto(AN) the dealer

‘The Polo I will sell my mother, but the Golf I prefer to sell to the dealer.’

In the case of verbs other than *verkaufen* (which selects an experiencing recipient semantically, as shown above in (378-380)), as *schicken*, there exists a much broader range of possible recipients. This fact allows me to claim that the type of participation of the third participant is a true governing factor also in the dative/an alternation. Consider the following sentences:

(397) Kann man ein Paket auch an ein Postfach verschicken?

Can you a package also onto(AN) a post-box away-send?

‘can you send a package also to a post box?’

(398) Natürlich kann man ein Paket auch an ein Postfach schicken.

Certainly can one a package also onto(AN) a post-box send

‘Of course, one can send a package to a post box, too.’

(http://www.gutefrage.net/frage/kann-man-ein-paket-an-ein-postfach-verschicken)

These two sentences indicate the semantic difference between the *an*-variant and the dative variant concerning the role of the recipient. The context of the package makes it clear that the post box is not the spatial goal of the theme argument. On the same webpage someone else added:

(399) Der Postkunde bekommt dann ins Postfach eine Karte, dass er ein Paket am Schalter abholen soll, dort unterschreibt er den Erhalt und bekommt das Paket.

'The client gets a notice into his post box that he should collect a package at the teller. There he signs that he received it and gets the package.’
The post box, and also someone's address are part of the procedure of receiving. They are conceptualized as a kind of inanimate recipient, and therefore the usual preposition used for post boxes and addresses is *an*, not *zu* or *in*:

Google results of quotes:
- zu einem Postfach (ver)schicken/senden: 35
- in ein Postfach (ver)schicken/senden: 217
- an ein Postfach (ver)schicken/senden: about 18,000

Similar results were obtained for *Adresse* (address): (*zu*: 1715 vs. *an*: about 51,500). The dative variant with post box or address seems clearly to be ungrammatical, as these semantic concepts are inanimate and cannot experience anything.

(400) *?Oli schickte das Paket zu dem/ in das Postfach von Rina.
Oli sent the package.ACC to(ZU) the/into the postbox of Rina.
‘Oli sent the package to the postbox of Rina.’

Oli sent a/the postbox of Rina.DAT a package.ACC
‘Oli sent a package to the postbox of Rina.’

The alternating behavior of two additional semantic concepts which can refer to animates illustrate the special recipient status which can be denoted with the *an*-variant: the concepts of *Absender* (consignor, sender/sender address), and *Empfänger* (recipient/receiver). These two concepts, unlike the concepts of mail box or address, can refer to a specific person. The dative variant is therefore grammatical, but because it is left impersonalized, referring to the name written on the letter or in the e-mail header rather than to the person him/herself, the *an*-variant is preferred. If *Empfänger* clearly refers to the inanimate technical receiver, the dative variant is ruled out completely. In order to provide objective evidence for this claim, I again searched Google. However, as the alternation between the *an*-variant and the dative variant is also governed morphosyntactically, word order preferences and discourse structure preferences also have to be taken into consideration. I therefore searched Google for scrambled *an*-variants, which would be discouraged regarding the preference of unmarked
over marked word order. If they do appear, despite the expectation that they are infelicitous morphosyntactically, a semantic governing factor must also be active.

As a control group I searched for the following quotes with regular animate recipients: “schickt seiner/ihrer Mutter/Vater/Freundin” (‘sends his/her mother/father/friendDAT’) vs. “schickt an seine/ihrer Mutter/Vater/Freundin” (‘sends onto(AN) his/her mother/ father/ friend’). The *an*-variant presents a marked word order, as here the accusative theme argument would have to follow the PP. The results were unequivocal: 26,118 dative variants vs. 0 relevant *an*-variants. Following the syntactic considerations in Wegener (1985, p. 221, see section 5.2.1 above), who claims that the scrambled version *schickt an y z* is in principle grammatical, the search indicates that mother/father/friends are clearly experiencing recipients, thus increasing the syntactic infelicity to ungrammaticality of the construction.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schickt seiner Mutter:</td>
<td>3420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schickt an seine Mutter:</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schickt seinem Vater:</td>
<td>988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schickt an seinen Vater:</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schickt ihrem Freund:</td>
<td>14,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schickt an ihren Freund:</td>
<td>2 (irrelevant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schickt seiner Freundin:</td>
<td>4770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schickt an seine Freundin:</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schickt ihrer Mutter:</td>
<td>2440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schickt an ihre Mutter:</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Kunde* (client) is an intermediate kind of recipient which still has enough examples in Google to allow inferences about its appearance. Unlike *Absender* and *Empfänger*, this concept only refers to animates, but unlike *mother/father/friends* the relationship is much looser, weakening the semantic experiencer factor which provoked the total absence of the *an*-variant in the previous examples:
Schickt dem Kunden: 12,600
Schickt an den Kunden: 8

