Polish experiencer and affectedness datives as adjuncts
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In this paper I will propose an analysis of optional dative nominals that occur in the sentence-initial position in a number of structures in Polish. Contrary to proposals inspired by Pylkkänen’s (2002, 2008) applicative model, I claim that high datives in Polish should be analysed as adjuncts that select the structure they combine with on the basis of that structure’s eventive semantics. I will argue for a specific internal structure of all dative-inflected nominals that will be able to account for various differences between optional and argument datives on the one hand and dative and accusative nominals on the other.

1. Introduction

The distinction between arguments and adjuncts has commonly been considered one of the key issues of most current formal linguistic theories. Even though it is difficult to provide a definition of these notions, there are certain semantic and syntactic criteria that help to determine whether a given category should be classified as an argument or an adjunct. For instance, arguments, but not adjuncts, are expected to receive an interpretation that belongs to a limited list of semantic functions such as agents, experiencers and goals. Syntactic criteria draw a distinction between arguments and adjuncts on the basis of, for example, their obligatory or optional presence in structure, movement and extraction. As arguments are also subcategorised for by a verb and directly related to its meaning, their omission often renders a sentence ungrammatical. Adjuncts, on the other hand, are never obligatory, since they are not implied by the semantics of the predicate. As they are always optional elements of the sentence, when removed they do not create any sense of semantic incompleteness or ungrammaticality.

In the present paper I will focus on a number of Polish structures particularly significant from the point of view of the above argument–adjunct distinction. I will demonstrate that the common assumption that a case-marked DP referring to an individual associated with an event should be assigned argument status can be challenged when confronted with data from less closely investigated languages.

1.1. Preliminary data

The structures that provide crucial evidence in support of the above claim are illustrated below. The
sentences in (1) – (3) contain an optional dative DP that can be omitted without affecting the grammaticality of the structure. In (4) the dative is required by the predicate and in many theories it is thus treated as an argument of the verb *dedykować* 'dedicate'. Accusative DPs occurring with transitive verbs or in double object constructions are uncontroversially considered arguments of the verb.

(1) a. (Jankowi) dobrze się tańczyło.
   (John.DAT) well REFL danced.3SG.N
   ‘(John) / One danced and he experienced that as good.’

b. (Jankowi) zakaszla się.
   (John.DAT) coughed.3SG.N REFL
   ‘(John) / One (accidentally) coughed.’

(2) (Jankowi) zepsuł się samochód Pawła.
   (John.DAT) broke down REFL car.NOM Paul.GEN
   ‘Paul’s car broke down (and John was affected by that).’

(3) (Jankowi) te teksty łatwo się tłumaczą.
   (John.DAT) these texts.NOM easily REFL translate.3PL
   ‘(To John), these texts translate easily.’

(4) Anna dedykuje ten wiersz *(Jankowi).
   Anna.NOM dedicates this poem.ACC John.DAT
   'Anna dedicates this poem to John.'

Structures containing dative-inflected NPs that are not selected by the main predicate have been identified in numerous unrelated languages. Two central issues discussed in the literature addressing them concern the above mentioned argument or the adjunct status of those datives and whether their semantic interpretation is licensed internally or externally to the dative constituent. Two obvious analyses of its structure will propose that the dative DP is either an argument of an external functional head introduced in the verbal projection which assigns the relevant semantics to it or that it is an adjunct that is assigned its interpretation internally to its constituent. The literature on dative nominals by and large adopts the former view and many such proposals have been inspired by Pylkkänen’s (2002, 2008) applicative analysis. They include, among others, an analysis by Bosse et al. (2012) of dative structures from Albanian, German, Hebrew and Japanese, proposals by Rivero & Arregui (2012) on dative structures in Slavic languages and by Rivero et al. (2010) on Polish and St’át’imcets and an analysis of Polish dative sentences by Malicka-Kleparska (2012a,c). In this paper, contrary to the above-mentioned proposals, I will claim that dative DPs in (1) – (3) should be analysed as adjuncts that receive their semantic interpretation from a functional head within the dative constituent. The two remaining possibilities in relation to the status of the dative NP and the source of its interpretation would assume that the dative is an adjunct introduced either by an external head or an argument introduced by an internal head. I will not follow Cinque’s analysis of adjuncts which assumes that they are specifiers of a particular class of functional heads. The analysis according to which the dative is an argument introduced by an internal head from which it receives its interpretation is incoherent and therefore cannot account for the structure of dative-nominal sentences.

In this article, I will propose an analysis that will be able to account for a number of differences between structures containing optional datives such as (1) – (3) and those with datives selected by the main predicate. The main feature of my proposal will be that the dative constituent occurring in (1) – (3) has an internal structure that comes partly from dative case itself and partly from a functional head internal to the constituent. This head will be absent in sentences such as (4) where the dative is
introduced into the structure by the verb. The proposal put forward in this paper will be able to explain differences between the two above-mentioned types of datives and, in addition, between the class of dative-inflected nominal on the one hand and nominative or accusative DPs on the other. I will demonstrate that when confronted with the full range of those structures¹, my analysis will offer a better account of the data than proposals based on the applicative model. More precisely, in section 2 I will introduce a specific syntactic structure both for argument and adjunct dative nominals and provide arguments in its favour on the basis of various dependency relations that exist between those datives and elements contained in the remaining part of the structure. In addition, I will provide a semantic representation for adjunct dative DPs and discuss the interpretations that they can receive in various contexts as well as the mechanisms by which those interpretations can be assigned. Section 3 will discuss some other aspects of dative-nominal structures related to the position in which adjunct dative DPs can appear in the clause. I will also refer to the competing proposals and demonstrate why they cannot account for the full set of the data introduced in this paper. Section 4 will conclude the paper and summarise the main ideas of the proposed analysis.

