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1. Introduction: The diversity of datives

a. Dative as inherent Case (e.g. Russian, Pesetsky & Torrego to appear): Idiosyncratic; retained through the derivation and syntactically inactive, i.e. incapable of undergoing (EPP-driven) movement to Spec,TP.¹

b. Dative as quirky Case (e.g. Icelandic): Idiosyncratic; retained through the derivation but syntactically active, i.e. capable of undergoing (EPP-driven) movement to Spec,TP.

c. Dative as a structural case (e.g. Ancient Greek). In certain languages, dative arguments enter case alternations qualifying as having structural case.

d. Dative as a mixed case. Dative has a double status (structural or inherent), across languages, or even within one language (Harley 1995 for Japanese, Webelhut 1995, Fanselow 2000 for German).

In this paper, we provide evidence based on Case alternations in passives and middles in favor of view (d). Cross-linguistically, we find three types of languages:

(i) Uniform languages where dative is never structural Case, and dative-nominative alternations never take place (e.g. Modern Greek, Russian). We will not exemplify these here.

(ii) Mixed languages where dative qualifies as structural in ditransitives and as inherent case in monotransitives (e.g. Standard German).

(iii) Uniform languages in which alternations happen both in ditransitives and in monotransitives (e.g. dialects of German, Ancient Greek, Japanese, Icelandic).

• But: in languages of type (ii) and (iii) NOT all datives alternate.

Building on Rezac’s (2008) theory of opacity vs. transparency of theta-related Case to Agree, combined with a (modified) theory of Case alternations in terms of m(orphological)-case (Marantz 1991), we propose that

(i) dative arguments are PPs, unlike accusatives which are DPs.

¹ Sometimes, the terms ‘inherent’ and ‘lexical’ dative are used interchangeably. As convincingly argued for by Woolford (2006), however, inherent and lexical Cases are distinct and are subject to different licensing conditions: inherent Case is thematically licensed while lexical Case is idiosyncratically determined. In this paper, we group them together because they behave in a similar manner morpho-syntactically.
(ii) Being complements of P, dative DPs are often invisible to an outside probe, Voice or T, for Agree.

(iii) Under certain conditions, however, they become visible:

- we propose that PPs become transparent when P incorporates into a higher verbal head, thus lifting the phase-hood of P (as proposed in Anagnostopoulou & Sevdali 2012 for Ancient Greek); see den Dikken 2007, Gallego 2005, 2010, Gallego, and Uriagereka 2006, Wurmbrand, Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou 2012 for a discussion on how movement of certain heads extends the phase to the higher projection.
- P-incorporation will be an important tool in understanding why some languages (namely German dialects and Dutch) use special auxiliaries when datives become nominatives in passives.

(iv) The actual distribution of m-cases (dative, accusative, nominative) in actives, middles, and passives of languages with alternating datives is determined at the PF component, subject to the case-realization disjunctive hierarchy proposed by Marantz (1991).

- A dative argument entering Agree qualifies as having ‘dependent case’ in the sense of Marantz (1991) and not as having “lexically governed case”. Being dependent cases, datives become nominative whenever the structural conditions for dependent case are not met.

**2. Dative-Nominative alternations across languages**

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

2.1.1 **Ancient Greek**

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

**Monotransitives:**

(1) a. Athenaiοι καταθενομαι he:min  
Athenians-NOM betray-3 sg-pres-act us--DAT

‘The Athenians are betraying us’

b. He:meis hup’ Athe:naio:n epibouleuometha  
We-NOM by Athenians-gen betray-1 pl-pres-pass

‘We are betrayed by the Athenians’ (Thucydides, *Historia I*: 82.1)

---

2 Interestingly, Greek underwent a transition from a system with a fully structural dative and genitive Case (in Classical Greek) to a system with a fully inherent/lexical genitive Case (in Modern Greek). Both changes took place in Medieval Greek (Lavidas 2007: 192), the period where the transition from a structural to an inherent dative Case system was completed. Even though the exact stages of this transition from a structural to an inherent Case system have not been documented in detail, one could imagine an intermediate stage where dative is uniformly structural in some dialects (resembling Luxemburg German, see below) while it has a mixed status in others (resembling Standard German, see below).
Ditransitives:

(2) a. *All-o ti meiz-on hum-in epitaksoyin* Active

Something else-ACC bigger-ACC you-DAT order-ACT-PRES-3PL

‘They will order you to do something else bigger/greater’

b. *All-o ti meiz-on hum-eis epitaksoyin* Passive

Something else-ACC bigger-ACC you-NOM order-PASS-PRES-2PL

‘You will be ordered to do something else, bigger.’

(Thucydides, *Historia I*: 140,5)

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

• This suggests that dative in Ancient Greek has a mixed status, sometimes being structural and sometimes lexical/inherent.

2.1.2 Japanese

Ishizuka (2012: 82) reports that in Japanese the direct object of a substantial number of verbs is realized not as an accusative DP but as a dative DP, and these dative DPs can be raised to the nominative position in the passive. We illustrate this with theme datives, but Ishizuka notes that *ni*-directional and *kara*-source Ps can also become nominatives:

Monotransitive

(3) a. Naomi-ga Ken-ni kisu(-o) si-ta.

‘Naomi-nom Ken-dat kiss-(acc) do-pst’ *Active*

‘Naomi kissed Ken.’

b. Ken-ga Naomi-ni kisu(-o) s-are-ta.

Ken-nom Naomi-dat kiss-(acc) do-pass-pst *Passive*

‘Ken was kissed by Naomi’

The *dative goal/recipient/addressee* argument of ditransitives can become nominative in passives (see Fukuda, to appear, Ishizuka 2012 for recent discussions and references):

Ditransitives

(4) a. Naomi-ga Ken-ni labuletaa-o watasi-ta. *Active*

Naomi-NOM Ken-DAT love.letter-ACC hand-PAST

‘Naomi handed Ken a love letter.’

b. Ken-ga Naomi-ni labuletaa-o watas-are-ta. *Passive*

Ken-NOM Naomi-DAT love.letter-ACC hand-PASS-PAST

‘Ken was handed a love letter by Naomi.’ Ishizuka (2012: 81f.)
As in Ancient Greek, not all dative can become nominatives; locative and benefactive \textit{ni}-Ps, and instrumental and directional \textit{de}-Ps do not alternate (in both ditransitives and monotransitives):

\begin{align*}
(5) \quad & a. \quad \text{Hahaoya-ga Naomi-ni huku-o kat-ta.} \quad \text{Active} \\
& \quad \text{mother-nom Naomi-dat clothes-acc buy-pst} \\
& \quad \text{‘Mother bought Naomi the dress.’} \\
& b. \quad ??Naomi-ga hahaoya-ni huku-o kaw-are-ta. \quad \text{Passive} \\
& \quad \text{Naomi-nom mother-dat clothes-acc buy-pass-pst} \\
& \quad \text{Int. ‘Naomi was bought the dress by her mother.’}
\end{align*}

\begin{itemize}
\item Ishizuka takes this distribution as suggesting \textbf{either} that i) Ps come in \textbf{two} different categories, Case and full-fledged ones, and only the complement of the former can undergo passivization \textbf{or} ii) it relates to the structural height of P-attachment.
\end{itemize}

\subsection*{2.1.3 Luxemburg German}

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

\textit{NB}. In the literature, the status of this passive has been debated. Here we side with the view that the \textit{kréien/bekommen/krijgen}-construction has all the properties conventionally associated with the passive (see Wegener 1985; Reis 1985; Fanselow 1987; Webelhuth and Ackerman 1994, Zifonun & al. 1997 for German; B&C 1994, to appear for Dutch).\footnote{See Alexiadou, Anagnostopoulou & Sevdali (to appear) for arguments and discussion.}

\begin{align*}
\text{\textit{Monotransitives}}
\quad & (6) \quad \text{De Mann kritt gedroot} \\
& \quad \text{The man gets threaten}
\end{align*}