Sendet dem Kunden: 1,470,000
Sendet an den Kunden: 539.

In the cases of Absender and Empfänger the results show that semantic factors disturb the picture. Even though the dative variants are still the majority pointing on the fact that even here, word order preferences for the unmarked dative variant seem to override the semantic factor, and the an-variant does appear in many examples:

Schickt dem Absender: 203
Schickt an den Absender: 98

Sendet dem Absender: 107
Sendet an den Absender: 183

Schickt dem Empfänger: 669
Schickt an den Empfänger: 115

Sendet dem Empfänger: 2390
Sendet an den Empfänger: 943

(402) Der Sender schickt an den Empfänger eine zufällige Zahl. Dieser verschlüsselt die Zahl mittels des gemeinsam bekannten Passworts [...].
The sender sends onto(AN) the recipient a random number.ACC. This encrypts the number by-means-of the common known passwords.
‘The sender sends the recipient a random number. The latter encrypts the number by means of the common known password.’
Der Exchange (Postmaster) sendet an den Absender eine "Delivery Status Notification" Meldung.

The Exchange (Postmaster) sends onto(AN) the sender a „Delivery Status Notification“ message.ACC.

‘The Exchange (Postmaster) sends to the sender a “Delivery Status Notification.’

(http://www.benutzer.de/search.php?query=delivery+%7C+failure+%7C+meldungen+%7C+richtig+%7C+deuten)

a. Oli schickt eine Botschaft an seine Mutter.

Oli Sends a message.ACC onto(AN) his mother

‘Oli sends a message to his mother.’

b. *Oli schickt an seine Mutter eine Botschaft.

Oli sends onto(AN) his mother a message.ACC

‘Oli sends to his mother a message.’

The Google searches here are intended to show objectively that the semantic governing factor necessary vs. possible experiencer role plays a role in the alternation of the dative variant and an-variant, at least with some types of recipients in the schicken-type class. The experience role seems to interfere with the morphosyntactic motivations mentioned before once the recipient denotee cannot or does not experience the transfer of possession that is denoted by the event. These findings support the intuitive interpretation of German speakers, in which the dative variant denotes personal transfer events and the an-variant more official transfer events. In this sense, these last observations of what governs the dative alternations in German close the circle back to the old description of the dative case as the personal case, as by Adelung (1781).

My results show, however, that in German, this intuitive understanding of language or ‘semantic flavor’ overrides the morphosyntactic motivation for the realization of the event in the two variants only in extreme cases. As animacy itself usually implies the experiencer role, the dative variant and the an-variant are in most cases used and interpreted identically. Further evidence, as a thorough analysis of even more examples of expressions of transfer events and their context, would have to be found in order to make the claim that the
experiencer factor influences the argument realizations of all events denoted by the variants. I assume that, because I only discovered a semantic ‘flavor’, and not a semantic entailment which makes vast differences in grammaticality, this search will not be a trivial enterprise.

5.4 Summary

In this chapter I have shown that the alternations of the dative variant, zu-variant, an-variant, and particle-zu variant are governed by two types of factors. On the one hand, the presence or absence of the two event schemata caused motion and/or caused possession clearly influence the morphosyntactic realization of the argument structures of the verb classes in question. The results can be compared straightforwardly to the results of the dative alternation in English as analyzed in Rappaport Hovav and Levin (2008). On the other hand, the factor of necessary vs. possible experiencer role of the third participant clearly governs the alternation between the dative variant and the von-variant. The von-variant can both have a non-spatial and a spatial interpretation, as here experiencing participation is not entailed, but the dative variant can only have a non-spatial interpretation with an experiencing dative denotee. Finally, I have shown that the experiencer factor is also active in the alternation between the dative variant and the an-variant, at least in the schicken-type class of verbs. It seems to be possible, though very difficult to examine objectively, that the semantic flavor of the dative variant, the personal affective, influences the preference of a dative variant over a prepositional one in all cases.