1.2. The meaning of dative nominal structures

In the structures in (1) – (3), the optional dative requires the sentence it combines with to express an event that the dative is associated with but not in control of. In some of these structures, the dative is identified with the performer of the action and in cases in which it is not associated with the subject argument, it is interpreted as an individual affected by a given event. There are no particular requirements with regards to the morphology of structures that can combine with the dative. However, as will be demonstrated further in the paper, the availability of the actor argument interpretation of the dative depends on the presence of the reflexive morpheme się² in sentences that the dative precedes.

In (1a) and (1b) the dative DP co-occurs with an impersonal sentence that is obligatorily composed of the neuter third person singular form of the verb and the morpheme się. I will refer to the dative sentences exemplified in (1) as the dative impersonal się construction. The sentence in (1a) also contains an obligatory adverb that refers to the way in which the agent perceives the action that he is performing and not to the quality of the action itself. In the absence of the dative, the remaining impersonal structure expresses an action that is performed by an arbitrary [+human³] subject.⁴ The

¹ Each of the above mentioned analyses that rely on the applicative proposal focuses on a limited set of dative structures that exist in the languages under discussion and in some cases would require some readjustments to be applicable to a wider range of structures.

² ‘Reflexive’ is the term traditionally used to refer to the morpheme się. I will use this term throughout the paper even though się has many usages some of which are not related to the notion of reflexivity.

³ As indicated by Krzek (2010:76), after Kibort (2008), the default [+human] interpretation of the impersonal się construction can be overridden by providing a different referent for the unspecified agent somewhere in the context, as in (i).

⁴ The
adverb occurring in such a structure, similarly to its interpretation in sentences containing a dative DP, normally refers to the way in which the arbitrary subject perceives the action that he is performing. This interpretation of the adverb is not possible in nominative-subject sentences. In these cases, the adverb can only refer to the quality of the action (5).

(5) Janek dobrze tańczył.
    John.NOM well danced.3SG.M
    ‘John danced well.’
    Not: ‘John danced and he experienced dancing as good.’

As indicated earlier, the difference between the two dative impersonal się sentences in (1) lies in the obligatory presence of an experiencer adverb in one of them. Both examples, however, contain an event that the dative is not in control of. Namely, in (1b) the dative does not control the action of coughing. The sentence in (1a), on the other hand, can be thought of as containing two events, one being the event of dancing and the other the event in which dancing is experienced in a certain way. In this case, the dative is in control of dancing but not of the experience.

The nominative-subject version of (1b), illustrated by (6) below, in underspecified as to whether or not the subject is in control of the action – it is compatible with a scenario in which John performs the action on purpose and with one where he does it accidentally.

(6) Janek kichnął.
    John.NOM sneezed.3SG.M
    ‘John sneezed.’

For this reason, it seems that the use of the dative case in sentences such as (1b) is justified only if the event expressed by the predicate can in theory be controlled by the actor argument. This initial observation is confirmed by the ungrammaticality of sentences in which the dative precedes a subject experiencer verb that describes a state that cannot be controlled as in (7).

---

4 Depending on the referent(s) available in the context in which the sentence is uttered, the covert arbitrary subject of the impersonal się construction may be specified for any person, number or gender (the following example has been adopted from Kibort 2004:288).

  i. Pracowało się jako nauczyciel / nauczycielka / nauczyciele / nauczycielki.
     worked.3SG.N REFL as teacher.M / teacher.F / teachers.VIR / teachers.NON-VIR
     ‘One worked as a teacher.’ / ‘People worked as teachers.’

As will be illustrated later in the paper, the presence of such an arbitrary subject in the structure will be necessary for the dative in sentences such as (1a) and (1b) to receive an (involuntary) agent/experiencer interpretation.

5 There is no similar restriction on the formation of impersonal się sentences that contain subject experiencer verbs:

  i. Lubi się Annę.
     likes.3SG.N REFL Anna. ACC
     ‘One likes Anna.’
(7) *Jankowi lubi się Annę.
   John.DAT likes. 3SG.N REFL Anna. ACC
   Intended reading: ‘John likes Anna.’

If the dative cannot be identified with the subject argument of the event described by the sentence it combines with, it has to be interpreted as affected by that event. In the example in (2) above the affectedness dative precedes the anticausative structure but it can co-occur with sentences that belong to various syntactic types. The obligatory affectedness interpretation of the dative occurring in such sentences is due to the fact that they all contain independent grammatical subjects with which the dative cannot be co-referential. The availability of the affectedness interpretation for the dative will be discussed in the relevant sections of this paper.

