The visitor gave a lecture to the audience.

*Gestur gaf fyrirlestur til áhorfenda.

Ditransitives in English and Icelandic
Provide an overview of the debate about the nature of DP-DP vs DP-PP in English
- Derivational Approach
- Alternative Projection Approach
- Verb-Sensitive Approach
- Information Structure Approach
- R(ightward)-Dative Shift Approach

Outline the case and word order patterns in Icelandic ditransitives
- General case patterns and restrictions on DP-PP
- Evaluating Icelandic against the backdrop of approaches for English
- Object inversion (DO precedes IO)

Illustrate parallels between inversion and other constructions in Icelandic
- Passives
- Alternating predicates
Alternating vs Non-alternating Constructions

Theoretical Approaches
- Derivational Approach
- Alternative Projection
- Verb Sensitive
- Pragmatic/Information Structure
- R(rightward)-Dative Shift
a. The baby-sitter gave the child an apple.  
DP-DP

b. The baby-sitter gave an apple to the child.  
DP-PP

c. The quarterback threw the wide-receiver the ball.  
DP-DP

d. The quarterback threw the ball to the wide-receiver.  
DP-PP

e. The announcer handed the wrong actor the Oscar.  
DP-DP

f. The announcer handed the Oscar to the wrong actor.  
DP-PP

g. The landlord rented the visiting professor a nice apartment.  
DP-DP

h. The landlord rented a nice apartment to the visiting professor.  
DP-PP

Many constructions alternate between the double object frame and the prepositional frame.
Only DP-DP allowed

a. The boss denied George a promotion.
b. *The boss denied a promotion to George.  (based on Bruening 2010b, ex 4)
c. Smith envied Jones his good fortune.
d. *Smith envied his good fortune to Jones. (Rappaport Hovav & Levin 2008, ex 30)
e. The judge fined the company one million dollars.
f. *The judge fined one million dollars to the company.
Only DP-PP allowed

a. The contractors restored the building to the original state.

b. *The contractors restored the original state the building.

c. The yoga instructor explained the basic principles of the practice to the students.

d. *The yoga instructor explained the students the basic principles of the practice.

e. The supplier donated materials to the art school.

f. *The supplier donated the art school materials.
DP-PP is sometimes bad

a. The noise gave Terry a headache.
b. *The noise gave a headache to Terry.

(Rappaport Hovav and Levin 2008, ex 5)

DP-DP is sometimes bad

c. *The visitor gave the audience a lecture.
d. The visitor gave a lecture to the audience.

Sometimes the canonical ditransitive give is non-alternating
• Core element of the DP-PP structure is basic and the DP-DP structure is derived.

• The indirect object gets its theta role from the verb.

• Larson draws a parallel between subjects being “less important” to verb meanings (this idea was around pre- little v/voice)
  • Larson argues that direct objects are less important to verb meanings than indirect objects.
  • “gave to the world” has a different meaning than “gave to his patron”
- The verb raises via head movement to an empty V position for word order and to assign case to the direct object.

- Under the assumptions at the time, the verb can’t assign case to the DP in its specifier (even though T assigned case to its specifier).
  - The conditions governing which case gets assigned where have been a perpetual issue in syntax...

\[
\text{DP-PP}
\]

\[
V' \text{ Reanalysis}
\]
Let $\alpha$ be a phrase $[\_ \ldots]$ whose $\theta$-grid contains one undischarged internal $\theta$-role. Then $\alpha$ may be reanalyzed as $[\ldots]$. 

The base structure
The underlying structure
- The indirect object is complement to V.

The surface structure
- Verb movement
- Movement of indirect object

“Dative shift” (Larson’s term for this structure) is like a passive in that an object is “promoted” to subject position inside the VP to get case.

This analogy was contested...
The DP-PP frame can be base generated or derived from the DP-DP frame.

DP-PP is base-generated with non-alternating verbs, but derived from DP-DP with alternating verbs.

Evidence from purpose clauses:

- Purpose clauses have same argument association in DP-DP and DP-PP frames with alternating verbs, but not with non-alternating verbs.
DP-DP: The 1st DP, the possessor, is coreferential with PRO. The 2nd DP, the theme, is coreferential with the empty category.

(6) a. Mary gave Johni a puppyj [PROi to play with ej].
   b. Mary sent Johni a manuscriptj [PROi to read ej].
   c. Mary assigned Johni a jobj [PROi to do ej].
   d. Mary lent Johni a bicyclej [PROi to run some errands with ej].
   e. Mary offered Johni her apartmentj [PROi to stay in ej].

DP-PP: The first DP, the theme, is coreferential with the empty category. The 2nd DP, the possessor/locative, is coreferential with PRO.

(7) a. Mary gave a puppyj to Johni [PROi to play with ej].
   b. Mary sent a manuscriptj to Johni [PROi to read ej].
   c. Mary assigned a jobj to Johni [PROi to do ej].
   d. Mary lent a bicyclej to Johni [PROi to run some errands with ej].
   e. Mary offered her apartmentj to Johni [PROi to stay in ej].
• Verbs like *put, lead, pour, immerse, place* don’t alternate; they only have a DP-PP frame. And they pattern differently with purpose clauses.

