

Spatial datives as affected datives

Summary: In a variety of languages the dative case can be used in motion constructions with a spatial interpretation, identifying, specifically, the Ground of motion. A case in point is the Latin dative when used with prefixed verbs of motion, which I call *p-dative*. I argue that *p*-datives are neither arguments of the prepositional prefix nor high datives (benefactive/malefactive), but arguments introduced by an Affected Applicative head in the sense of Cuervo (2003). The dative, merged below the eventive head, binds a null nominal embedded in the structure of a PP encoding the final location and providing the source for the prepositional prefix. The dative is thereby interpreted as the Ground of motion. Finally, I compare this use in Latin with similar uses of the dative in Catalan and German.

P-datives (*aggeri* ‘the rampart’) identify the Ground of motion with predicates headed by prefixed verbs (*in-ferebant* ‘carried against’):

- (1) *Aggeri ignem in-ferebant.* (Caes. Gall. 7, 22, 4)
 rampart.DAT fire.ACC in-carry.IPFV.3PL
 ‘They were carrying fire against the rampart.’

This use of the dative has been the matter of a long debate in the Latin linguistic tradition, because of the great number of prefixed verbs that license it (Lehmann 1983). Interestingly, the construction contrasts with similar ones in which the Ground of motion shows up in the accusative (goal Grounds; see 2) or in the ablative (source Grounds; see 3), depending on the preposition that corresponds to the prefix at hand:

- (2) *Istum circum-duce has=ce aedis.* (Plaut. Most. 843)
 that.M.ACC around-bring.IMP.2SG this.ACC.F.PL=here house.ACC.PL
 ‘Take that one round this house.’
 Cf. *circum aedis* (Acc.)/**aedibus* (Abl.) ‘round the house’

- (3) *[Metellus] monte de-scenderat.* (Sall. Iug. 50, 2, 22)
 Metellus.NOM mountain-ABL downward-climb.PLUPRF.3SG
 ‘Metellus had climbed down from the mountain.’
 Cf. *de monte* (Abl.)/**montem* (Acc.) ‘down from the mountain’

Importantly, the dative case is not selected by any preposition in Latin, so while an incorporation account could be entertained for the cases in (2) and (3), the preposition being prefixed onto the verb from an embedded PP (Miller 1993, Oniga 2005), this analysis cannot be carried over to (1). This and other problems plague Lehmann’s (1983) seminal proposal that the dative encodes the Ground argument of the prefix. An alternative hypothesis exists which does not distinguish *p*-datives from benefactive/malefactive datives. Thus, Rubio (1982) proposes that in the following example the stone is a personified entity that is “robbed” of the sparkle; in no case is the dative to be understood as the Ground of the preverb *ex*- ‘out’:

- (4) *Silici scintillam ex-cudit.* (Verg. Aen. 1, 174)
 stone.DAT sparkle.ACC out-beat.3SG
 ‘He beat a sparkle out of the stone.’

However, it is difficult to argue for a benefactive/malefactive interpretation in the dative of examples like (1) or (5):

- (5) *Hi duo amnes [...] in-cidunt Oriundi flumini.* (Liv. 44, 31, 4)
 These.NOM two.NOM river.NOM.PL in-fall.3PL Oriuns.DAT river.DAT
 ‘These two rivers fall into the river Oriuns.’

Moreover, this hypothesis does not explain the interpretation of the dative as the Ground of the preverb. To describe my proposal, I will use (5), for which I propose the structure in (6):

- (6) [_{VP} *in-cidunt* [_{AppIP} *Oriundi flumini*_i [_{AppI'} AppI [_{PathP} *hi duo amnes* [_{Path'} Path [_{PlaceP} Place [_{LocusP} ~~IN~~ Locus_i]]]]]]]]

I adopt the standard articulated analysis of PPs in motion constructions, with a Path head merged on top of a PlaceP (Koopman 2000, Svenonius 2010, a.o.). However, I propose, following Noonan (2010) and Terzi (2010), that the PlaceP embeds a nominal of inalienable possession semantics, here called Locus, which, optionally modified by a locative preposition (here *IN* ‘in’), identifies the region of space corresponding to the Ground, a complement to this nominal. In cases like (5) Locus has no complement, but it is provided with reference by the dative (*Oriundi flumini* ‘the river Oriuns’). Indeed, the p-dative is a DP merged as the specifier of an Affected Applicative head in the sense of Cuervo (2003), relating entities to resulting states. Assuming a standard conceptualisation of states as locations, I argue that the dative is interpreted as the possessor of a resulting location, codified in the PathP; in this case the final location is that of the Figure argument *hi duo amnes* ‘these two rivers’, which is an interior, as codified by [_{LOCUSP} IN Locus]. The fact that the p-dative is merged as the specifier of Appl accounts for the affectedness interpretation that authors have observed in p-datives as opposed to true Ground arguments merged as objects of prepositions (Devine & Stephens 2013), and that is unresolved in Lehmann’s (1983) theory. Being the possessor of the final location, the dative is thereby also the possessor of the nominal Locus, and this triggers the inference that the denotatum of the dative is in fact the Ground of the motion construction. These semantic effects are parallel to those in Cuervo’s (2003) original proposal for the datives accompanying change of state predicates in Spanish. For instance, in the next example Cuervo (2003:105) argues that Valeria is interpreted as the possessor of the state of the radio being broken, whereby the resulting affectedness interpretation:

- (7) Emilio le rompió la radio a Valeria.
 Emilio DAT.3SG break.PRF.3SG the radio to Valeria
 ‘Emilio broke Valeria’s radio.’

The final assumption is that the preposition IN ends up prefixed onto the verb, yielding *incidunt*. The analysis supports theories in which the specification of the region of the Ground is a nominal, rather than a functional category (e.g., Svenonius’s 2006 *AxPart*). Languages recruit their strategies to glue this nominal with the Ground. Unsurprisingly, English, which has only low applicatives (Pylkkänen 2008), license neither affected datives nor spatial datives, whereas German and Romance license both the former (8) and the latter (9):

- (8) a. Meine Mutter [...] schnitt ihm das Haar. (German; Google)
 my.NOM mother.NOM cut.PST.3SG him.DAT the.ACC hair.ACC
 ‘My mother cut his hair.’
 b. Ma mare li ha tallat els cabells. (Catalan)
 my mother DAT.SG has cut the hair
 ‘My mother has cut his/her hair.’
- (9) a. Ich warf dem Kind den Ball zu. (German; Oya 2009)
 I threw.1SG the.DAT child.DAT the.ACC ball.ACC to
 ‘I threw the ball to the child.’
 b. El floc de neu li ha caigut damunt. (Catalan)
 the snow flake DAT.SG has fallen on_top
 ‘The snow flake has fallen on top of him/her.’

Selected references: CUERVO, M^a C. 2003. *Datives at Large*. PhD thesis. MIT. LEHMANN, C. 1983. Latin preverbs and cases. H. Pinkster (ed.). *Latin Linguistics and Linguistic Theory. Proceedings of the 1st International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics. Amsterdam, April 1981*, 145-165. John Benjamins. NOONAN, M. 2010. *Á to zu*. G. Cinque & L. Rizzi. *Mapping Spatial PPs: The Cartography of Syntactic Structures, Vol. 6*, 161-195. Oxford University Press. TERZI, Arhonto. 2010. Locative prepositions and Place. G. Cinque & L. Rizzi. *Mapping Spatial PPs: The Cartography of Syntactic Structures, Vol. 6*, 196-224. Oxford University Press.