My results challenge the approach of Wunderlich (2005), in which the prepositional variants always denote caused motion events, and the dative variant only caused possession events. They show that the alternation between dative and prepositional constructions of transfer events can only be sufficiently analyzed if all the semantic components are taken into consideration. The semantics of the verb, the semantics of the theme argument, and the kind of participation of the third participant all play a role. In addition, syntactic preferences and discourse structure influence the choice of semantically identical or similar constructions. The results are consequently subtle. My observations in this dissertation are modest, but I hope that they will open a new line of research in this area of German grammar.
Chapter 6: Conclusion

6.1 Summary

This thesis presents an analysis of dative/prepositional argument realization alternations in German which appear with verbs denoting transfer events. The constructions discussed in this study are the dative construction alone, the prepositional constructions headed by the prepositions an, zu, and von, and the dative construction which appears with particle verbs of transfer. I provide a semantic analysis of these constructions and have isolated the factors which govern the semantic and syntactic motivations for the alternations between these constructions.

The results of my investigation challenge the commonly-held view that the prepositional variants always encode an event in which some entity is moved to a goal, a 'caused motion' event, while the dative construction encodes an event in which an animate, typically a human being, undergoes a change in his/her possession, a 'caused possession' event. This view fails to account for a variety of fine-grained semantic differences between the variants. The 'uniform multiple meaning approach' sketched above, has therefore been refined into a ‘verb-sensitive approach’, proposed by Rappaport Hovav and Levin (2008) for the English dative alternation, the alternation between the double object construction (John gave Peter the ball) and the prepositional to-construction (John gave the ball to Peter). This approach claims that the verbal semantics is decisive in indicating whether two alternations do or do not bear meaning differences. Verbs such as send, which lexicalize a spatial transfer, can logically be
analyzed as compatible with both a caused motion and a caused possession event, thus giving rise to possible meaning differences between the two alternates, but verbs such as *give*, which only lexicalize caused possession, are better accounted for as encoding a ‘caused possession event’. According to this view, the preposition *to* in the *to*-construction is better analyzed as a dative marker, and not as a spatial preposition.

Following the verb-sensitive view, I show that the selection of the various prepositional phrases in German is also sensitive to the semantics of the verbs and sometimes to the joint semantics of verb and DO. I propose dividing the verbs participating in dative alternations in German into five classes (the *geben* (give)-type class, the *verkaufen* (sell)-type class, the *schicken* (send)-type class, the *werfen* (throw)-type class and the *stehlen* (steal)-type class); each class shows specific semantic properties which are responsible for the grammaticality of the realization options.

The analysis of verb classes has been as follows:

- **Geben**-type verbs lexicalize a change of possession of the recipient; they are compatible with a caused possession event and the only argument realization option possible in German is the dative-accusation construction (the ‘ditransitive’ construction, here called the ‘dative variant’). The situation in German is unlike that of the English counterparts of these verbs (*give*, *dedicate*, and *leave (something to another’s possession)*), which appear both in a double object construction comparable to the German dative construction, and in a prepositional *to*-construction.

- **Verkaufen**-type verbs are different from *geben* or *widmen*. They specify a change of possession of the external argument as well as of the recipient; they denote a ‘transfer’ of possession event, and can be realized with both a dative variant and a prepositional construction headed by the preposition *an* (the *an*-variant).

- **Schicken**-type verbs lexicalize a change of location, and because of their endpoint-directed semantics are also compatible with a caused possession scenario. The dative variant, the *an*-variant, and the *zu*-variant are grammatical options in the relevant semantic contexts.
Werfen-type verbs are usually spatial motions verbs, but can appear with a dative DP denoting a recipient when combined with a directional particle, as in zuwerfen (to-throw). The argument realization options for this verb class are the zu-variant and the ‘dative-particle’ variant.

Finally, stehlen-type verbs lexicalize a reversed change of possession and often also a change of location; the third participant is the deprived person or source. In contrast to the other alternations, the argument realization alterations between the dative variant and the von-variant which are grammatical for this verb class can best be accounted for as motivated by the type of participation of the deprivee. If this participant is a conscious experiencer of the event, the dative variant is preferred.