In the middle sentence in (3), similarly to the examples in (1), the dative NP is normally interpreted as the performer of the action expressed by the verb. However, it turns out that for a number of reasons middle structures in Polish behave differently from impersonal *się sentences. For example, they do not contain a syntactically active agent and can only be formed with transitive verbs.

As stated earlier, the sentences in (1) – (3) differ from the one in (4) due to the optional presence of the dative in their structure. Example (4) illustrates a case where it is normally assumed that the dative, nominative and accusative DPs are all arguments of the main predicate. The structures so far introduced in this paper should also be distinguished from other kinds of datives that are also widely used in Polish. In particular, even though optional datives in (1) – (3) may at first sight seem similar to those that occur in sentences such as (8) below, there are a number of reasons to think that they should not be treated in a uniform way.

\[\text{**An affectedness dative can combine with any type of structure that has an independent grammatical subject. In the sentence below it precedes the impersonal } –no/\text{-to construction that contains a covert subject which has to have a human referent. However, there are reasons to believe that there are certain restrictions on possible subjects of impersonal } –no/\text{-to sentences that do not apply in the impersonal *się construction (but see Kibort, 2004 for discussion). As a result, in the sentence below the dative cannot receive the involuntary agent/experiencer interpretation that was available for it in sentences in which it preceded the impersonal *się construction.}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{i.} & \quad (\text{Jankowi}) \ zepsuto \ samochód \ Pawła. \\
& \quad \text{(John.DAT) broke. -no/-to IMPERSONAL car.ACC Paul.GEN} \\
& \quad \text{‘People broke Paul’s car (and John was affected by that).’}
\end{align*}\]

\[\text{**Unlike impersonal *się sentences, middle structures cannot be followed by a purpose clause (i) and modified by the adverb celowo ‘deliberately’ in (ii).}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{i.} & \quad *\text{Te teksty szybko się tłumaczą żeby zadowolić wydawcę.} \\
& \quad \text{these texts.NOM fast REFL translate.3PL in order to please. INF publisher.ACC} \\
& \quad \text{‘*These texts translate fast in order to please the publisher.’} \\
\text{ii.} & \quad *\text{Te teksty szybko się tłumaczą celowo.} \\
& \quad \text{these texts.NOM fast REFL translate.3PL deliberately} \\
& \quad \text{‘*These texts translate fast on purpose.’}
\end{align*}\]

\[\text{**For reasons of space I cannot provide any relevant argumentation here but refer to Szymanek & Bondaruk (2007) for a discussion of some of the properties of the structure in (8).}\]
In the next section I will develop an account of structural differences between the two types of dative nominals and provide more details on the interpretations that are assigned to the optional dative in (1) – (3).

2. Basic proposal

Optional dative DPs can combine with a number of constructions that otherwise occur in the language as independent, well-formed structures. I propose that these datives should be analysed as adjuncts that select their sister constituent on the basis of that constituent’s eventive semantics (9).

According to my proposal, internally to the dative adjunct’s constituent, a dative-marked DP is selected by a functional head that assigns the out-of-control interpretation to it. I will therefore propose that the dative adjunct constituent has the internal structure illustrated by (10) and its meaning is represented as (11).

I will assume that depending on the structure in which it occurs, the dative’s lack of control over the event can be expressed either when the dative is identified with the subject argument of that event or when it is affected by that event. In order to be interpreted as the performer of the action, the dative has to be co-indexed with the referent of the arbitrary [+human] subject argument available in the structure that it precedes. I will propose that the reference of the dative DP is assigned to the subject of the
impersonal sentence following these steps of the *arb* interpretation rule in (12).\(^9\)

(12) a. If there is a suitable\(^{10}\) dative antecedent, assign its index to the subject.

\[
\text{TP} \\
\text{DP_{iDAT}} \\
\text{TP (e)}
\]

(Adv) ... *się* ... V

b. If there is no suitable antecedent available, interpret the subject as arbitrary.

As demonstrated above, the dative is interpreted as the performer of the action when it is identified with the referent of the arbitrary subject present in the structure to which it attaches. As participants in a given event must be specified, the requirement in (11) that the dative has to be interpreted as a participant in the event it is associated with is satisfied when, as a result of co-indexation with the arbitrary subject argument, the dative is linked to the subject's thematic role. On the other hand, if no such specification is provided, I will propose that through the application of the default rule in (13)\(^{11}\), participants are interpreted as affectees and then the requirement that they should be specified is satisfied.

\[
\text{PARTICIPANT} (x) \rightarrow \text{AFFECTED} (x)
\]

In line with Bosse, Bruening & Yamada's (2012) analysis, I will propose that affectedness dative structures in Polish contribute non-truth conditional meaning. I will assume that affectedness should be interpreted as a presupposition.

2.1. *Affectedness as presupposition*

According to the rule in (11), when the dative receives the actor interpretation, it is not in control of the event in which it participates. In the affectedness scenario, the action is not performed by the dative but there is a presupposition that the dative is psychologically affected by that event. I will demonstrate that this claim is true on the basis of the *Hey wait a minute* test, illustrated by von Fintel (2001), among others, that will be applied to one of the affectedness dative structures. According to the test, in

\(^9\) Similar proposals have been put forward in the literature to explain the interpretation of PRO subjects of infinitives, e.g. Williams (1980).

