Scrambling Verb-final Languages and the Underlying Order of Objects in Ditransitive Constructions

In the recent literature on ditransitive constructions it has been claimed that German (Müller 1995, McGinnis 1999, Anagnostopoulou 2003, Tungseth 2008, among others) and Turkish (Issever 2003) counterexemplify the generalization that the indirect object (IO) is base generated higher than the direct object (DO) (Marantz 1994, Pylkkänen 2002, Bowers forthcoming, among others). In this paper, I provide evidence from stranded depictives, in support of the view that IO>DO is the underlying order in German (Lenerz 1977, Webelhuth 1989, among others) and Turkish DOCs, thus showing that the German and Turkish data in fact support <IO, DO> as the universal underlying order in DOCs. Following Georgala’s et al. (2008) analysis of applicative constructions, which supports IO>DO as the underlying order, I propose that German and Turkish have both low- (raising) and high-type (thematic) applicative constructions, but a single position for applicative heads above the lexical VP. The depictive stranding facts strongly support the view that in the raising applicative construction, ApplP has a strong EPP feature that attracts the recipient IO from its underlying position [Spec, VP]. The depictive stranding data in fact support <IO, DO> as the universal underlying order in DOCs.

Accounts of German: Müller (1995, 1999) and McGinnis (1999), among others, argue for underlying DO>IO base order in German, with IO>DO derived by A-bar movement. Müller’s and McGinnis’s evidence mainly comes from reflexive/reciprocal binding. Based on Grewendorf’s (1988) data, which show that dative IOs cannot bind accusative DO reflexives/reciprocals to their right (1a-b), Müller and McGinnis argue against the view that datives originate higher than accusatives. Crucially, Müller’s and McGinnis’s analyses do not account for the data in (2), where the anaphor is embedded in the DO (Sabel 1996) and the IO e-commands the DO. To account for the ungrammaticality of (1b), I assume that (i) the IO is base generated in [Spec, VP] where it is assigned inherent Case by the lexical verb, and (ii) the anaphor sich raises from its position within the lexical VP to its Case checking position, outer [Spec, vP] (cf. Cardinaletti and Starke 1999). Thus, the IO cannot bind the reflexive DO from its base position. Furthermore, McIntyre (2009) points out more contexts, where reflexive binding of the accusative by the dative is actually possible, as shown in (3a-c). In addition, there seems to be dialectal variation regarding the anaphor binding data, e.g., Frey (1993) considers example (1b) with the anaphor grammatical.

Accounts of Turkish: Simpson et al. (2008) argue that the neutral order of objects in the double object construction in Turkish is <IO, DO>, when the DO is non-specific (no case marking). When the DO is specific, marked with accusative case, Simpson et al. interpret binding facts to show that both IO>DO and DO>IO are underlying orders (4a-b). However, the contrast between (5a) and (5b) where the reciprocal is the head (not the possessor) of the theme/goal leads Simpson et al. to suggest that IO>DO might be a derived order in Turkish. Also, Kornfilt (2003) observes that native speakers usually judge <DO_{ACC}, IO_{DAT}> as the unmarked order in Turkish, which leads her to suggest that the accusative DO is placed in a hierarchically higher position than the dative IO.

My proposal: Depictive stranding reveals IO>DO base order. Previously unnoticed data from depictive stranding in DOCs support the hypothesis that IO>DO is the underlying order in both German and Turkish. Depictives in German and Turkish can be predicated of DOs, but not of IOs, and can be stranded by A-movement, for example by unaccusative or passive movement. Following Stowell (1981) and Bowers (1993), among others, I assume that in object-oriented depictives the DO e-commands the depictive underlingly. Crucially, depictives can be stranded by ACC DAT depictive stranding in both languages, as shown in (6a-b). The depictive secondary predicate cold in (6) is stranded in the base position of the DO, which is thus shown to be to the left of the IO Mary.

This paper introduces novel data from stranding depictives, showing that German and Turkish, languages, which have been assumed to be exceptions, in fact support the emerging consensus of a single universal hierarchy of arguments in DOCs, namely IO>DO.
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