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

\begin{align*}
\text{\textit{Ditransitives}}
\quad & (7) \quad \text{Sie bekommt geholfen} \quad \text{(Leirbukt 1997)} \\
& \quad \text{She gets helped}
\end{align*}
2.2 Languages where datives become nominatives in passives of ditransitives only: Standard German and Dutch

Ditransitive predicates in German have four distinct realizations that differ in the morphological marking of the direct and indirect object as well as the “unmarked linearization” of the two objects (Lenerz 1977; Höhle 1982; Fanselow 1991, 2000; Haider 1993; Sternefeld 2006). The four patterns are schematically represented in (9):

(9) German argument linearization and morphological case in ditransitives
   a. NOM>DAT>ACC  c. NOM>ACC>ACC
   b. NOM>ACC>DAT  d. NOM>ACC>GEN

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

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

According to Broekhuis and Cornips (B&C 1994, 2012), Standard Dutch mostly has goal ditransitives, as in ((10); B&C’s (34a); see their list of verbs in (33), and references therein for a more complete list based on an extensive corpus research):

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

In German and Dutch, datives cannot become subjects of passives when the auxiliary is werden/worden. These only permit 'direct passives', as in (13), where the DO becomes the subject.\footnote{Note that in Dutch krijgen is the only auxiliary used, while in German both bekommen and kriegen are possible (and in some cases erhalten too). It is not clear which auxiliary is the most widely used one in German, see Lenz (to appear). Here, we will refer to the German ditransitive passives as bekommen passives.}
Datives can become subjects in passives when the passive is formed with the auxiliaries *bekommen/krijgen* (Dutch data from Everaert 1990: 127 and Broekhuis and Cornips 1994: 176):

(14)  Er bekam die Blumen geschenkt
He-NOM got the flowers-ACC given
‘He was given the flowers’

(15)  Hij kreeg de boeken op zijn kantoor bezorgd
He got the books at his office given
‘He got the books delivered at his office’

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

- Dutch as well as Standard German allow the *krijgen/bekomen*-passive with ditransitive predicates only. Monotransitives only allow *werden*-passivization, where dative objects retain their case and are not allowed to become nominative, as shown by the contrast between (16b) and (16c) (Lenz 2011). When monotransitive verbs assign accusative case, this becomes nominative in *werden*-passives:

(16)  a.  Maria half ihm.
Maria helped him-DAT
‘Maria helped him.’

b.  Ihm wurde geholfen.
Him-DAT was helped
‘He was helped.’

c.  *Er bekam geholfen
He/him-NOM got helped
‘He was killed.’

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

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

(i) As also discussed in Fanselow (2000) and Cook (2006), the *bekommen*-passive is possible and acceptable for all speakers of German only for ditransitive verbs with the basic/unmarked word order DAT > ACC, e.g. ‘schenken’ and not with verbs with the basic/unmarked word order ACC>DAT e.g. ‘unterziehen’ (see also Czepluch 1988, Haider 1993, Molnárfi 1998, McFadden 2004).  \(^6\)

(17)  
(a) Der Mann bekam ein Buch geschenkt
The man-NOM got a book-ACC given
‘The man was given a book’
(b) *Die Operation bekam den Patienten unterzogen
The operation-NOM got the patient-ACC submitted

(18) Der Patient wurde einer Operation unterzogen
The patient-NOM was an operation-DAT submitted

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

(ii) In the ACC>ACC frame, accusative IOs become subjects in *bekommen*-passives, as shown in (18a) (Beermann 2001). This suggests that *it is the higher argument with structural Case* that becomes subject in *bekommen*-passives. In “regular ditransitives” the highest argument bearing structural Case is the dative IO, and accusative DOs become the subjects of *werden*-passives, as in (19b):

(19)  
(a) Die Schüler bekamen das Lied gelehrt
The students-NOM got the song-ACC taught
‘The students are taught the song’
(b) Ein Buch wurde dem Mann geschenkt
A book-NOM was the man-DAT given
‘A book was given to the man’

\(^6\) Note that verbs like *entnehmen* can surface with two word orders ACC> DAT, and DAT> ACC. Interestingly, only the latter can form a *bekommen*-passive, as Cook (2006) discusses in detail.