\(^{10}\) For a dative DP to co-index with the subject, the locality condition must be fulfilled and the dative also has to occur in its base-generated position.

\(^{11}\) There are other rules of this nature that assign default interpretations to categories which remain unspecified. See, for example, Harley and Ritter's (2002) discussion of person features.
response to the speaker’s utterance of Y, the hearer can reply *Hey wait a minute I didn’t know X* if and only if Y presupposes X. Therefore, in the context of (14a), when the hearer is informed about Paul’s actions, they can object along the lines of (14b).

(14) a. Jankowi Paweł hałasuje!
    John.DAT Paul.NOM makes-noise.3SG.M
    ‘Paul is making a noise (and John is affected by that).’

    b. *Hej, zaraz, nie wiedziałem, że to Jankowi przeszkadza!*
    Hey, wait a minute, I didn’t know that this.NOM John.DAT disturbs.3SG
    ‘Hey, wait a minute, I didn’t know that John was affected by that!’

On the other hand, the results of the *Hey wait a minute* test applied to datives which are identified with actor arguments of their events confirm that there is no need to assume that those datives are also affected (15).

(15) a. Jankowi się zakaszlało!
    John.DAT REFL coughed.3SG.N
    ‘John (accidentally) coughed!’

    b. *Hej, zaraz, nie wiedziałem, że to Jankowi przeszkadza!*
    Hey, wait a minute, I didn’t know that this.NOM John.DAT disturbs.3SG
    ‘Hey, wait a minute, I didn’t know that #John was affected by that!’

In this respect, (15a) resembles sentences with nominative subjects which are not presupposed to be affected by the action that they perform.

    John.NOM coughed.3SG.M
    ‘John coughed.’

    b. *Hej, zaraz, nie wiedziałem, że to Jankowi przeszkadza!*
    Hey, wait a minute, I didn’t know that this.NOM John.DAT disturbs.3SG
    ‘Hey, wait a minute, I didn’t know that #John was affected by that!’

The above data confirm that datives which are interpreted as involuntary performers of the action are not necessarily interpreted as affectees. Therefore, in this aspect they pattern with nominative agents that are not expected to encode affectedness as part of their semantics. The proposal described above assumes that the affectedness interpretation for the dative is only available when the dative is a participant in an event but the structure it combines with has no argument to which it could be linked to be interpreted as the performer of the action. This does not mean that an experiencer/involuntary agent dative cannot at the same time be affected by the event that he performs. In fact, one would be expected to be affected by a state that one experiences or an action that one knowingly performs. In this case, this additional affectedness interpretation does not need to be assigned to the dative as it is specified as a participant in the event via its agent theta role. However, if the dative is not the performer of the action, as in the examples above, it can only be linked to that action via the notion of affectedness.

2.2. Non-truth-conditionality of affectedness
Evidence that the sense of affectedness should be considered a non-truth-conditional part of the meaning of sentences such as (14a) comes from the fact that their affected meaning survives under negation (17) and yes/no questions (18). For example, even if the answer to the question in (18) below is negative, it cannot refer to lack of affectedness on the part of the dative DP.

(17) Nie jest tak, że Jankowi Paweł zbił wazon Tomka.
   ‘It is not the case that Paul broke Tom’s vase (and John was affected by that).’
   Unavailable interpretation: ‘Paul broke Tom’s vase but that did not affect John (or anyone else).’

(18) Jankowi zepsuł się samochód Pawła?
   ‘Did Paul’s car break down (and did that affect John)?
   a. Tom’s car broke down (and John was affected by that).
   b. Paul’s car broke down (and Mary was affected by that).
   c. Paul’s bike broke down (and John was affected by that).
   d. Paul’s car stalled (and John was affected by that).
   Unavailable reading: ‘No - Paul’s car broke down (and John (or anyone else) was not affected by that)’

The fact that the sense of affectedness contributes to non-truth-conditional meaning is consistent with its proposed presupposition status.

2.3. The internal structure of adjunct datives

The representation in (10) makes certain predictions with regards to the properties of the dative DP. The initial evidence in favour of its adjunct status is based on their three important characteristics. Namely, in all the examples in (1) – (3), the dative nominal is an optional element of the structure. It makes a consistent semantic contribution to the meaning of the constituent that it modifies and it seems to attach to its sister constituent on the basis of that constituent's semantic specification. In addition, it will be shown that the representation in (10) correctly predicts the dative’s properties in relation to binding and control of secondary predicates and is also able to account for a number of differences between dative DPs in (1) – (3) and those that appear in double object constructions or as sole objects of a verb. These contrasts cannot be captured by the competing analyses that ascribe the argument status to all of those dative nominals.\(^\text{12}\) The structure in (10) is repeated as (19).

\(^{12}\) Please see references at the beginning of the paper.
As proposed in the above representation, internally to the dative adjunct, the dative NP is an argument of a functional head that assigns the out-of-control interpretation to it. In addition, I will follow analyses along the lines of Caha (2008), which rely on the idea of case hierarchy and propose that the dative case involves more complex structure than the accusative or any other case that is lower in the hierarchy. The internal structure of the dative constituent will thus be represented as in (20).