My study includes a thorough discussion of the semantics of the prepositions involved in the denotation of transfer events. I show that the preposition zu (to) necessarily denotes a change of location in all its uses in transfer events, but an (at, on) and von (of, from) are not restricted to spatial contexts. They can also denote possessional transfer without any motion in space. Concerning the preposition an, I conclude, based on its semantic behavior, that the use of an with possessive context verbs is a special semantic facet of this preposition, the addressee-an, and speculate that the semantic component ‘contiguity’ is more a relation of one entity holding another than a mere spatial relation of one entity being physically close to another. This ‘force’ relation is reinterpreted as possession when an is used with an animate being. Concerning the preposition von, I assume that the actual non-spatial, or at least non-directional, part-whole relation is the basic semantic component of this preposition. The denotation of a spatial path from a source is evoked by the semantics of the governing verb. This view is different from previous views of the semantics of the prepositions, which until now have been lumped together with other, truly spatial prepositions such as zu (to), in (in), and auf (on) (see, e.g., Wunderlich (2005), Zwarts (2005)). I propose that by assuming a non-spatial semantics, the selection by verbs and the occurrence of the constructions as alternates to dative constructions can be much better explained.

In addition, I present a study of the semantic contribution of the dative case itself. By isolating dative constructions which do not have a semantically identical prepositional variant (e.g., the body part possessor dative, judge datives, experiencer datives, etc.), I show that the semantic feature of ‘experiencer’ can be isolated. This approach is in agreement with
Fillmore’s (1971) deep case notion Experiencer, Wegener (1985), and with general traditional German linguists, who associate the dative case with the personal sphere (e.g., Adelung (1781), Wilmanns (1909)). However, the claim that the dative case has a real semantic ‘animate’ feature remains controversial. I propose, following McIntyre (2006), among others, that the argument which is assigned to the dative case is the subject of a HAVE-relation, \( x \) has \( y \). I describe the semantics of HAVE as a force relation, one entity holding another. Embedded in eventive argument structures, one entity, the dative DP, does not always ‘hold’ only one other entity, but can also ‘hold’ an event, or at least parts of it, such as a certain result state. The idea that there are two types of datives, an entity-related and an event-related dative, originates from studies of the applicative (Pylkkänen (2002)). Given the clear majority of event-related datives over entity-related datives in linguistic expressions in German, the animacy and experiencer flavor of the dative case can now be established by proposing that an individual can only ‘hold’ an event, if he/she is experiencing it.

The analysis of the semantic roles of the dative case provides the basis for the analysis of the remaining construction which participates in German dative alternations, the particle-\( \text{zu} \) variant of \( \text{werfen} \) (throw)-type verbs, \( \text{zuwerfen} \). Unlike its English counterpart \( \text{throw} \), \( \text{werfen} \), in its base form, can only appear in a transfer event in the \( \text{zu} \)-variant. The verb is compatible with a dative DP as a goal argument only after adding a particle such as \( \text{zu} \). It has been shown here that \( \text{werfen} \)-type verbs and their particle-\( \text{zu} \) construction as \( \text{zuwerfen} \) differ semantically from \( \text{schicken} \) (send) in a way which affects the interpretation of an additional dative DP. The particle \( \text{zu} \), like other particles such as \( \text{zurück} \) (back) and \( \text{weiter} \) (forth), adds directionality to \( \text{werfen} \)-type verbs, which they lack in their basic lexicalized semantics. 

\( \text{Schicken} \), on the other hand, has a directional nature \( \text{per se} \). This directionality is shown to be the reason why the dative DP is not only understood as a beneficiary, but also as a recipient, even though the verb does not encode any possessive semantics. It is shown that a recipient interpretation arises from combining directional semantics and an animate participant who is realized as a dative DP. The dative recipient of \( \text{zuwerfen} \) is thus analyzed equivalently to other non-selected event-related datives carrying the role of the experiencer, the ‘haver’, of the event. The exact role of this experiencer is bound by the unsaturated directional semantics, which turns it into a recipient of the theme argument.