(i)  
(a) *Das Buch bekam ein Zitat entnommen
the book-NOM got a quotation removed
(b) Wenn der armer Mensch die inneren Organen entnommen bekommt
when the poor person-NOM the internal organs removed gets
‘when the poor person gets their internal organs removed.’
Note that ACC>ACC ditransitives never allow the DO to become NOM with a werden-passive when the IO surfaces with ACC, only when it surfaces with DAT (Florian Schäfer, p.c.):

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

That dative can be a lexical/inherent case is supported by:
(i) the ditransitive vs. mono-transitive asymmetry in Standard German and related dialects, and
(ii) verb class restrictions. As noted by Bayer, Bader & Meng (2000), in those German dialects which allow bekommen-passives with mono-transitive verbs (Luxemburg, German Rhine-Franconian/ Mosel dialects) there are certain verbs with a single dative object that can form a bekommen-passive and others that cannot:

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

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

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

2.3 Languages where datives become nominatives in middles: Icelandic

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

(23) a. Dative alternations never happen in passives.7 They occur in -st middles (and certain anticausatives and adjectival passives).
b. The dative ‘absorbed’ in ditransitives is the case of the DO, never of the IO.

---

7 As Zaenen & Maling (1990: 145f.) note, the same applies to idiosyncratic accusative case which is never absorbed in passives.
Difference a: Middles. A systematic DAT-NOM alternation is found with middle Voice verbs ending in –st, as shown in (24b). These verbs often have an anticausative meaning, and are referred to as ‘middle’ in the literature on Icelandic.⁸

(24) a. Ég týndi úrinu
      I-nom lost the watch-DAT
      ‘I lost the watch’
b. Úrð týndi-st
      The watch-NOM lost-MIDDLE
      ‘The watch got lost’

An important difference between the middle and the periphrastic passive in Icelandic is that the former does not imply agency while the latter does (see Sigurðsson 1989 for detailed discussion). Middles do not license by-phrases (25c), while periphrastic passives do (25b) (Sigurðsson 1989: 268; Svenonius 2006):

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

Difference b: Sigurðsson (1989) points out that in ditransitives only direct object theme datives alternate. The dative case of benefactive/goal indirect objects does not alternate (Jónsson 2000 provides a list of some verbs that can do this). This holds for the -st verbs, where dative indirect objects (IOs) stay dative, even under -st. For ditransitive verbs that take two dative objects, only the DO dative becomes nominative, the IO remains dative (26-27):

(26) a. Jón gaf mér þetta tækifæri.
      John-N gave me-DAT this opportunity-ACC
      ‘John gave me this opportunity.’ (Sigurðsson 1989:270)

⁸ Dative alternates in the adjectival/stative passive, which, once again, is incompatible with agentivity in Icelandic. In the stative passive in (i), which does not license a by-phrase, the DO surfaces with nominative. Note that (i) is clearly an adjectival passive corresponding to English adjectival passives with un-prefixation (Wasow 1977; Levin & Rappaport 1986 and much subsequent literature):

(i) a. Hann var boðinn (*af Mariu)
      He-NOM was invited-m.sg.NOM by Mary
      ‘He was invited’
b. Hann var óboðinn (*af Mariu)
      He-NOM was uninvited-m.sg.NOM by Mary
      ‘He was uninvited’
b. Mér gaf-st þetta tækifæri (*viljandi).
me-DAT gave-MIDDLE thisopportunity-NOM (*willingly)
'I happened to get this opportunity.' (Sigurðsson 1989:270)