In the remaining sections of this paper, I will demonstrate that the representation in (19) makes the right predictions in relation to the dative's (in)ability to participate in anaphoric and variable binding and control secondary predicates. I will assume that these relations are regulated by percolation of three different types of information contained in a noun phrase to higher nodes in the structure. According to (20), there are three levels within the dative constituent at which thematic information, (relevant to secondary predication), and case and scope information (that regulate anaphoric \(^{13}\) and pronominal binding, respectively), can be represented. More specifically, on the basis of the assumption that surface c-command is crucial in order to establish anaphoric binding and secondary predication relations but not required for variable binding, I will assume that (21) correctly illustrates percolation of the three types of information.

\(^{13}\) I will assume that anaphoric binding information is linked to case which would explain why this type of binding is restricted to A-positions.
According to the above diagram, thematic information remains low and case information, represented by an index, can only percolate to the dative node. Scope extension does not seem to be restricted in a similar way, which is consistent with the fact that the pronominal binding appears to be the most loose relation in terms of the c-command requirement. Even though it is not possible to specify at this stage why certain types of information can percolate higher than others, (21) predicts that a hierarchical order exists that specifies the availability of the three types of relations with respect to each other. Namely, it is expected that the inability of an element to perform pronominal binding excludes it both from becoming a reflexive binder and a controller of secondary predicates. This is represented in (22).

\[
\text{(22) } \text{pronominal binding} << \text{reflexive binding} << \text{predication}
\]

The diagram in (21) therefore makes certain predictions in relation to binding and control of secondary predicates by both adjunct and argument datives. In what follows, I will demonstrate how these predictions are confirmed by the data.

### 2.3.1 Pronominal binding

According to the diagram in (21), pronominal binding should be less restricted than anaphoric binding and secondary predication due to the fact that scope information percolates to a higher node than information relevant for the other two relations. However, it is still necessary to justify binding from an A-bar position in the first place as it is often assumed that only arguments can act as binders. The sentence in (23) confirms that pronominal binding by an adjunct is also possible.

\[
\text{(23) } \text{Every day, John thinks it is the best day of his life.}
\]

According to (21), scope information can percolate to the highest node within the dative constituent and as a result of this the dative DP c-commands the structure with which it combines. Subject to locality conditions on binding, dative adjuncts should therefore be able to bind pronouns occurring lower in the structure. This is confirmed by (24) and (25). The first example is ungrammatical as it
violates principle B\textsuperscript{14} but long distance binding is allowed in the second.

\textbf{(24)} \*Każdemu chłopcu Paweł goi uderzył.
\hfill [every boy].DAT Paul.NOM hei.ACC hit.3SG.M
\hfill Intended meaning: ‘Paul hit every boy (and every boy was affected by that).’

\textbf{(25)} Każdej nauczycielce Paweł oblał egzamin bo jej
\hfill [every teacher].i.DAT Paul.NOM failed.3SG.M exam.ACC because shei.GEN
\hfill ‘Paul failed an exam (and every teacher was affected by that) because he didn’t
\hfill nie słuchał.
\hfill NEG listened.3SG.M
\hfill listen to her.’

Similarly, pronominal binding by dative and accusative complements of a verb should be possible. As expected, (26) and (28) violate principle B but (27) and (29) are grammatical.

\textbf{(26)} *Przedstawiam każdemu chłopcu jego.
\hfill introduce.1SG [every boy].i.DAT himi.ACC
\hfill Intended meaning: ‘I am introducing every boy to himself.’

\textbf{(27)} Daję każdemu chłopcu książkę bo goi lubię.
\hfill give.1SG [every boy].i.DAT book.ACC because hei.ACC like.1SG
\hfill ‘I give every boy a book because I like him.’

\textbf{(28)} *Skłócam każdego chłopca z nimi.
\hfill conflict.1SG [every boy].i.ACC with him
\hfill Intended meaning: ‘I am causing every boy to argue with himself.’

\textbf{(29)} Zjadam wszystkie dania bo jej lubię.
\hfill eat.1SG [all courses].i.ACC because theyi.ACC like.1SG
\hfill ‘I’m eating all courses because I like them.’

The above examples confirm that both accusative objects and the two types of datives provided in (1) – (3) and (4) can perform pronominal binding. However, it cannot be concluded that there are no restrictions on this type of binding. For example, in (30) the quantifier cannot scope out of the relative clause.

\textsuperscript{14} Sentences in which the dative is co-indexed with a pronominal possessor or with a pronoun contained within a prepositional phrase receive better judgements than (24).

\begin{itemize}
  \item[i.] Każdej nianii Paweł ciągle oblewa herbatą jej ulubioną bluzkę.
  \hfill [Every nanny].i.DAT Paul constantly pours tea.INSTR [heri. favourite blouse].ACC
  \hfill ‘Paul constantly pours tea on every nanny’s favourite blouse (and every nanny is affected by that).’
  \item[ii.] Każdej nianii Paweł ciągle wylewa na nią herbatę
  \hfill [Every nanny].i.DAT Paul constantly pours tea.ACC on hei. herbatę
  \hfill ‘Paul constantly pours tea on every nanny (and every nanny is affected by that).’
\end{itemize}

Cross-linguistically, these two cases are known exceptions to the Principle B condition.
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(30) *Student, który czyta każdą książkę, rozumie ją.
Student.NOM who reads.3SG every book.i.ACC understands.3SG iti.ACC
*‘The student that reads every book understands it.’

