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Abstract
This study offers an overview of the main classes of German datives, arguing that most of them are interpreted in exactly the same way as subjects of English *have*, a result expressed by treating the datives as inherently case-marked specifiers of an applicative light verb which has the same underspecified meaning as *have*. The datives can relate semantically to either entities (DPs) or situations (VPs). A central new claim is that most datives relate to situations in the same way as subjects of so-called ‘experienter’ *have*. Thus, the dative in *Mir fiel ein Stein auf eine Hand* (‘meletzte fell a stone on a hand’) is interpreted in the same way as *I had a stone fall on a hand*. This analysis contrasts with possessor raising and other analyses treating all datives as being primarily possessors of entities. The analysis is extended to possessor datives, beneficaries, recipients, maleficiaries, privative (source) datives, datives with particle verbs and datives interpreted as causers. I also briefly discuss some types of datives to which this type of analysis should not be extended, the most important of which is a type of dative which is structurally lower than theme arguments.

1. Introduction
This study\(^1\) assesses the hypothesis that German datives (with exceptions noted in section 10) are interpreted in the same way as subjects of English *have*. Because it tests this claim on many different types of datives, this essay doubles as a descriptive overview of the most important semantic and syntactic classes of datives in German. Despite its focus on German, readers interested in dative/transitive and *have*-constructions will find a number of new suggestions worth testing in other languages.

We proceed as follows. Section 2 presents and briefly motivates some assumptions about the syntax of German datives. Most datives are licensed by an inherent-dative-assigning light verb which takes either DPs or (unaccusative) VPs as complement and is semantically equivalent to English *have*. Section 3 discusses the meaning of *have*. *Have*, *get*, *with* and *without* have a number of uses in common. These senses are seen as manifestations of a single highly underspecified two-place relation between an entity and either an entity or a situation.

Sections 4-9 apply the analysis to various different types of datives. Section 4 analyses *geben-, ‘give’*, noting that the *give*-have parallels extend beyond alienable possession. Section 5 discusses so-called possessor datives like (1a) and beneficiary/maleficiary datives. These datives are often possessors of a c-commanded DP. I argue that these datives relate semantically to events, not entities. The c-command requirement, when it does hold, as well as possessor variable binding and affectedness effects, are parallel to those observed with the so-called experiencer reading of *have* in the lower glosses in (1). Section 6 extends this type of analysis to privative (source) datives like (1b). Rather than treating source or NOT-HAVE relations as primitive, I suggest that all such datives relate to a situation as maleficiaries, a subcase of the affectedness relation which expericer*-have* can express.

(1) a. *Lhm ist ein Hund gestorben.*
    
    *him* is a dog*DAT* died

b. *Jemand hat mir das Auto geklaut.*
    
    someone has *me* the car*DAT* stolen

1 I thank Werner Abraham, Daniel Hole and two anonymous readers for comments on earlier versions.

Section 7 examines datives with various ‘possessive’ verbs and in recipient constructions, with verbs such as *geben*—‘belong’ and *send*—‘send’. The remaining sections deal with more challenging types of datives, including datives with particle verbs (section 8) and datives interpreted as causers (section 9). Section 10 notes some classes of datives not addressed here, notably a type of dative which is generated lower than theme arguments and is not introduced by a light verb corresponding to *have*.

2. Syntactic assumptions
(2) illustrates two syntactic structures (omitting clausal structure) I assume for datives. (Section 10 notes some dative classes for which (2) is not claimed to be correct.)

(2) a. (weil) *Annen ihm den Teller zerbrach*
    
    since *Anne* him*DAT* the plate*ACC* broke

b. (weil) *ich ihm ein Buch gab*
    
    since *I* him*DAT* a book*ACC* gave

Some arguments are introduced by meaningful light verbs (Pykkänen 2002). *V\^\text{CAUS}* in (2) introduces a causer/agent. Datives are introduced by a head I call *V\^\text{DAT})* (the applicative head of Anagnostopoulou 2002, Hole 2005, Lee-Schoenfeld 2006, McFadden 2003, Miyagawa & Tsujigka 2004, Pykkänen 2002). *V\^\text{DAT})* has the following properties:

1. *V\^\text{DAT})* is not a semantically empty case-marking head, but assigns its specifier an interpretation parallel to that found with subjects of English *have*.

2. *V\^\text{DAT})* can take a VP or a DP complement, depending on whether the dative relates semantically to an entity or an event. This idea is due to Pykkänen (2002), but I later query her claim that the head always takes a DP complement in German and English.
3. I assume that German lacks a structural dative and that \( V^\text{aux} \) assigns inherent dative to its specifier (cf. Anagnostopoulou 2002, Lee-Schoenfeld 2006). This means that there is no syntactic configuration where an argument generated in the specifier of \( V^\text{aux} \) can receive a case other than dative. Thus, stripping (2a) of \( V^\text{aux} \) gives us the unaccusative structure in (3), where dative is preserved and, as expected of structural arguments, the accusative argument becomes nominative. Theories seeing dative as a structural linker for arguments of intermediate prominence (Molnář 1998, Stechow 1996:101-105, Wegener 1991, Wunderlich 1996, 2000) seem unable to explain this without incongruous stipulations.