(27) a. þeir úthlutuðu okkur velli til 12:00
they-NOM allocated us-DAT field-DAT until 12:00
'They allocated a field to us until 12:00'
b. Okkur úthlutaðist völlur til 12:00
us-DAT allocated-st field-NOM until 12:00
We got allocated a field until 12:00 Sigurðsson & Wood (2012)

(28) Summary: dative-nominative alternations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>DAT-NOM in monotransitives only</th>
<th>DAT-NOM in ditransitives only</th>
<th>Only some DAT alternate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ancient Greek</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard German</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lux. German</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>unclear⁹</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Icelandic</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Towards an Analysis

3.1 What needs to be explained

- **Fact 1**: Dative Case is in principle flexible. In some languages it doesn’t alternate. In other languages it does.
- **Fact 2**: Not all datives alternate.
- **Fact 3**: The ditransitive only vs. monotransitive & ditransitive difference. Alternating dative is in some languages/dialects limited to ditransitives while in other languages/dialects it also occurs in monotransitives. *We have found no language where dative-nominative alternations occur in monotransitives and not in ditransitives.*
- **Fact 4**: The passive vs. middle asymmetry.
- **Fact 5**: The auxiliary difference. In (some) passives (at least in German and Dutch), different auxiliaries are chosen depending on which IO argument alternates.

3.2 Dative Case: opaque or transparent to Agree

There are different types of datives:

Following Rezac 2008, dative DPs (both lexical and inherent datives in Woolford’s 2006

---

⁹ Given that Dutch lacks morphological dative case, it seems unclear whether it has any monotransitive verbs assigning dative to their single object. Presumably not. But see, Broekhuis & Cornips (1994).
terms; Rezac calls both “theta-related Cases”) are contained within PPs.

PPs are phases (Abels 2003, McGinnis 2001) and, therefore, the ϕ-features of the containing DPs are not visible for Agree to a probe outside the PP, Voice or T. As a result, Opacity obtains (cf. Pesetsky 2010, p. 7 for a related recent approach to arguments bearing dative Case as “…bearing an affix of category P”, i.e. as being PPs).

• This is the analysis we will assume for inherent as well as lexical datives, i.e. the ones that do not alternate with nominatives, namely that they are opaque PPs not entering Agree (see Rezac 2008 and Pesetsky 2010 for more discussion of the categorial status of datives as PPs and references).

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

• Agree transparency: dative DPs can be visible for Agree in certain cases:10

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

In addition to (c) we propose that PPs can become transparent of P incorporates into a higher head (Voice-v; Anagnostopoulou & Sevdali 2012; cf. Taraldsen 2010).

It is the process of preposition incorporation itself that makes the PPs in question transparent. If PPs are phases, then the phase-lifting effect of P incorporation follows from the hypothesis that movement of certain phase heads extends the phase to the higher projection (den Dikken 2007, Gallego 2005, 2010, Gallego, and Uriagereka 2006, Wurmbrand, Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou 2012), are formed by preposition incorporation which results in a configuration where the complex verb has a PP complement headed by the trace of the incorporated preposition, exactly as was proposed by Baker (1988 ch. 5) for applicative constructions in Bantu languages.

Support for this comes from Ancient Greek, where monotransitive and ditransitive complex verbs formed with prepositions assigning dative case such as en-, sun-, epi-, para-, hupo- and the adverb omou- inherit from the prepositions their dative assigning capacity, see the data in

10 In order to account for this variability, Rezac proposes that P may itself have a ϕ-probe which enters Agree with its DP complement. The result of this P-DP ϕ-Agree relationship is visible Agree from the outside. He proposes that a ϕ-probe on P entering Agree with the DP selected by P transmits the ϕ-features of this DP outside the opaque PP domain. As far as we can tell, Rezac (2008) is not explicit on how exactly this transmission of ϕ-features takes place as a result of P-DP Agree. In order for this to work, one has to assume that the ϕ-probe on P is valued by the containing DP and remains active for further Agree with a higher probe, Voice or T. It must be the case then that the ϕ-features on P are valued but not deleted.
(1) and (2) above which instantiate the phenomenon with the incorporated preposition epi.