• The 1\textsuperscript{st} DP, the theme, cannot be coreferential with the empty category.
• The 2\textsuperscript{nd} DP, the locative, cannot be coreferential with PRO.

\begin{align*}
(8) \ a. \ & \text{Mary put the child on the horse.} \\
\ & *\text{Mary put the horse the child.} \\
(9) \ a. \ & *\text{Mary put the child}_j \text{ on the horse}_i \text{ [PRO}_i \text{ to carry e}_j \text{].} \\
\ & *\text{Mary led the horse}_j \text{ to John}_i \text{ [PRO}_i \text{ to feed e}_j \text{].} \\
\ & *\text{Mary poured honey}_j \text{ on her little brother}_i \text{ [PRO}_i \text{ to lick off e}_j \text{].} \\
\ & *\text{Mary immersed the cloth}_j \text{ in oil}_i \text{ [PRO}_i \text{ to permeate e}_j \text{].} \\
\ & *\text{Mary placed the planting pots}_j \text{ under the tomato vines}_i \text{ [PRO}_i \text{ to grow over e}_j \text{].}
\end{align*}
DP-DP: Alternating

- Theme starts in Spec, VP
- Goal is in Spec, vP
- Theme c-commands empty category (op)
- Goal c-commands PRO

- Two little vP layers: an approach to ditransitives that doesn’t involve ApplP

- Previous work argued that purpose clauses attach VP-internally.
- Purpose clauses are semantically conjoined with denotation of V’.
- $\mu$ combines with the agent-introducing vP and is realized as the verb after movement of [HAVE [v2[CAUSE]]].
- Without a more articulated post-syntactic feature-mapping process, it’s not totally clear how the right verb gets inserted.
DP-PP: Alternating
- Theme starts in Spec, VP
- PP is adjunct to v'
- Just like with DP-DP:
  - Theme c-commands empty category (op)
  - Goal c-commands PRO

Mary gave a puppy to John to play with.

The CP moves to get the right word order.
DP-PP: Non-Alternating

- Theme starts in Spec, VP
- PP is complement to V
- DP and PP are born inside VP
- Goal (floor) does not c-command PRO
  - John c-commands PRO
- Here, the theme is coreferential with the empty category
  - Unlike earlier non-alternating examples
  - Structure allows for coreferentiality here, but doesn’t force it.
• DP-DP and DP-PP frames have different meanings which map to different structures.
  ➢ DP-DP = caused possession
  ➢ DP-PP = caused motion

• Builds on early observations in Green 1974 and Oehrle 1976.

a. The editor sent the article to Sue.
b. The editor sent the article to Philadelphia.
c. The editor sent Sue the article.
d. ?? The editor sent Philadelphia the article.  
   (Harley 2002, ex 7)

• Sue need not actually receive the article, but there is a set of possible worlds in which Sue could receive the article.

• Philadelphia cannot possess the article in any possible world, unless Philadelphia is “animate” because it is representative of a group of people.

Alternative Projection Approach

Explains badness of earlier examples:

*The noise gave a headache to Terry.  
  No caused motion: The headache does not move from the noise to Terry.

*The visitor gave the audience a lecture.  
  No caused possession: The audience does not have the lecture.

Or NOT-HAVEP

Thilo denied Satoshi the victory.

Double Object frame:
- HAVEP complement to V
- IO merged in the specifier
- “Real” ditransitives and applicatives have the same structure (same as Pylkkänen)

Prepositional frame:
- PP complement to V
- DO merged in the specifier of VP

a. Satoshi sent Thilo the Damron Guide. (ex 1a)
b. Thilo cooked Satoshi kisimen. (ex 15b)
c. Satoshi sent the Damron guide to Satoshi. (ex 1b)
Double Object frame:
- HAVEP complement to v
- IO merged in the specifier
- Verb root is adjoined to v

Prepositional frame:
- Same as Beck and Johnson 2004
The interpretation of the DP-PP frame depends on the verb.

- Agree with Alternative Projection Approach that DP-DP = possession.
- But, DP-PP can encode either possession or motion:

\[
give\text{-type verbs}: \quad \text{DP-PP} = \text{possession} \\
\text{throw and send\text{-type verbs}: } \quad \text{DP-PP} = \text{possession or motion}
\]

a. I gave the package to Maria/*London.
b. I sent the package to Maria/London.
c. I threw the ball to Maria/the other side of the field.

(Rappaport Hovav and Levin 2008, ex 15)

(a): London is bad because no possession interpretation
(b/c): Maria = caused possession; London/the other side of the field = caused motion

The relationship between animacy and possession is actually evidence that the verbal root - and not the structure - is responsible for the interpretation of the DP-PP frame.

*Give*-type verbs can’t take a spatial PP or a PP that encodes a path.

a. *Susan gave the ball all the way/halfway to Bill.
b. *Fred gave/offered the ball under/behind/over Molly.
c. *Jill gave/offered the ball at/towards Bob.

(Rappaport Hovav and Levin 2008, ex 16&17)

- **DP-PP doesn’t actually encode caused motion with *give*-type verbs.**

And **throw-type verbs allow a broader range of spatial prepositions than *send*-type verbs.**

d. Fred threw/kicked the ball under the porch/behind the tree/over the fence.
e. *Fred sent/shipped the box under the awning/behind the factory.