The last part of my dissertation is dedicated to the question of what governs the choice of variants in actual discourse. Using internet and corpus-based observations about the way
these constructions are used, I present two factors which govern the alternations: caused possession vs. caused motion event description, and necessary vs. possible experiencer role. My results are as follows:

- **Type of event:** If the event is mainly characterized as a caused possession event, the dative variant (or if licensed, the *an*-variant) will be used. For *werfen*-type verbs the caused possession realization has been shown to be the particle variant, as can often be illustrated with an abstract theme argument, which is only grammatical in these variants.

- **Type of event:** If the event is mainly perceived as a caused motion event, the *zu*-variant is the best choice, especially if the goal argument is an inanimate location to which the theme argument can only move, but not change possession.

- **Geben-type and verkaufen-type verbs** are not involved in meaning differences. The dative/*an* alternation of *verkaufen*-verbs is therefore shown to be mainly motivated by syntactic and discourse structure needs.

- **Type of participation of the third participant:** some types of recipients of the *schicken*-type verbs which are not experiencers, such as electronic receivers, mail boxes, and impersonal addresses can only be realized in the *an*-variant, and not in the dative variant as is the case in other recipient arguments.

- **Type of participation of the third participant:** Whether the deprivee of *stehlen*-type verbs is a necessary or only a possible experiencer motivates the dative/*von* alternation. Inanimate sources, which cannot experience, or deprivees who should be expressed as not taking notice, i.e., are not a necessary experiencer, trigger the *von*-variant. Deprivees who should be expressed as necessary experiencers take the dative variant.

### 6.2 Outlook

The results of my investigation shed light on the much-studied English dative alternation, supporting the 'verb-sensitive view' of Rappaport Hovav and Levin (2008). The *to*-construction of English transfer verbs corresponds to the dative construction of German *geben*-type verbs and to the non-spatial *an*-variant of *verkaufen*-type verbs. This supports a view in which *to* can be a dative marker only, without spatial semantics. On the other hand,
the *to*-construction can also correspond to the truly spatial *zu*-variant in German, here displaying its more obvious spatial semantics.

In addition, I hope that my study will contribute to the understanding of the semantics and selection of prepositions, and the function of the dative case in German. The view presented here on the semantics of the prepositions *an* and *von* in German, which until now have been lumped together with the spatial prepositions, is particularly important. I propose that at least in the context of transfer verbs, a non-spatial analysis better captures their selection. Second, I present a uniform account of all verb-governed datives. So far, I can show that by isolating the contribution of the dative case, the HAVE-relation in its two instances, entity- and event-related, I have been able to derive most of the various readings of the selected and the non-selected datives compositionally from the semantics of the dative and the semantics of the verbs and their context (building on Wegener’s (1985) approach). Early stages of accounts of other datives have been developed and are worth continuing. Third, I contribute to compositional semantic issues in my analysis of particle construction in which the recipient role of the dative DP is created by combining directional and benefactive semantics. I speculate that the reason for the exceptional argument realization of *zuwerfen* (*to-throw*) is the effect of choosing an animate goal. My analysis may therefore contribute to Kittila's (2008 etc.) insightful crosslinguistic studies of the various effects of animacy on linguistic constructions. Fourth, the study presents interesting evidence for the ‘old’ but controversial semantic flavor of the dative case, namely the ‘experiencer role’. Its salient influence on the ungrammatical realization of the impersonal recipient as a dative DP and on the semantic role of animate sources (deprivees) of *stehlen*-type verbs represents a renewed view of these constructions. Finally, it shows the active contribution of the dative case in the German language. Even though prepositional constructions, as analytic constructions, more directly reflect the semantics of transfer situations, whether spatial or possessive, the results of my dissertation provide further evidence why German speakers persist in using the dative case. Despite opinions such as that of Moser (1970), who sees the dative, as a synthetic case, as in danger of extinction, German speakers apparently feel that it is indispensable. I attribute this indispensability to the fact that the dative case remains the best linguistic marker for denoting an event participant who, possibly in addition to its main role, experiences the event, is pleased by it or suffers from it, or can simply be inferred as having an interest in it.
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The work presented in this paper is situated within the field of lexical semantics and was written within a theoretical framework of German word order argument analysis. The work presents an analysis of the switches in the realization of these structures. The grammatical structures examined in the research are the combinations. Between combinations that are dative in relation to an accusative and combinations such as the dative itself.

\[ \text{Oli verkaufte (dem) Peter das Buch} \]
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The work presents an analysis of the switches in the realization of these structures. The combinations that are dative in relation to an accusative and combinations such as the dative itself.
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I shall show that in German the choice of different relational words depends on the context of the sentence and its semantic content. In this way, we can distinguish between different types of sentences, such as questions, statements, and declarative sentences.

