

The end of the path for the selected vs. non-selected distinction?

BACKGROUND AND CLAIM. Dative arguments present a challenge to argument realization models since in many languages, among them Russian, the third argument of ditransitive constructions (*send*), an optional argument of transitive constructions (*break*), and an inner argument of intransitive constructions (*surrender*, *lie*) are identically marked, blurring a clear division between selected and non-selected arguments within one language or cross-linguistically. Russian is an interesting case, as a large number of canonical ditransitive verbs (Gropen *et al.*'s 89 classifications) appearing with morphologically marked dative arguments present a semantic and syntactic ambiguity:

- (1) Ivan poslal/prodal Maše motociklet i. 'Ivan sent/old a motorcycle to Masha.'
 Ivan sent/sold Masha.DAT motorcycle.ACC ii. 'Ivan sent/sold a motorcycle for Masha.'

We show that the ambiguity is due to two underlying available orders, featuring respectively low and high datives (Miyagawa & Tsujioka 04, a.o.). We claim that the low dative of (2a) is to be seen as a selected dative, since it serves as the building block of the event-skeleton of caused-motion predicates (Larson 88 a.o.): it is part of a PP that semantically encodes the reference point on a (un)bounded complex or simplex path scale (Hay et al. 99, Beavers 11) and forms a complex predicate with V, sharing the figure/theme argument. Syntactically, the PP has a defective internal structure and is headed by a null preposition, that maps the referential expression into sets of points (akin to K in Svenonius 08, cf. den Dikken 06). In (2b), the dative DP is not part of any specific scalar structure, and is introduced by an applicative head (Bruening 10 et seq.) freely added to VPs with any of the possible scalar structures expressing change: extent, path, property (Hay et al. 99), and it is in this sense it is not selected.

- (2) a. [_{VP} DP_{Agent} v [_{VP} DP_{ACC} V [_{PP} P_o **DP_{DAT}**]]]
 b. [_{VP} DP_{Agent} v [_{ApplP} **DP_{DAT}** Appl [_{VP} ... V DP_{ACC} / DP_{ACC} V (PP)...]]]

We assume that the morphological identity of the two datives is due to the similar coding of P_o and Appl (Wood & Marantz 15), where both heads are null and introduce an animate DP. These differ as to the directionality of selection (Wood 13) with non-trivial repercussions on the event structure. While *the lower null head* merges with an animate complement and is selected by V, like a traditional directional P (Svenonius 06, Gehrke 08), *the higher null head* merges with a (scale-denoting) VP including the object DP, and introduces in its specifier an animate DP. Crucially, we point to a strict correlation between interpretation and height true for languages with datives such as Russian (A), in which even those verbs with caused possession interpretation that might seem as instantiating only high datives such as *give* and *show*, always have low, locational, datives as well. Under this view a low dative is interpreted as a possessor due to a transfer construal structurally represented by a V-P_o complex predicate, and a high dative is interpreted as a possessor without a transfer construal (Beavers 11) as this interpretation represents a subclass of bene-/maleficiary readings (cf. Levin 08, Boneh & Sichel 10). Also, we identify a particular property of Russian enabling to tease apart the two types of datives: high datives only occur with bi-argument predicates, while low datives can also be found in *intransitive* structures, where either Agent or Theme is syntactically realized (B).

A. HEIGHT OF ATTACHMENT CORRELATES WITH INTERPRETATION. Many ditransitive verbs, traditionally divided into caused motion and caused possession predicates, present systematic symmetric binding patterns, showing meaning differences as those exemplified in (1). The DAT can be interpreted as a beneficiary when it is the binder, but this reading is unavailable with ACC as a binder.

- (3) general poslal (a) etix soldat drug drugu / (b) drug drugu etix soldat (na pomošč)
 general sent these soldiers.ACC each other.DAT / each other.DAT these soldiers.ACC (for help)
 'The general sent the soldiers to each other (for help).' [the soldiers end up at the same place]
 (4) sud'ba poslala (a) etim soldatam drug druga / (b) drug druga etim soldatam
 fate sent these soldiers.DAT each other.ACC / each other.ACC these soldiers.DAT
 'Fate sent these soldiers each other.' [soldiers may not be at the same place]

These binding patterns with their meaning correlates are consistent with the fact that only the binding pattern DAT>ACC and a bene-/maleficiary reading for the dative is available when it occurs with predicates expressing property scales (i.e. change of state verbs):

- (5) Ja uspokoil/ zakoldoval { mal'čikam drug druga / *mal'čikov drug drugu}
 I calmed / jinxed boys.DAT each other.ACC / boys.ACC each other.DAT
 'I calmed the boys for each other.' / 'I jinxed the boys for each other.'