(Rappaport Hovav and Levin 2008, ex 11&12)
**DP-PP = Caused Possession**

**Acts of giving:** give, hand, lend, loan, pass, rent, sell

The landlord rented the visiting professor a nice apartment.

The landlord rented a nice apartment to the visiting professor.

**Future having:** allocate, allow, bequeath, grant, offer, owe, promise

**Communication:** tell, show, ask, teach, read, write, quote, cite

---

**DP-PP= Caused Possession or Caused Motion**

**Sending** (*send*-type): forward, mail, send, ship

Instantaneous causation of **ballistic motion** (*throw*-type): fling, flip, kick, lob, slap, shoot, throw, toss

Causation of accompanied motion in a **deictically specified** direction: bring, take

**Instrument of communication:** e-mail, fax, radio, wire, telegraph, telephone

(Rappaport Hovav and Levin 2008, ex 8-9)
Factors related to pragmatics, information structure, prototypical use determine whether DP-DP or DP-PP is used.
- Pronoun vs non-pronoun, givenness, animacy, definiteness, phrasal length

“We can use both dative NP and dative PP syntax to express transfers of possession, but the prototypical uses of giving are heavily biased toward the dative NP construction.” (Bresnan and Nikitina 2007:14)
a. The boss denied George a promotion.
b. *The boss denied a promotion to George. 

(based on Bruening 2010b, ex 4)
c. Who could deny something to someone so dedicated to the causes of international friendship and collaboration?

(Bresnan and Nikitina 2007, ex 22)
d. The lighting here gives me a headache.
e. *The lighting here gives a headache to me. 

(Bruening 2010b, ex 2)
f. ...a stench or smell is diffused over the ship that would give a headache to the most athletic constitution.

(Bresnan and Nikitina 2007, ex 15)
g. The judge fined the company one million dollars.
h. *The judge fined one million dollars to the company.
i. The judge fined one million dollars to the company whose waste had contaminated the ocean.

Previously observed restrictions on the DP-PP variant vanish when the goal is phonologically heavy.
Bruening 2010(b): These sentences actually have an underlying DP-DP structure.

c. Who could deny something to someone so dedicated to the causes of international friendship and collaboration?

f. ...a stench or smell is diffused over the ship that would give a headache to the most athletic constitution.

i. The judge fined one million dollars to the company whose waste had contaminated the ocean.

➢ The goal DP is merged in a rightward specifier. Hence, the theme and the goal are flipped.
➢ Evidence from scope.

Rightward Dative Shift
(Bruening 2010b)

Argues against the Pragmatic/Information Structure Approach (for some constructions).
I gave a different child every candy bar.

- There is a different child, and that child was given every candy bar
  - [a > every]
- *For every candy bar, it was given to a different child
  - [*every > a]

I gave every child a different candy bar.

- For every child, that child got a different candy bar
  - [every > a]
- *There is a different (kind of) candy bar, and every child got that candy bar
  - [*a > every]

I gave a different candy bar to every child.

- There is some different (kind of) candy bar, and that candy bar was given to every child
  - [a > every]
- For every child, that child got a different candy bar
  - [every > a]

I gave every candy bar to a different child.

- For every candy bar, it was given to a different child
  - [every > a]
- There is a different child, and that child got every candy bar
  - [a > every]  
  (Bruening 2010b, ex 12-13)
Bruening’s Analysis of Scope Asymmetry

**DP-DP**
- Theme is merged as sister to V.
- Goal is merged in Spec, ApplP.
- Theme and goal are arguments of different heads and the goal asymmetrically c-commands the theme.
- The goal will move first in scope-movement operations.
- Theme can’t cross over the goal.

➤ **Surface scope**

**DP-PP**
- Goal is merged as sister to P.
- Theme is merged in Spec, PP.
- Theme and goal are arguments of the same head.
- Theme and P’ c-command each other.
- Either theme or goal (P’) can move first in scope-movement operations.

➤ **Surface or inverse scope**
This lighting gives **everyone** a different kind of headache.

- For every person, there is a different kind of headache  
  
  * There is some different kind of headache, and that headache is given to everyone

(Examples on slides 19-22 from Bruening 2010b, ex 14)
This lighting gives a different person every kind of headache.

There is a different (type of) person and that person gets every kind of headache

[a > every]

* For every kind of headache, it is given to a different (type of) person

[*every > a]
This lighting gives every kind of headache to a different (type of) person.

✓ There is a different type of person, and that person gets every kind of headache  
   [a > every]

* For every kind of headache, it is given to a different type of person  
  [*every > a]
This lighting gives a different kind of headache to everyone who enters the room.

✓ For everyone who enters the room, that person gets a different headache  
   [every > a]

?There is some different kind of headache and that headache afflicts everyone who enters the room  
   [a > every]

Inverse Scope Preferred

Unexpected again!

Bruening (2010b) proposes that the underlying structure is actually DP-DP with the two DPs flipped.  
The indirect object is merged in a right-projected specifier

The ? for the surface scope is my judgment.
Bruening’s (2010b) analysis

- Goal is merged in right-projected specifier of ApplP.
- Goal moves to a higher right-projected specifier of VoiceP.
- As a result of this movement, ‘to’ is inserted.