I shall show that in German the choice of different relational words depends on the context of the sentence and its semantic content. In this way, we can distinguish between different types of sentences, such as questions, statements, and declarative sentences.
In English...

Bilingual students of German had no trouble with the sentence. They were able to understand and repeat the sentence, which contained two an and one von. However, students who had only learned German and had never heard the sentence before were unable to understand it. They were unable to identify the semantic relations and the roles of the participants in the event. The results of this study suggest that a deeper understanding of the semantic relations in German is needed for bilingual students to be able to understand and use the language effectively.
The events increase in clarity as the daetive pronouns are traced to the fact that the number of daetive pronouns can be explained from the perspective of absolute numbers in German. Only living creatures are able to experience, the semantic role of the daetive pronoun creates a preference for a certain story. This leads to an explanation of the different semantic roles associated with the daetive pronoun. These roles can be understood compositionally from the semantic role of the daetive in conjunction with the grammar of the actions and their relations

Wegener (1985) showed that the daetive pronoun is only used in cases of partial relationships, such as when the daetive pronoun is in possession or an agentive noun phrase, and is able to refer to a specific referent (benefactive). Moreover, this can be a starting point for future research, as general guidelines for the analysis of additional daetive pronouns establish the foundations for the analysis of the semantic roles of the daetive pronoun and the variant of the daetive pronoun with the connexive, which is involved in the daetive pronouns in German.

As mentioned in Wegener and Olsen (1997), the daetive pronoun in German is similar to its English counterpart, and differs from the English counterpart, which is similar to its German counterpart. This is due to the different semantic significance of the daetive pronoun, and it is the reason why I argue that the directional argument of the action is not only a beneficiary, but also a recipient. During the discussion, we rejected and accepted the analysis. Despite the fact that the action itself is not related to the semantics of passives, the opposite of zuwerfen, like other actions that appear with the connexive zu, and have a similar meaning to zugeben, undergo a change in meaning in which an additional component of attachment is added to it (to express the directional argument). In the process of lexicalization, which is based on the reduction of meaning or the blurring of the boundaries between similar actions, the unique solution that we consider is a compositional analysis of Olsen (1997) and the other arguments. The semantic role of the action is encoded in the recipient of the action zuwerfen, and this role is changed depending on whether the daetive pronoun is used in the context of a specific situation or not.
לאחר חתימת הסמכות על המבנה השוכניombo הפוסטימורי הבולשביסטי בחיפה העברה
ב�名יה, הלך ההאנטר על העבירה יedReaderiano שוצאת בין ההשקה והקと共にין את בחירת
ה었ראטירטוס השוכניות בכמה. במאגרת מחברת מבית-מאקרפיסטי שלימייה ע AVR שיווה
במניאתח תלול. צאצאי של ורוקם המחכיבים את החילופים: גו הלארו, עוד החסות והשhoria לש
הארוגטונה שלישית (وعد מרבל ואובק פאפה). הגרוס והשורי, או השדר, ושל המקוד
מרבי בקצות יוחס בoley גראטיאל צניעי הפוסטימורי בֶּן הדאטיבי והחילופים בֶּן הדאטיבי
שהסתיימו על חומרים וununsaturated(לא מרון/אובק פאפה). הנורס והשורי, או השדר, ושל המקוד
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‫עשויים לחשוב בגישה המייחסת תנועה במרחב לווריאנט היחס‪ ,‬אלא משום ש'הוא' קרוב לוודאי‬
‫סובל מאבדן השמחה‪.‬‬
‫הממצאים המחקריים המוצגים בחיבור זה שופכים אור על החילופים הדאטיביים באנגלית‬
‫שנחקרו רבות‪ ,‬ומספקים תימוכין מהגרמנית לגישת הרגישות לפועל של ‪Rappaport Hovav and‬‬