2.3.2. Anaphoric binding

On the other hand, case information related to anaphoric binding in (21) cannot be represented beyond the dative case node and therefore the out-of-control head blocks c-command from this node to the constituent with which the dative NP combines. For this reason, it is expected that there will be a contrast in the anaphoric binding properties of dative adjuncts in (1) – (3) on the one hand and dative complements of a verb which are not introduced into the structure by an additional functional head on the other. Accusative objects are expected to pattern with dative arguments and allow anaphoric binding as well. This is confirmed by the data. The sentence in (31) shows both that anaphoric binding by the affectedness dative is not possible and that the accusative object (and nominative subject) of przedstawiać ‘introduce’ can act as a binder.

(31) [Obydwu chłopcom]i pro)i przedstawiamy obie dziewczyny sobie*i,j,k nawzajem.
[Both boys]i.DAT (we)j introduce.1PL [both girls]k.ACC self*i,j,k.DAT reciprocally
‘We introduce both girls to each other (and both boys are affected by that).’

As expected, the dative argument of powiedzieć ‘tell’ and pokazać ‘show’ can bind the reflexive/reciprocal expression within the PP (32a) and the reciprocal direct object (32b).

(32) a. Piotrze powiedział dziewczynom o sobie*i,j.DAT (nawzajem).
Peter.NOM told.3SG girlsj.DAT about selfi,j (reciprocally)
‘Peter told the girls about himself/ each other.’

b. Piotr i Tomek pokazali dziewczynom siebie*i,j (nawzajem).
[Peter and Tom]i.NOM showed.3PL girlsj.DAT selfi,j,NOM (reciprocally)
‘Peter and Tom showed the girls to each other.’
(Witkoś: year unknown)

The above structures confirm that dative adjuncts can bind pronominal but not anaphoric elements occurring in the clause with which they combine. This contrast is expected under (21) but should disappear in sentences such as (33) below where the dative is identified with the performer of the action. This is because in such sentences the dative is co-indexed with the impersonal subject argument that is normally allowed to bind reflexive/reciprocal expressions. As predicted, (33) is acceptable.

(33) [Ani i Janowi]i miło się przedstawia obydwu uczniom siebie*i,j nawzajem.
[Ann and John]i.DAT nicely REFL.introduce.3SG.N [both pupils]j.DAT selfi,j.ACC reciprocally
‘Ann and John are introducing both pupils to each other and they experience that as nice.’

Differences in the ability to perform anaphoric binding between adjunct and complement datives illustrated by (31) – (32) are not expected under the applicative analysis as this proposal ascribes argument status to both types of datives. Moreover, it presupposes that the dative should be able to bind
anaphors regardless of whether or not it is associated with the impersonal subject. For this reason it cannot explain the contrast between sentences such as (31) in which binding by the dative is not possible and examples such as (33) where the dative can act as a binder.

2.3.3. Secondary predication

As secondary predicate licensing conditions include the requirements that a secondary predicate has to be c-commanded by its subject and that the subject has to occupy an A-position, secondary predication data can provide a further argument to support the configuration in (21). The role of the c-command restriction on predication is demonstrated in (34).

(34)  
a. John ate the dish warm.
b. *John ate from the dish warm.

In both cases the subject of the secondary predicate occupies an argument position. However, in the ungrammatical (34b) the dish does not c-command the adjective that it is supposed to be modified by because it is contained inside a PP which does not contain warm; in (34a), however, there is c-command from the DP to the modifying adjective. Similarly, the c-command requirement is not satisfied in the case of adjunct dative DPs and therefore they cannot be modified by non-agreeing\textsuperscript{15} secondary predicates (35).

(35)  
*Jankowi Paweł hałasował nago.
  John.DAT Paul.NOM made-noise.3SG.M naked.NON-AGR
  ‘Paul was making a noise naked (and John was affected by that).’
  Unavailable reading: ‘Paul was making a noise (when John was naked and John was affected by that event).’

The above sentence is acceptable if the secondary predicate nago ‘naked’ modifies the nominative subject. Therefore, just as in the case of the anaphoric binding data (cf. (33)), the dative becomes a possible controller of the secondary predicate when it is identified with the impersonal subject (36).

(36)  
Jankowi przyjemnie tańczyło się nago.
  John.DAT pleasurably danced. 3SG.N REFL naked.NON-AGR
  ‘John danced naked and he considered dancing pleasurable.’

Again, the contrast between (35) and (36) is not expected under the applicative analysis but can be

\textsuperscript{15} Dative DPs can be modified by agreeing secondary predicates:

\begin{enumerate}
\item Jankowi Paweł hałasował nagiemu.
  John.DAT Paul.NOM made-noise.3SG.M naked.DAT.M
  ‘Paul was making a noise (when John was naked and John was affected by that event).’
\end{enumerate}

The contrast between (i) here and (35) above can be accounted for on the assumption proposed for various languages that agreement is an alternative to c-command.
accounted for by the proposal in (21). In addition, (21) offers an explanation for the unavailability of control of secondary predicates in the case of dative nominals, regardless of their adjunct or argument status. Namely, as illustrated in (37) and (38), dative but not accusative objects also fail to control secondary predicates.