In actives, T enters Agree with the external argument (EA in (30) below) and Voice Agrees with the internal argument. In passives, the \( \phi \) features on passive Voice are inactive, and the object enters Agree with T. As a result, the Object DP/PP carries Nom.

\[
\begin{align*}
(30) \quad &a. \& TP [u\phi] [VoiceP EA [i\phi] [Voice [u\phi] [RootP DP/PP[i\phi] ]]]] \quad \text{active} \\
&b. \& TP [u\phi] [VoiceP [RootP DP/PP[i\phi] ]] \quad \text{passive}
\end{align*}
\]

This accounts for the fact that dative Case is in principle flexible (sometimes entering alternations and sometimes not), unlike Accusative which alternates always.

Rezac proposes that variation in the content of a \( \phi \)-probe can additionally derive the difference between quirky datives and alternating datives:

\[
(31) \quad \text{Quirky vs. structural datives: variation in the content of the \( \phi \)-probe}
\]
- Quirky datives enter \textit{incomplete Agree} (along the lines proposed by Anagnostopoulou 2003, 2005a for PCC effects; see also Rezac 2008 and others).
- Alternating datives enter \textit{complete Agree} (behaving exactly like alternating Accusatives).

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

Morphological case realization is determined at PF. Marantz (1991) argues that the distribution of morphological case is determined at PF, subject to the case realization hierarchy in (32):

\[
(32) \quad \text{case realization disjunctive hierarchy: i) lexically governed case, ii) "dependent" case (accusative and ergative), iii) unmarked case (environment-sensitive), iv) default case}
\]

The more specific a case is, it is assigned first taking precedence over the cases lower in the hierarchy. In this system, structural accusative Case is “dependent case” subject to the definition in (33):

\[
(33) \quad \text{Dependent case is assigned by V+I to a position governed by V+I when a distinct position governed by V+I is:}
\]
- not "marked" (not part of a chain governed by a lexical case determiner)
- distinct from the chain being assigned dependent case

Dependent case assigned up to subject: ergative
Dependent case assigned down to object: accusative

According to (33), dependent accusative is assigned “downwards” to a DP in opposition to a higher DP not bearing lexically governed case (what we called here “inherent” or “lexical”,
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but also “quirky”).

*Modification of Marantz (1991):* We propose to link this parameter to the Agree condition (30), which could be seen as a formal licensing condition (like EPP in Marantz’s 1991 paper and structural case in Harley’s MCP) appropriately interpreted at PF.

(34) a. A PP that is *transparent to Agree* is not and cannot be lexically governed case as it enters a checking relation with a functional head, and will therefore receive a case determined lower in the hierarchy (dependent or environment sensitive or default).

b. On the other hand, a PP that is *opaque to Agree* bears lexically governed case. This modification leads to a definition along the following lines:

(35) Dependent case is assigned by V+I to a position governed by V+I when a distinct position governed by V+I is:

a. not "marked" (not part of a chain governed by a lexical case determiner)

b. distinct from the chain being assigned dependent case

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

The realization of dependent case will be based on:

(a) the DP vs. PP distinction (DP = accusative vs. PP = dative/genitive) and (b) more specific information provided by the zero Ps and the selecting v/Vs (in order to e.g. distinguish dative from genitive realization in languages like Ancient Greek where both dative and genitive Cases alternate qualifying as dependent).