Note that binding patterns are not altered by scrambling in (3)-(4), triggered in the (b) examples by discourse operations such as leftward movement of the focused anaphor (contrastive focus

scrambling) or left dislocation of the distressed anaphor to foreground the focused binder (distress scrambling). Thus VP-internal scrambling does not feed A-binding and counts as an A-bar operation (Wurmbrand 10, contra Bailyn 10, 12). This view of scrambling and binding patterns correlated with interpretation is strengthened when considering nominalizations. Datives can appear in nominalizations with a path reading only, and as expected, only GEN(=theme)>DAT pattern is attested. Bene-/maleficiary arguments, which we claim to be introduced by Appl, are not customarily attested (Kayne 84, Bruening 10). This will exemplified in the talk.

Additionally, while datives with path reading are not subject to frozen scope effects, benefactive datives are. This pattern is due to difference in structural height and possibilities of reconstruction (Antonyuk-Yudina 15, Bruening 01).

- (6) a. Ja poslal kakomu-to bolel'sčiku každuyu futbolku ($\exists > \forall$), ?($\forall > \exists$)
 I sent some fan.DAT each tee-shirt.ACC 'I sent (to) some fan each tee-shirt.'
 b. Ja otbelil kakomu-to bolel'sčiku každuyu futbolku ($\exists > \forall$), *($\forall > \exists$)
 I whitened some fan.DAT each tee-shirt ACC 'I whitened for some fan each tee-shirt.'

Finally, with the most prototypical ditransitive verb, *dat* 'give', a clear contrast emerges in scope patterns between the verb in Oehrle contexts (7), where the dative is high and devoid of any locative meaning, presenting frozen scope, and cases like (8) with fluid scope, where the dative is low and locational with an implied transfer reading typical of nuptial contracts. The same pattern correlating height an interpretation is also attested with A-binding, and will be presented in the talk.

- (7) žizn imperatora dala kakuju-to pjesu každomu pisatelju / kakomu-to pisatelju každuju pjesu
 life.NOM emperor.GEN gave some play.ACC each writer.DAT / some writer.DAT each play.ACC
 i. 'The emperor's life gave some play for/to each writer.' ($\exists > \forall$), ($\forall > \exists$)
 ii. 'The emperor's life gave some writer each play.' ($\exists > \forall$), *($\forall > \exists$)
 (8) korol dal kakuju-to doč' každomu rycarju / kakomu-to rycarju každuju doč'
 king gave some daughter.ACC each knight.DAT / some knight.DAT each daughter.ACC
 i. 'The king gave some daughter (of his) to each knight.' ($\exists > \forall$), ($\forall > \exists$)
 ii. 'The king gave some knight each daughter (of his).' ($\exists > \forall$), ($\forall > \exists$)

B. NUMBER OF ARGUMENTS AFFECTS DATIVE HEIGHT. Two additional pieces of evidence, peculiar to Russian, which tie path readings of datives with their low structural source come from syntactic environments involving reduced argument realizations: (i) Unaccusatives allow only low datives with path reading and disallowing high datives with a beneficiary interpretation in change of state unaccusatives.

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

We maintain that expletive voice heading unaccusative vPs cannot select an argument introducing Appl as the introduced argument disrupts the strict identity relation between the theme and the expletive voice denotation 'event happening on its own' often spelled-out by non-active/reflexive *-sja* morpheme (Haspelmath 93, Shaeffer 08).

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

- (11) a. *sdat'sja vragu* (surrender [lit. *give up*] enemy.DAT); b. *poddat'sjasoblaznu* (give in temptation.DAT); c. *otrkyt'sja psixologu* (confess [lit. *open up*] psychologist.DAT);

We show that these verbs are akin to Icelandic "fake" figure reflexive *-st* predicates (Wood 14), where a V selects the path PP and the VP combines with an external Agent argument, also understood as the figure with respect to the PP. The affix *-st/-sja* is taken to function as an expletive that semantically conveys the figure-hood of the object (coreferent with the agent) but does not count as a referential internal argument. Predicates in (11) are to be contrasted with a restricted number of *-sja* agentive reflexives.

- (12) mal'čik pomylsja/nariadilsja (*mame)
 boy wash-sja/dress-up-sja mother.DAT
 'The boy washed himself/dressed himself up for (his) mother.'

The verbs in (12) cannot appear with dative arguments as their event structure involves a property scale and disallows the projection of the low dative only compatible with path scales. Moreover, as the subject of the change (i.e. the theme) is not structurally present in VP (the reflexives only allow sloppy readings under VP-ellipsis, (Sells et.al. 87)), the high Appl cannot introduce an argument to an unsaturated scale, marked by *-sja*, disrupting thus the strict adjacency between the agent and the expletive theme.