The Extraction Constraint on Rightward Specifiers: The specifier of ApplP may be ordered to the right of its sister only if the NP that occupies it undergoes A-bar extraction. (Bruening 2010b, ex 9)
Accounting for inverse scope with DP-DP

a. This lighting gives every kind of headache to a different (type of) person.
   • There is a different type of person, and that person gets every kind of headache.
   [a > every]

b. This lighting gives a different kind of headache to everyone who enters the room.
   • For everyone who enters, that person gets a different headache.
   [every > a]
Derivational:
Larson 1988: DP-PP structure is basic and DP-DP is derived
Hallman 2015: DP-DP is base-generated and DP-PP can be base-generated or derived from DP-DP

Alternative Projection:
Each frame has a uniform interpretation
DP-DP = caused possession  DP-PP = caused motion

Verb Sensitive:
The verb determines the interpretation of the DP-PP frame
DP-DP = caused possession  DP-PP = caused motion or caused possession

Pragmatic:
Information structure, discourse and phonological factors determine which frame is used

Rightward Dative Shift:
Counter to the Pragmatic Approach
Some DP-PP surface forms are actually underlyingly DP-DP

SUMMARY OF APPROACHES FOR ENGLISH
Case patterns in Icelandic ditransitives

Restrictions on DP-PP

Evaluation of Icelandic against the backdrop of approaches for English

Object inversion (DO precedes IO)
Standard Word Order
a. Þau sýndu foreldrúnum krakkana.
   they.Nom showed the parents.Dat the kids.Acc
   ‘They showed the parents the kids.’

Inverted Word Order
b. Þau sýndu krakkana foreldrúnum.
   they.Nom showed the kids.Acc the parents.Dat
   ‘They showed the kids to the parents.’
   (Collins and Thráinsson 1996, ex 44)

- D.O. precedes I.O., but there’s no preposition
The subject is always nominative.
The vast majority of ditransitives exhibit the canonical dative-accusative pattern.

a. Ég sagði þér söguna. Dat-Acc
   I told you.Dat the story.Acc
   ‘I told you the story.’

a.’ Hann gaf litla barninu bókina Acc
   he gave the small child.Dat the book.Acc
   ‘He gave the small child the book.’

Approximate number of verbs for each case pattern:
- Dat-Acc (>220)
- Acc-Dat (37)
- Dat-Dat (29)
- Dat-Gen (28)
- Acc-Gen (21) (Jónsson 2000, ex3)

Two verbs have double accusative objects- kosta ‘cost’ and taka ‘take’.

Jónsson (2000) and Thrálínsson (2007:178) show that the second object is a measure phrase.
b. Þeir leyndu Ólaf sannleikanum.  
they concealed Olaf.Acc the truth.Dat  
‘They concealed the truth from Olaf.

b.’Lögreglan sviptir marga ökuskírteininu.  
the police deprive many.Acc the driver’s license.Dat  
‘The police take the driver’s license away from many people.’

c. Ólafur lofaði Maríu þessum hring.  
Olaf promised Mary.Dat this ring.Dat  
‘Olaf promised Mary this ring.

c.’ Jón skilaði henni vasanum.  
John returned her.Dat the vase.Dat  
‘John returned the vase to her.’
d. Maria óskaði Ólafi alls góðs.
   ‘Mary wished Olaf everything good.’

D-G

’d.’ Ég synjaði þeim leyfis.
   ‘I refused to grant them permission.’

A-G

e. Jón bað mig bóinar.
   ‘Jon asked me a favor.’

A-G

e.’ Hann krafði hana sagna.
   ‘He asked her to reveal the information.’

D-G
Interesting Point 1: Case and semantic restrictions on DP-PP

- Only Dat-Acc, Dat-Dat, Acc-Dat verbs allow for DP-PP.
- And, there has to be physical motion of the direct object.

a. Haraldur sendi mér ost.
   Harold sent me.Dat cheese.Acc
   ‘Harold sent me (some) cheese.’

a’. Haraldur send ost til mín.
   Harold sent cheese.Acc to me.Gen
   ‘Harold sent (some) cheese to me.’

b. Þeir föxuðu mér samninginn.
   they faxed me.Dat the contract.Acc
   ‘They faxed me the contract.’

b’. Þeir föxuðu samninginn til mín.
   they faxed the contract.Acc to me.Gen
   ‘They faxed the contract to me.’
a. María gaf Haraldi bókina.
   Mary gave Harold. Dat the book. Acc
   ‘Mary gave Harold the book.’

a’. *María gaf bókina til Haraldar.
   Mary gave the book. Acc to Harold. Gen

b. Hann síndi strákunum bátinn.
   he showed the boys. Dat the boat. Acc
   ‘He showed the boys the boat.’

b’. *Hann síndi bátinn til strákanna.
   he showed the boat. Acc to the boys. Gen
   (Thráinsson 2007:173-174)
Dat-Dat verbs also allow DP-PP when there is physical motion of the direct object

a. Hún skilaði mér bókinni. 
   she returned me.Dat the book.Dat
   ‘She returned the book to me.’

a’. Hún skilaði bókinni til mín. 
   she returned the book.Dat to me.Gen
   ‘She returned the book to me.’

b. Ég lofaði henni því. 
   I promised her.Dat it.Dat
   ‘I promised her it.’

b’. *Ég lofaði því til hennar. 
   I promised it.Dat to her.Gen
   ‘I promised it to her.’