- *Ditransitives* in languages where both cases, dative and accusative, alternate (Japanese, Ancient Greek, German *bekommen* and *werden* passives and their Dutch counterparts):

Voice enters Agree with both the IO and DO either under *Multiple Agree* (as independently proposed by Anagnostopoulou 2003, Anagnostopoulou 2005a and Nevins 2007, 2011 in order to account for Person Case Constraint (PCC) effects in ditransitives; cf. Baker 2011 who also proposes that Voice can agree with both arguments) or because it has two φ-probes. The two arguments are assigned dependent case in opposition to a higher argument not bearing lexical case (DAT is assigned in opposition to the higher EA, and ACC in opposition to the higher DAT). In passives, Voice is defective (and non-phrasal) in not introducing an EA and not containing a φ probe. The two arguments enter Agree with T.

---

11 Note that in the calculation of dependent case assignment at PF, quirky case qualifies as “lexically governed” case, despite entering partial Agree, as proposed in (31). This means that only dative and genitive PPs entering *complete Agree* will qualify as dependent cases in (35).

12 Note that in order to deal with *Agree* in passives, the simplest solution would be to assume Multiple Agree
(36)  

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad [TP [uφ] [VoiceP EA [iφ] [Voice [uφ] [ApplP IO[iφ] [ DO [iφ] ]]]] \quad \text{active} \\
\text{b.} & \quad [TP [uφ] [VoiceP [ApplP IO[iφ] [ DO [iφ] ]]]] \quad \text{passive}
\end{align*}
\]

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

- Locality determines which argument will surface as nominative:

The first dependent case cannot be assigned, and the higher argument surfaces with nominative.

The second/lower argument bears dependent case in opposition to the higher ('derived') nominative. Assuming that the underlying order of arguments is IO>DO, this makes NOM>ACC passives of ditransitives to be the simple case: German 

*bekommen*-passives, Dutch 

*krijgen*-passives, Ancient Greek passives where DAT becomes nominative and ACC is retained, Japanese passives where DAT becomes NOM and ACC is retained.

NOM>DAT passives of ditransitives are more difficult to handle: something extra needs to be stated for German and Dutch 

*werden*-passives, Ancient Greek passives where ACC becomes nominative and DAT is retained, Japanese passives where ACC becomes NOM and DAT is retained. This is not a problem specific to the present account, however. It is a more general problem for all theories dealing with locality in languages with so called “symmetric passives”.  

13 See Ura (1996); McGinnis (1998); Anagnostopoulou (2003, 2005b); Doggett (2004); Citko (2008); Haddican (2010), among others, for some proposals. As also mentioned in fn.5, Anagnostopoulou (2003: 215-220) building on an observation by den Dikken (1995: 207-208) specifically appeals to scrambling of the intervening IO, in order to account for the grammaticality of 

*worden*-passives in Dutch; other escape strategies are also discussed in the literature cited here and could apply, in principle.  

14 In terms of Harley's (1995) Mechanical Case Parameter, the canonical case would be a language that has a monotransitive vs. ditransitive asymmetry (like Standard German), see Anagnostopoulou & Sevdali (2012) for discussion.

3.4 Accounting for the variation
3.4.1 The ditransitive vs. monotransitive asymmetry

Languages where dative alternates in both monotransitives and ditransitives are the canonical case for the theory outlined in the preceding sections (if a language has transparent datives the null hypothesis would be that it has them in both contexts).

On the other hand, languages with the monotransitive-ditransitive asymmetry are more
problematic. For languages having this asymmetry it would have to be stipulated that dative PP arguments are opaque to Agree in monotransitives (i.e. they lack P-incorporation) and transparent to Agree (i.e. they have P-incorporation) in ditransitives. The same has to be assumed for these datives that cannot undergo passivization in e.g. ditransitives in Germanic and Japanese.

In the set of languages we looked, we did not find a language that has a DAT-NOM alternation in monotransitives, but not in ditransitives; hence we suspect that (37) is an implicational universal:

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

3.4.2 Datives in passives vs. middles

Turning to Icelandic, following Svenonius (2006) and Wood (2012), we adopt the view that the distribution of direct object case (DAT or ACC) is partially sensitive to event structure in this language.