‫‪ .(2008) Levin‬מצד אחד‪ ,‬המבנה באנגלית המשלב צירוף יחס שגרעינו ‪ to‬עם פעלי העברה מקביל‬
‫למבנה הדאטיבי הגרמני רק בכל הנוגע לארגומנט הדאטיבי של פעלים מקבוצת ‪ ,geben‬ולווריאנט‬
‫‪ an‬של פעלים מסוג ‪ verkaufen‬רק במובנם הלא‪-‬מרחבי‪ .‬יש בכך לחזק את הטענה שלפיה ‪ to‬אינו‬
‫אלא סימון יחסת הדאטיב‪ ,‬והוא נטול סמנטיקה מרחבית‪ .‬מהצד האחר‪ ,‬המבנה האנגלי המשלב‬
‫‪ to‬עשוי להיות מקבילו של וריאנט ‪ zu‬המרחבי המובהק בגרמנית‪ ,‬והסמנטיקה המרחבית שלו‬
‫בהקשר זה ברורה‪.‬‬
‫בנוסף‪ ,‬מחקרי תורם להבנת הסמנטיקה ועקרונות הבחירה של מילות יחס‪ ,‬ותפקידה של‬
‫יחסת הדאטיב בגרמנית‪ .‬התרומה העיקרית למחקר העתידי היא הגישה השונה לסמנטיקה של‬
‫מילות היחס ‪ an‬ו‪ von-‬בגרמנית‪ ,‬שעד כה נכללו בין מילות היחס המרחביות‪ ,‬ללא הבחנה‪ .‬אני‬
‫סבורה שלפחות בהקשר של פעלי העברה‪ ,‬ניתוח לא מרחבי שלהן מדויק יותר מבחינת עקרונות‬
‫הבחירה בהן‪ .‬שנית‪ ,‬אני מקווה לתרום לנושאים של סמנטיקה קומפוזיציונלית בניתוח של מבנה‬
‫הקונוורב‪ ,‬שבו התפקיד התמטי של מקבל הפעולה המקודד בצירוף שמני דאטיבי נוצר על ידי‬
‫שילוב של סמנטיקה כיוונית ומוטבית‪ .‬אני משערת כי הסיבה לשוני במימוש הארגומנטים של‬
‫פעלים מסוג ‪ zuwerfen‬תלויה בהשפעתו של יעד המציין יצור חי‪ .‬השפעותיה השונות של תכונת‬
‫החיות על מבנים לשוניים בשפות שונות נחקרו על ידי ‪ 2008) Kittilӓ‬ועוד(‪ .‬הניתוח המוצע תורם‬
‫אם כן תובנות נוספות ותימוכין‪ .‬שלישית‪ ,‬מחקרי מציג הוכחות מעניינות לטענה הוותיקה אך‬
‫השנויה במחלוקת בדבר הזיקה של יחסת הדאטיב לבין חוֹוה האירוע‪ .‬השפעתו ניכרת באי‪-‬‬
‫הדקדוקיות של צירוף שמני דאטיבי כמקבל פעולה שאינו החוֹוה‪ ,‬וכן בתפקיד הסמנטי של נגזלים‬
‫אנושיים )מקורות שהם בני אדם( המופיעים עם הפועל ‪) stehlen‬לגנוב( ודומיו; מבנים אלו נבחנו‬
‫מחדש בעבודה זו‪ .‬לבסוף‪ ,‬העבודה עומדת על תפקידה של יחסת הדאטיב בשפה הגרמנית‪ .‬צירופי‬
‫היחס נראים קלים יותר לניתוח בזכות המבנה האנליטי‪ ,‬והם עשויים להתקשר לאירועי העברה‬
‫כפי שהוצגו כאן‪ ,‬בין אם באירועי תנועה במרחב או שינוי בעלות‪ ,‬ממצאי העבודה הזאת מספקים‬
‫הסבר להעדפת יחסת הדאטיב בפי דוברי גרמנית‪ .‬נראה כי אין בסיס לטענת ‪(1970) Moser‬‬
‫ואחרים‪ ,‬כי ימיה של הדאטיב כיחסה סינתטית ספורים‪ ,‬להיפך‪ :‬דוברי הגרמנית אינם יכולים‬
‫לוותר עליה בשום אופן – היא נותרה הכלי הלשוני המוצלח ביותר לסימון חוֹוה האירוע‪ ,‬מקבל‬
‫הפעולה‪ ,‬מוטב הפעולה‪ ,‬או אפילו משקיף בעל עניין מיוחד באירוע‪.‬‬
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