(Thráinsson 2007: 177-178)

Suggests Alternative Projection Approach...
Poor nations possess assistance: DP-DP good

a. Bankinn aðstoðar fátækar þjóðir.
   the bank.Nom assists poor nations.Acc
   ‘The bank assists poor nations.’

b. Bankinn veitir fátækum þjóðum aðstoð.
   the bank gives poor nations.Dat assistance.Acc
   ‘The bank gives poor nations assistance.’ (Jónsson 2000, ex 45)

Pedestrians do not possess assistance: DP-DP questionable

c. Lögreglan aðstoðar gangandi vegfarendur.
   the police.Nom assists pedestrians.Acc
   ‘The police assist pedestrians.’

d. ?Lögreglan veitir gangandi vegfarendum aðstoð.
   the police gives pedestrians.Dat assistance.Acc
   ‘The police give pedestrians assistance.’ (Jónsson 2000, ex 44)

✓ Good for some speakers in a context where the pedestrians are getting something from the police (e.g. a map).
X But… d is always good for other speakers. So, things are complicated.
a. Ég styð Eirík.
   I.Nom support Erik.Acc
   ‘I support Erik.’

b. Ég veiti Eiríki stuðning.
   I.Nom give Erik.Dat support.Acc
   ‘I give Erik support.’ (Jónsson 2000, ex 41)

c. Ég styð þessa tillögu.
   I.Nom support this proposal.Acc
   ‘I support this proposal.’

d.?? Ég veiti þessari tillögu stuðning.
   I.Nom give this proposal.Dat support.Acc
   ‘I give this proposal support.’ (Jónsson 2000, ex 42)

- (d) is good for some speakers and (e) is totally fine

e. Ég veiti þessari tillögu móralbank/síðferðilegan stuðning.
   I give this proposal.Dat moral support.Acc
   ‘I give this proposal moral support.’
Some Acc-Dat verbs allow DP-PP without a locative interpretation...but the preposition is different.

a. Þeir leyndu hana sannleikanum.
   they concealed her. Acc the truth. Dat

b. Þeir leyndu sannleikanum fyrir henni.
   they concealed the truth. Dat from her. Dat
   ‘They concealed the truth from her.’
   (Thráinsson 2007, ex 4.65&4.66)

- Recall Rappaport Hovav and Levin 2008: Choice of preposition is support for the Verb Sensitive approach.
Interesting Point 2: Inversion is restricted according to case frame, but is not sensitive to the semantics of individual verbs within a case frame. Some verbs that do not allow DP-PP do allow object inversion.

a. Hann gaf konunginum ambáttina.
   he gave the king.Dat the maidservant.Acc
   ‘He gave the king the maidservant.’

b. Þau sóngu foreldrunum krakkana.
   they showed the parents.Dat the kids.Acc
   ‘They showed the parents the kids.’

a’. Hann gaf ambáttina konunginum.
    he gave the maidservant.Acc the king.Dat
    ‘He gave the maidservant to the king.’

b’. Þau sóngu krakkana foreldrunum.
    they showed the kids.Acc the parents.Dat
    ‘They showed the kids to the parents.’

(Collins and Thráinsson 1996, ex 43/44)

No physical motion, but inverted order is allowed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Base Order</th>
<th>Inverted Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Dat-Acc</td>
<td>Acc-Dat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Dat-Dat</td>
<td>?Dat-Dat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can be repaired</td>
<td>Acc-Dat</td>
<td>*Dat-Acc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acc-Dat</td>
<td>*Dat-Dat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not allowed</td>
<td>Dat-Gen</td>
<td>*Gen-Dat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acc-Gen</td>
<td>*Gen-Acc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Inversion not allowed with Genitives**
- **Descriptive generalization:** Dative must be to the right.
- **Theoretical insight:** Only a Dative can occupy a right-projected specifier.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PP Structure Allowed</th>
<th>Inversion Allowed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dat-Acc</td>
<td>✓ Motion required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat-Dat</td>
<td>✓ Motion required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc-Dat</td>
<td>✓ Motion not required, <em>but fyrir</em> ‘for/from’ used instead of <em>til</em> ‘to’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat-Gen</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc-Gen</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summarize Collins and Thráinsson’s (1996) observations about object inversion

Extend Bruening’s (2010b) R-Dative Shift proposal for English to Icelandic

SECTION 3: ZOOMING IN
ANALYSIS: OBJECT INVERSION IS R-DATIVE SHIFT
Object Shift Obeys Holmberg’s Generalization

Holmberg’s Generalization: Object shift is allowed if the verb moves out of the VP.

Both the verb and the object shift over negation.

a. Jón las bækurnar ekki.
   John.Nom read the books.Acc not
   ‘John did not read the books.’