As in Wood, we propose to tie direct object datives to some feature or property of a special type of the little v head in (38), vDAT, given that this head is responsible for event semantics (assuming the basic architecture of verbs argued for in Alexiadou, Anagnostopoulou & Schäfer (2006), Marantz (2005) and others according to which, verbs are syntactically decomposed into a Voice, a v and a Root component). From this perspective, alternating dative in Icelandic (i.e. the dative assigned to themes of motion) is assigned by a head lower than Voice and, therefore, is not affected when passive Voice is present.15

(38) [Voice [v [ Root ]]]

Following Schäfer (2008), Sigurðsson (2009a) and Wood (2012), we take –st in Icelandic middles to be an exponent of an expletive subject in Voice. This explains why there is never an implicit external argument in these constructions. We will also assume that that there the impoverishment rule operative at PF in Icelandic proposed in Wood (2012) which deletes the feature leading to dative case assignment at PF in the context of expletive Voice:

(39) vDAT → v / [VoiceP –st Voice ___

This rule is most immediately compatible with post-syntactic m-case approaches towards Case distribution. When dative case cannot be assigned to direct objects due to the impoverishment rule in (39), then nominative is employed as the ‘Elsewhere’ case assigned when nothing else is available to assign case. The rule in (39) will not have any effect on dative assigned by the applicative head in ditransitives (and some monotransitives) or on

15See Svenonius (2006) who argues that dative case in Icelandic is assigned structurally by a combination of v(our Voice) and a VD (our v). cf. also Schäfer (2008: 290f.) who argues that dative case is licensed by VoiceDAT.
Turning, finally, to Icelandic ditransitives, we saw that, crucially, DAT-NOM alternations never happen with IOs. This is explained as follows. IO dative is quirky, i.e. partially transparent entering incomplete Agree (see Anagnostopoulou 2003 2005a; Rezac 2008 and footnote 22 above), and is always preserved (see Wood 2010 for a recent discussion).

3.4.3 The auxiliary issue

In at least in German and Dutch, different auxiliaries are chosen depending on which Case alternates (dative or accusative).

We would like to propose that bekomen/krijgen is simply the 'lexicalization' of a Voice+v+P complex head, resulting from the incorporation of P into Voice-v. Here we assume an analysis of auxiliary decomposition in the spirit of Kayne (1993), and Taraldsen (2010) for get-passives in Norwegian. 17

\[ \text{bekomen/krijgen} \] is the overt lexicalization of Voice+v+P, in the spirit of Taraldsen (2010).

- When P incorporates into Voice-v, the complex head is spelled out as bekomen/krijgen. When no incorporation takes place, the head is spelled out as werden.
- ACC-ACC predicates that also allow passivization with bekomen, involve ACC introduced by P.

\[ (40) \quad \text{[VoiceP [vP [ApplP PP \text{DAT-goal} Appl DP\text{ACC-theme}]]]} \]

We assume that IO dative goals are specifiers of an applicative head (high or low), similarly to IO accusative goals in languages like English (see, in particular, Anagnostopoulou 2005 for arguments that benefactive and goal PPs can be specifiers of vAPPL). When P does not incorporate into Voice-v, the dative is opaque. When P incorporates into Voice-v the dative becomes transparent. See the structure in (36) above. In German and Dutch, bekomen/krijgen is the overt lexicalization of Voice+v+P, in the spirit of Taraldsen (2010). 18

\[ \text{ACC-ACC predicates that also allow passivization with bekomen, involve ACC introduced by P.} \]

---

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

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

\[ (i) \quad \text{[Init ..[Appl..[ProcP]]]} \]

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

18 In Ancient Greek and Japanese there is no overt lexicalization on an auxiliary; in Ancient Greek, though, there can be overt P-incorporation of prepositions assigning dative in monotransitives and ditransitives (Anagnostopoulou & Sevdali 2012).
4. Summary

- We provided evidence in favor of the view that dative is a mixed Case.
- We proposed that this picture emerges as datives while generally opaque to Agree can under certain conditions (e.g. P-incorporation) become transparent to Agree.
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