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]. Thematic applicatives are merged in [Spec, ApplP].

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 c-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, *v*P] (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 c-commands the depictive underlyingly. 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.

(1) a. Der Arzt   zeigte den   Patienten$_i$ sich$_i$ im   Spiegel   (Grewendorf 1988)
        the doctor showed the.ACC patient.ACC REFL in-the mirror
        "The doctor showed the patient to himself in the mirror."
    b. Der Arzt   zeigte dem   Patienten$_i$ *sich$_i$ im   Spiegel
        the doctor showed the.DAT patient.DAT REFL in-the mirror
        "The doctor showed himself to the patient in the mirror."

(2) weil   Hans$_i$ dem   Studenten$_j$ ein   Bild   von sich$_{i/j}$ zeigte.   (Grewendorf 2005)
    because Hans.NOM the.DAT student.DAT a.ACC picture.ACC of REFL showed
    "because Hans showed the student a picture of himself."

(3) a. ??Wir zeigten **ihm$_i$**   **sich$_i$**   **selbst**   im   Bild   (Brandt 2003)
        we showed him.DAT REFL.ACC FOCUS-PART in-the picture
    b. ?Wir zeigten **ihm$_i$**   [die   Frau   und   **sich$_i$**   **selbst**]   (Brandt 2003)
        we showed him.DAT the.ACC woman.ACC and   REFL.ACC FOCUS-PART
    c. Der Hochmut nämlich nimmt dem Menschen Gott, der Neid nimmt   (McIntyre 2009)
        ihm den Nächsten, der Zorn nimmt **ihm$_i$ sich$_i$ selbst**   .

(4)   (Simpson et al. 2008)

a. Ali John ve Mary-e   birbirler-i-nin   arkadaşlar-i-ni   taniş-tir-di   IO>DO
   Ali John and Mary.DAT each other.POSS.GEN friends.POSS.ACC meet.CAUS.PAST
   "Ali introduced John and Mary each other's friends."
b. Ali John ve Mary-i   birbirler-i-nin   arkadaşlar-i-na taniş-tir-di   DO>IO
   Ali John and Mary.ACC each other.POSS.GEN friends.POSS.DAT meet.CAUS.PAST
   "Ali introduced John and Mary to each other's friends."

(5)   (Simpson et al. 2008)
c. Ali Ayşe ve Mehmet-i   parti-de birbirleri-ne   taniş-tir-di   DO>IO
   Ali Ayse and Mehmet.ACC party.LOC each other.DAT meet.CAUS.PAST
   "Ali introduced Ayse and Mehmet to each other at the party."
d. ?Ali Ayşe ve Mehmet-e   parti-de birbirleri-ni   taniş-tir-di   ?IO>DO
   Ali Ayse and Mehmet.DAT party.LOC each other.ACC meet.CAUS.PAST
   "Ali introduced Ayse and Mehmet each other at the party."

(6) a. Ich habe [das   Bier]$_i$ Maria   t$_i$ kalt$_i$ serviert
       I   have the.ACC beer.ACC Maria.DAT   cold served
       "I served the beer to Mary cold."
    b. Ben [bira-yi]$_i$ Mary-ye   t$_i$ soguk$_i$ servis ettim
       I   beer.ACC Mary.DAT   cold   service did.1SG
       "I served the beer to Mary cold."

Selected References

Baltin, M. 2003. "The interaction of ellipsis and binding: implications for the sequencing of Principle A." *NLLT* 21: 215-246.

Bowers, J. Forthcoming. *Arguments as Relations*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Georgala, E., W. Paul, J. Whitman. 2008. "Expletive and thematic applicatives." In C. B. Chang and H. J. Haynie (eds), *Proceedings of the 26th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics (WCCFL 26)*, 181-189. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

Grewendorf, G. *Minimalistische Syntax*. Basel: A. Francke Verlag.

Müller, G. 1995. *A-bar Syntax: A Study in Movement Types*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Simpson, A., H. Hwang, C. Ipek. 2008. "The comparative syntax of double object constructions in Japanese, Korean, and Turkish." In R. Vermeulen and R. Shibagaki (eds), *Proceedings of the 5th Workshop on Altaic Formal Linguistics (WAFL5)*, MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 58, 41-62.

Stowell, T. 1982. *The Origins of Phrase Structure*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT. Cambridge, MA.