Only the verb moves (no object shift).

b. Jón las ekki bækurnar.
   John.Nom read not the books.Acc
   ‘John did not read the books.’ (C&T 1996, ex 2)
- Auxiliary occupies T, preventing verb movement.
- No object shift in transitive in (a) or ditransitive in (d/e).

a. *Jón hefur lesið bækurnar ekki.
   John.Nom has read the books.Acc not

b. Jón hefur ekki lesið bækurnar.
   John.Nom has not read the books.Acc (C&T 1996, ex 5d/e)

c. Ég hef ekki lánað Maríu bækurnar.
   I.Nom have not lent Maria.Dat the books.Acc

d. *Ég hef Maríu ekki lánað bækurnar.
   I.Nom have Maria.Dat not lent the books.Acc

e. *Ég hef Maríu bækurnar ekki lánað.
   I.Nom have Maria.Dat the books.Acc not lent (C&T 1996, ex 20 & 22)
If the main verb moves to T in a ditransitive:
- The indirect object can shift alone (preferred) =a
- The indirect object can shift with the direct object =b

a. Ég lána Maríu ekki bækurnar.
   I lend Maria. Dat not the books. Acc
   ‘I do not lend Maria the books/books.’

b. ?Ég lána Maríu bækurnar ekki.
   I lend Maria. Dat the books. Acc not
   ‘I do not lend Maria the books.’ (C&T 1996, ex 19a & 23)

Object shift in ditransitives

Important: The indirect object precedes the direct object in both (a) and (b).
The auxiliary prevents verb movement, but both orders are allowed.

**Standard**

a. Ég hafði gefið konunginum ambáttina sína.
   
   I had given the king.Dat the maidservant.Acc his(refl)
   
   ‘I had given the king his maidservant.’

**Inverted**

b. Ég hafði gefið ambáttina konungi sínum.
   
   I had given the maidservant.Acc king.Dat her(refl)
   
   ‘I had given the maidservant to her king.’ (C&T 1996, ex 50)
In inversion, the dative has to be stressed. It doesn’t have to be heavy.

Inversion is reported to not be allowed with reduced pronouns.

a. Þeir gáf ‘onum ‘ana.
   they gave him.Dat her.Acc
   ‘They gave her to him.’

b. *Þeir gáf ‘ana ‘onum.
   they gave her.Acc him.Dat
   ‘They gave her to him.’

   (C&T 1996, ex 49)

(But...b is acceptable for some speakers. So again, things are complicated.)
Rightward extraposition is allowed when inversion is not.

a. Forstjórinnsviptimanninnvinnunni.
   the boss deprived the man. Acc the work. Dat
   ‘The boss deprived the man of the work.’

Extraposition

b. ?Forstjórinnsviptivinnunniemanninnsemhafðiunnið
   the boss deprived the work. Dat the man. Acc that had worked
   hjá honum í 10 ár.
   for him for 10 years

Inversion

c. *Forstjórinnsviptivinnunnimanninn.
   the boss deprived the work. Dat the man. Acc

   (C&T 1996, ex 45)

Recall, this is good when Acc is changed to Dat
Alternative Projection Approach

Collins and Thráinsson (1996) argue that the inverted order is base generated.

A null causative verb selects for a TP small clause.

That TP contains a VP whose head decomposes into the ditransitive verb plus either HAVE or BE.

HAVE selects for a DP and BE selects for a PP.

Collins and Thráinsson (1996): Inversion has the same structure as the DP-PP variant.

(based on C&T 1996, ex 17 and 65)
Collins and Thráinsson 1996 is similar in spirit to Harley 2002

Harley 2002: PP small clause complement to $v$-cause:
- Double object frame: IO merged in specifier of PP
- Prepositional frame: DO merged in specifier of PP and IO is inside of a lower PP

- We saw earlier that this proposal is modified in Harley and Jung 2015.

(Harley 2002, ex 3)
In line with Collins and Thráinsson 1996, inversion is a base-generated structure, but it’s not the same as the DP-PP structure.

The DP-PP frame and inversion have different distributions.
Recall Bruening’s (2010b) Analysis

Deriving Inverse Scope with DP-DP

a. This lighting gives every kind of headache to a different (type of) person.
   • There is a different type of person, and that person gets every kind of headache.
   [a > every]

b. This lighting gives a different kind of headache to everyone who enters the room.
   • For everyone who enters, that person gets a different headache.
   [every > a]
a. DP-DP: Surface Scope Only

Haraldur sendi einhverjum blaðamannin öll skjölin.
Harold sent some reporter. Dat all the documents. Acc
‘Harold sent some reporter all the documents.’

*Surface*: There is some reporter and that reporter received all documents.

*Inverse*: For all documents, each one was sent to a different reporter.

b. DP-PP: Ambiguous Scope

Kennarinn sendi skjal til allra foreldra í skólanum.
the teacher sent a document. Acc to all parents. Gen in the school
‘The teacher sent a document to all the parents in the school.’

*Surface*: There is some (kind of) document and that document was sent to all parents.

*Inverse*: For all parents, they received some unique (kind of) document.
a. Norðurljósin færa öllum útlendingum einhverja tilfinningu.

The northern lights provide all foreigners. Dat some feeling. sg. Acc

‘The northern lights provide all foreigners some feeling.’