(37) *Anna pomaga Jankowi nago.
    Anna.NOM helps.3SG John.DAT naked.NON-AGR
    ‘Anna helps John naked.’

(38) Anna spotkała Janka nago.
    Anna.NOM met.3SG John.ACC naked.NON-AGR
    ‘Anna met John naked.’

The difference between these two sentences and the ungrammaticality of (37) follow form the internal structure of the dative proposed in (21). Namely, the additional structure of the dative case compared with accusative or nominative blocks c-command from the DP to the modifier regardless of whether the dative DP is a complement of a verb or whether it is introduced by the out-of-control head. Again, it is not clear how the applicative analysis could account for the above grammaticality judgements for (35), (37) and (38). One solution that it could adopt to explain the contrast between (37) and (38) is to admit that dative case has more structure than accusative case. However, once this is accepted, it seems that there is not much motivation to claim that the dative’s semantics should be located outside the dative constituent in the extended verbal projection.

2.3.4. Optionality and semantic selection by the dative

As far as the optionality of the adjunct is concerned, the semantic or syntactic well-formedness of the above sentences does not depend on the dative DP. Therefore, in the absence of a dative nominal, sentences such as (1) will be interpreted as impersonal structures referring to the action performed by an arbitrary subject who will perceive that action as pleasurable. Another difference between adjuncts and arguments concerns the fact that adjuncts are systematically optional whilst arguments can be left out from the structure only under certain conditions. As was indicated earlier, the dative is never an obligatory constituent of the structures illustrated by (1) – (3). This is a property characteristic of adjuncts. Arguments, on the other hand, can only be left out in some specific cases. For example, objects of some transitive verbs can only be omitted if the interpretation of the verb-object unit is specified in the lexicon and, as a result, its reading remains the same even when the object has been omitted. This happens in the case of verbs such as smoke or drink that typically refer to smoking tobacco and drinking alcohol also when their objects are not explicitly present. Expression of a direct object is sometimes also optional in the case of other transitive verbs such as read, win, bake. However, alongside such verbs there are those that never allow their objects to be omitted. In that respect, the distribution of the dative is much more regular than that of direct objects. Namely, the dative in sentences (1) – (3) is never an obligatory element of the structure and as such it can be freely omitted without having to satisfy any semantic or syntactic requirements.

Also, impersonal się sentences cannot be treated as instances of, for example, (1a) or (1b) in which the dative would have been left out according to the same principles that allow the omission of pragmatically inferable argument pronouns in a number of pro-drop languages. As demonstrated by the two examples below, only (39b) is an acceptable continuation of (39a). The unacceptability of (39c) in
this context confirms that this sentence is an impersonal structure referring to an action carried out by
an arbitrary subject and as such it does not contain a phonologically null dative pronoun.

(39) a. Czego chciałeś się dowiedzieć o Janku?
What wanted.2SG find out.INF about John
‘What did you want to find out about Janek?’

b. Że właśnie wyszedł?
That just left.2SG.M
‘That he has just left?’

c. Że przyjemnie się wczoraj tańczyło?
that pleasurably REFL yesterday danced.3SG.N
Intended meaning: ‘That he danced yesterday and considered dancing pleasurable?’

The above data confirm that datives in (1) – (3) pattern with adjuncts rather than with arguments. Just
like adjuncts, they are always optional. Even though in some circumstances arguments can also be
considered optional, there exist certain conditions specifying when they can be left out from the
structure. There are no similar restrictions in the case of the dative.

Arguments and adjuncts also differ in terms of the way in which they contribute semantically to the
meaning of the sentence in which they occur. Whilst arguments demonstrate a great deal of variation in
terms of their semantic interpretation, it has typically been assumed that adjuncts make a constant
semantic contribution to the meaning of the constituent that they modify.\(^{16}\) Therefore, even though
adjuncts belong to different groups distinguished on the basis of their meanings, a particular adjunct
will always contribute to the meaning of a sentence in the same way. For example, adverbs of time will
always specify the temporal frame of the modified event regardless of the other properties of the
structure in which they occur. Arguments, on the other hand, will receive a different interpretation
depending on the kind of syntactic head they are selected by.\(^ {17}\) As a result, even the interpretation
assigned to arguments that constantly occur in the subject or the object position in a clause will vary
among agents, experiencers, themes, etc. For instance, the DPs in run a mile, knit a sweater or worry
John will be interpreted in different ways even though they occupy the same position within their
verbal phrases. The fact that unselected datives always receive the same interpretation regardless of the
structure that they are followed by demonstrates that in this respect they also pattern with adjuncts.

\(^{16}\) A proposal trying to undermine this claim could potentially rely on the observation that the adverb ‘cleverly’ in the
following examples can either describe the way in which the car was repaired (i) or it can refer to the fact that the car was
repaired at all (ii), which would suggest that the meaning of the adverb changes depending on the position in which it
attaches:

i. John has repaired the car cleverly.
ii. John cleverly has repaired the car.