Surface scope: For every foreigner, each person gets a unique feeling.
[every > a]

*Inverse scope: There is a unique feeling and every foreigner gets that feeling.
[*a > every]

b. Norðurljósin færa einhverjum útlendingi allar tilfinningar.

The northern lights provide some foreigner. sg. Dat all feelings. pl. Acc

‘The northern lights provide some foreigner all feelings.’

Surface scope: There is some foreigner and that person gets all feelings.
[a > every]

*Inverse scope: For every feeling, that feeling is given to a different foreigner.
[*every > a]
Norðurljósin færa allar tilfinningar einhverjum útlendingi.
The northern lights provide all feelings.pl.Acc some foreigner.sg.Dat
‘The northern lights provide every feeling (to) some foreigner.’

Inverse scope (preferred reading): [a > every]
There is some foreigner and that person gets all feelings.

??Surface scope (can be forced): ??[every > a]
For every feeling, that feeling is given to a different foreigner.

...But inverse scope is strongly preferred with inversion...

...Unexpected!
Patterns like English!
...And speakers like inversion better with a heavy DP.

Norðurljósin færa einhverja tilfinningu öllum útlendingum sem koma til Íslands. The northern lights provide some feeling.sg.Acc all foreigners.pl.Dat that come to Iceland. ‘The northern lights provide some feeling (to) every foreigner that comes to Iceland.’

**Inverse scope** (preferred): \([\text{every} \rightarrow \text{a}]\)
For every foreigner that comes to Iceland, each person gets a unique feeling.

??**Surface scope** (forced): ??\([\text{a} \rightarrow \text{every}]\)
There is some particular feeling and that feeling is given to all foreigners.

Resembles English...
Regular Order
- Dative merged in a left Spec, ApplP.
- Accounts for surface scope.

Inverted Order
- Dative merged in right Spec, ApplP and moves to right Spec, voiceP.
- Inverse scope preference remains.

- Icelandic has an extraction “preference” on rightward specifiers, not the extraction constraint that Bruening (2010b) proposes for English.
- Either the second or third derivation applies to inversion.

Inverted Order with Heavy DP
- Dative merged in right Spec, ApplP and moves to right Spec, voiceP.
- Inverse scope preference remains.

- Either the second or third derivation applies to inversion.
The Prepositional Construction

DP-PP: Ambiguous Scope

Kennarinn sendi skjal til allra foreldra í skólanum.

‘The teacher sent a document to all the parents in the school.’

*Surface:* There is some (kind of) document and that document was sent to all parents.     [a > every]

*Inverse:* For all parents, they received some unique (kind of) document.    [every > a]

Bruening’s (2010a/b) proposal could apply.
Differing distributions of DP-PP frame and inversion suggest that they are different structures.

Evidence from object shift and rightward extraposition suggest that inversion is base-generated.

Scope facts which are parallel to English suggest that inversion is R-Dative Shift.
Highlight previous observations made for Icelandic that the syntax is sensitive to the distinction between structural and non-structural case.

Other case frames that allow inversion
Passives
Alternating predicates
a. Ólafur lofaði Maríu þessum hring.
    Olaf promised Mary.Dat this ring.Dat
    ‘Olaf promised Mary this ring.

b. Ólafur lofaði þessum hring Maríu.
    Olaf promised this ring.Dat Mary.Dat
    ‘Olaf promised this ring to Mary.

c. Þeir leyndu Ólaf sannleikanum.
    they concealed Olaf.Acc the truth.Dat
    ‘They concealed the truth from Olaf.

d. *Þeir leyndu sannleikanum Ólaf.
    they concealed the truth.Dat Olaf.Acc
    ‘They concealed the truth from Olaf.

e. *Þeir leyndu sannleikanum Ólafi.
    they concealed the truth.Dat Olaf.Dat
    ‘They concealed the truth from Olaf.

Acceptable with Acc-Dat

Acceptable with Acc-Dat if repair strategy used and
Accusative is changed to Dative

• Akin to Person Case
Constraint repair strategies...maybe...
a. Ég synjaði þeim leyfis.
   I denied them. Dat permission. Gen
   ‘I refused to grant them permission.’

b. *Ég synjaði leyfis þeim.
   I denied permission. Gen them. Dat

Inversion not allowed

c. Þeir spurðu manninn tveggja spurninga.
   they asked the man. Acc two questions. Gen
   ‘They asked the man two questions.’

d. *Þeir spurðu tveggja spurninga manninn.
   they asked two questions. Gen the man. Acc
   Acc-Gen = *Gen-Acc
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Base Order</th>
<th>Inverted Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Dat-Acc</td>
<td>Acc-Dat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Dat-Dat</td>
<td>?Dat-Dat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can be repaired</td>
<td>Acc-Dat</td>
<td>*Dat-Acc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acc-Dat</td>
<td>?Dat-Dat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not allowed</td>
<td>Dat-Gen</td>
<td>*Gen-Dat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acc-Gen</td>
<td>*Gen-Acc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Inversion not allowed with Genitives**
- **Descriptive Generalization:** Dative must be to the right
- **Theoretical Insight:** Only a Dative can occupy a right-projected specifier.
Other Word Order Variations

“Symmetric” verb constructions

- Allow either the underlying subject or the underlying object to raise to the syntactic subject position.
- Underlying structure is Dat-Nom.

a. Méð hafa alltaf nægt tvénnir skór.  
   me.Dat have always sufficed two.pairs shoes.Nom

b. Tvénnir skór hafa alltaf nægt mér.  
   two.pairs shoes.Nom have always sufficed me.Dat
   ‘I have always made do with two pairs of shoes.’
   (Wood and Sigurðsson 2014, ex 2)

- The Nominative (theme) is merged as sister to Appl.
- The Dative is merged in Spec,ApplP.
- Appl moves to V, making the Dative and the Nominative equidistant to higher positions.
- Either DP can move to Spec,TP.
Ditransitive passives in which either DP can passivize

Allowed when the standard frame is Dat-Acc (in the active).

a. Konunginum voru gefnar ambáttir.
   the king.Dat were given maidservants.Nom
   ‘The king was given maidservants.’

b. Ambáttir voru gefnar konunginum.
   Maidservants.Nom were given the king.Dat
   ‘Maidservants were given to the king.’

   (Zaenen, Maling, Thráinsson 1985, ex 44, slightly modified)

- Also discussed in Wood and Sigurðsson 2014.
Inversion is allowed only with Dative and Accusative combinations

Only a dative can occupy the right specifier

Word order variation is most freely available when a non-structural case precedes a structural case in the base structure

| Inversion | Dat-Acc |
| Passivization of either object | Dat-Acc |
| Symmetrical verb constructions | Dat-Nom |
NEXT STEPS
Bruening (2010b) argues that A-bar extraction of the goal forces the right specifier in English.
- Heavy shift, Wh-movement

In Icelandic, inversion is better with a heavy goal. Speakers prefer (a)...

a. Norðurljósin færa einhverja tilfinningu öllum útlendingum sem koma til Íslands.
the northern lights provide some feeling.sg.Acc all foreigners.pl.Dat that come to Iceland
‘The northern lights provide some feeling (to) every foreigner that comes to Iceland.’

...but (b) is allowed.

b. Norðurljósin færa allar tilfinningar einhverjum útlendingi.
the northern lights provide all feelings.pl.Acc some foreigner.sg.Dat
‘The northern lights provide every feeling (to) some foreigner.’

I have to test more examples to explore the link between heaviness and inversion.
Other A-Bar Movement?

Who does he give the creeps to? (Bruening 2010b, ex 22) vs ?

Who does he give the creeps?

- The good sentence is derived from: *he gives the creeps who*

a. Norðurljósin færa öllum útlendingum einhverja tilfinningu.
   the northern lights provide all foreigners.pl.Dat some feeling.sg.Acc
   ‘The northern lights provide all foreigners some feeling.’

b. Norðurljósin færa einhverja tilfinningu öllum útlendingum.
   the northern lights provide some feeling.sg.Acc all foreigners.pl.Dat
   ‘The northern lights provide some feeling (to) all foreigners.’

c. Öllum útlendingum færa norðurljósin einhverja tilfinningu.
   all foreigners.pl.Dat provide the northern lights some feeling.sg.Acc
   ‘All foreigners, the northern lights provide some feeling.’

d. Einhverja tilfinningu færa norðurljósin öllum útlendingum.
   some feeling.sg.Acc provide the northern lights all foreigners.pl.Dat
   ‘Some feeling, the northern lights provide (to) all foreigners.’

Difficult to test in Icelandic because there’s no ‘to’ with inversion. If the dative is WH-moved, we can’t tell if (a) or (b) is the underlying structure.

Topicalization is also tricky:

(c) “should” be better than (d), but we don’t know if (c) is derived from (a) or (b).
Inversion of applicatives is ungrammatical.

a. Þeir héldu Jóni þessa veislu.  
   they held John.Dat this party.Acc  
   ‘They threw John this party.’

b. *Þeir héldu þessa veislu Jóni  
   they held this party.Acc John.Dat  
   ‘Intended: they threw John this party.’  
   (Víðarsson 2012, ex 84)

And applicatives don’t as freely allow either object to passivize.

c. Jóni var haldin þessi veisla.  
   John.Dat was thrown this party.Nom

d. ??Þessi veisla var haldin Jóni.  
   this party.Nom was thrown John.Dat  
   (Jónsson 2000, footnote 3)

Perhaps applicatives have a different structure, contra previous proposals - Beck and Johnson 2004, Pylkkänen 2008.
CONCLUSIONS

- Differing distributions of the DP-PP frame and inversion suggest that they have different structures.

- Parallels between the scope interpretations of some English and Icelandic ditransitives suggest that R-dative shift applies in both languages.

- Inversion patterns like symmetric verb constructions and ditransitives which allow passivization of either object in that a non-structural case precedes a structural case in the base structure.

*Future research includes:*

- A detailed investigation of the semantics of ditransitives in order to determine whether the Alternative Projection, Verb Sensitive, or Pragmatic/Information Structure model is the best model for Icelandic. I suspect the same debate that continues to be waged for English could be waged for Icelandic.

- Providing additional support for a right-projected specifier in Icelandic.

- An explanation of the inversion (and passivization) restriction on applicatives.

- A *much* more extensive look at scope in Icelandic.
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