However, the above data can also be explained in the following way. One possibility is that there are two types of ‘cleverly’
and each of these has unique semantic contribution. According to the other solution, there is only one ‘cleverly’ that has the
same semantic contribution but its interpretation depends on what element it combines with. Crucially, regardless of which
of the two options is chosen, the adverb still makes a single semantic contribution to the meaning of the constituent that it
modifies and the claim that its interpretation depends on its attachment site can no longer be maintained.

\(^{17}\) Proposals that would like to relate those different interpretations to different syntactic structures could rely on cross-
linguistic data showing that certain types of objects could occupy a different position from other objects with respect to the
head that they are selected by. However, no evidence is available as yet to confirm that such data actually exist.
2.4. Summary

The analysis introduced in this section is based on the representation in (21) that aims to account for different behaviour of the two types of dative NPs. It proposes that optional datives in (1) – (3) are best analysed as adjuncts that select a constituent they combine with on the basis of that constituent’s eventive semantics. The internal structure of dative DPs is confirmed by a number of types of data including binding and secondary predication examples.\(^{18}\)

3. High and low datives

The sentences in (1) - (3) all contain dative DPs which occur in the initial position in the clause. However, on the basis of a number of scope data, I will show that there is more than one position where those datives can originate.

Dative DPs that receive the agent interpretation occur sentence-initially in the neutral word order. Due to this and because of the fact that they lack any kind of interpretation that they could be assigned lower in the structure, I will claim that they surface in their base-generated position.

Conversely, the high attachment site is not available for affectedness datives and they occur sentence-initially only as a result of movement. This claim is supported by sentences such as (40) where the dative modified by scope-bearing dokładnie trzej ‘exactly three’ co-occurs with ponownie ‘again’.\(^{19}\)

\[
(40) \quad [\text{Dokładnie trzem nauczycielom}] \quad \text{ponownie} \quad \text{Janek oblał egzamin.}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[exactly three teachers].DAT} & \text{ again John.DAT failed.3SG.M exam.ACC} \\
\text{a. ‘Again, exactly three teachers were affected by John failing the exam (for the second time).’} & \text{again > exactly}
\end{align*}
\]

b. Unavailable reading: ‘Exactly three teachers were again affected by John failing the exam (for the second time).’

\*exactly > again

\(^{18}\) Further arguments in favour of (21) can possibly be provided by weak island extraction patterns but more research needs to be carried out to collect the relevant data.

\(^{19}\) The results of this test are contradictory to judgements of some speakers, including myself, who allow dative DPs to take scope over ‘again’ in sentences such as (i).

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{i. Marysi } & \text{ponownie Janek oblał egzamin.} \\
\text{Mary.DAT} & \text{again John.NOM failed.3SG.M exam.ACC}
\end{align*}
\]

Reading 1: ‘Again, John failed his exam and Mary was affected by that.’

Reading 2: ‘Mary was affected (for the first time) by John failing his exam again.’

\text{DAT > again}

Whilst reading 1 is available to everyone, reading 2 is only allowed by some. However, interpretation 2 is no longer available to anyone when in sentences such as (i) the dative is modified by the reflexive possessor swój ‘one’s’ that has to be bound by the subject. In such cases, the dative must originate in the scope of ‘again’ and it obligatorily reconstructs for binding. The speakers who allow affectedness datives to take scope over ‘again’ in examples such as (i) do not accept the wide scope of dative NPs interpreted as benefactives which shows that benefactive datives can occur sentence-initially only as a result of movement.
Namely, in (40) ‘exactly three’ can only be interpreted in the scope of ‘again’, which shows that the dative originates low in the clause. The sentence in (40) can thus describe a scenario in which again exactly three teachers are affected by the subject failing the exam for the second time. The wide scope reading of ‘exactly three’ is not available. Similarly to sentences containing dative affectees, evidence that there was an associated low position for dative agents could come from scope patterns in sentences such as (41) that contain the same scope bearing elements as (40).

(41) Dokładnie trzem kobietom przyjemnie ponownie się tańczyło.
[exactly three women].DAT pleasurably again REFL danced.3SG.N
a. ‘Exactly three women again danced and considered dancing as pleasurable.’
   exactly > again
b. Unavailable reading: ‘Again, exactly three women danced and considered dancing as pleasurable.’
   *again > exactly

In the above case, in order to get the reading illustrated by (41b), ponownie would have to occur sentence-initially. This is not required for it to take scope over dokładnie trzem in (40).

The above scope interaction data show that adjunct datives in (1) – (3) can originate in more than one position in the structure. The restriction demonstrated by (40) that affectedness datives have to be generated in the low position does not have any bearing on their predicted properties discussed in this paper.

4. Conclusions

I have proposed that optional dative DPs in (1) – (3) should be analysed as adjuncts with the inherent ‘out-of-control’ semantics defined by (11) and the internal syntactic structure represented by (20). This analysis correctly predicts the meaning of sentences in which optional datives occur and it accounts for the two interpretations that can be assigned to them in the relevant contexts. In addition, the internal structure proposed for optional and argument dative NPs explains different patterns of behaviour of these two classes of datives and also captures the differences between dative and accusative noun phrases. This cannot be achieved by proposals based on the applicative model that have been argued to be able to account for the properties of at least some structures containing optional datives in other languages.
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