(3) weil ihm der Teller zerbrach
  since him out the plate out broke

Some writers see ‘alternations’ like (4) as evidence that German has structural datives. (4b) is seen as a type of passive where bekommen or kriegen ‘get’ is an auxiliary allowing the promotion of the dative in (4a) (see Molnář 1998, Reis 1985, Wegener 1991, and the critiques in Cook, this volume, Haider 1986 and Abraham 1995). I suggest that the paraphrase relation in (4) exists because bekommen is an inchoative of the same HAVE relation as that which is argued below to be the relation which datives have to an event. Proving this would require a separate study, but note that much of the appeal of the passive analysis of (4b) dissipates when we observe that English get, which parallels bekommen closely in other uses (McIntyre 2005), can translate the bekommen structure in (4b) literally, although English lacks a structure parallel to (4a) upon which the get-structure could be based: He confiscated (*me) my/the passport. I see no reason why (4b) should not be directly generated in the same way as its English counterpart with get.

    a policeman confiscated me out the passport
    ‘I had a policeman confiscate my passport.’
  b. *Ich bekam den Pass (von einem Polizisten) entzogen.
    *I got the passport out (by a policeman) confiscated
    ‘I got/had my passport confiscated (by a policeman).’

3. The HAVE relation

I now introduce the HAVE relation, which I take to be what \( V^\text{aux} \) expresses, and to present in the meaning of have, get and with(out). Consider firstly the taxonomy below of different uses of HAVE. This draws on earlier literature on have (e.g. Belvin & den Dikken 1997, Benveniste 1966, Déchaine et al. 1994, den Dikken 1997, Freeze 1992, Harley 1998, McIntyre 2005, Ritter & Rosen 1997). To the examples with have I add examples with get (an inchoative of have), with and without, which have much the same array of uses.

A. Nominal complement uses

A1. Alienable possession: the subject is in an alienable possession (ownership) relation to the object. The external argument must be animate, since inanimates cannot own things.

(5) a. Mary had/got books. *The shelf had/got books.
  b. a person with(out) books; *a shelf with(out) books

A2. Relational: The complement is an inalienable possession or any kind of relational nominal. The external argument need not be animate.

(6) a. The table had/got new legs. The group has/got new members.
  b. The book had/got (good reviews/a catalogue number).
  c. a table with(out) new legs; a group with(out) new members; a book without (good reviews/a catalogue number)

B. Uses with small clause complements expressing situations

B1. Locational: the complement is a location predication which contains an element coindexed with the external argument of have/get/with (which need not be animate).

(7) a. The wall, had/got mud on it. The car, had/got dents in its, fender.
  b. a wall, with(out) mud on it; a car, with(out) dents in its, fender

B2. Experiencer: the subject of have etc. is affected by the situation expressed as a small clause in the complement. (I use the term ‘experiencer have’ because it is common in the literature, although it is descriptively and theoretically inaccurate in my view.)

(8) a. He, had/got students walking out of his, lecture. John had/got his, camera in the water/smashed. He had people (throw rocks at him/destroy his, car).
    The car had rocks falling on it.
  b. Lecturers, with(out) students walking out of their, lectures; someone, with their, camera in the water/smashed; a car with rocks falling on it

B3. Causative: the subject of have or get causes the situation in the complement to come about. (I have found no parallels with with(out).)

(9) a. The piano teacher had/got the student practising octaves.
  b. My boss had me check my work. My boss got me to check my work.

I wish to draw attention to the following points.

1. The complement of have/get/with(out) can be either an entity (as in the DP complement uses in A) or a situation (cf. the B uses with small clauses). I later argue that datives can also relate to either entities or situations.

2. The subject of have etc. can be inanimate in the relational and location uses in A2 and B1. We later see that datives and have-subjects may be inanimate under similar circumstances.

3. The literature on have observes that the locational and experiencer uses in B1 and B2 require that the subject of have be coindexed with a pronoun or variable somewhere in the complement (e.g. Belvin & den Dikken 1997, Déchaine et al. 1994, Harley 1998, McIntyre 2005, Ritter & Rosen 1997). After Belvin & den Dikken (1997) I call this the link requirement. If this requirement is not met, the experiencer readings like those in B2 become much harder to establish. Causative readings like those in B3 are not subject to the link requirement, and are thus the preferred reading if no anaphoric link is present. (10) illustrates. (10a) is possible if Egbert was not responsible for the location of the car, while (10b), where the link requirement is unfulfilled, strongly prefers the causative reading in which Egbert was responsible for the car’s being on the driveway. Unlike earlier studies, I see this requirement as pragmatic, not grammatical, since an experiencer reading for have is possible in suitable contexts like (10c) which disobey the link requirement. We later note that the link requirement is in evidence with German datives (in the form of ‘possessor raising’ effects).
4. That the non-cognates have, get and with(out) should all include the uses in A and B1, B2 in their set of meanings cannot be accidental.\(^2\) The only way I can see of capturing this is to assume that relational, alienable possession, location and experiencer uses of have, get, and with(out) (and most German datives, see below) stem from the same basic meaning.

I note the basic element of meaning common to the uses of have, get and with(out) as a two-place function HAVE\((x,y)\), where \(x\) corresponds to the syntactic external argument of have etc. and \(y\) to its DP or small clause complement. (11) is a suggestion for how HAVE integrates into structures with have, with(out) and get. (11) follows Harley’s (1998, 2002) variant of the hypothesis that have structures result from incorporation of a preposition into a copula (e.g. Belvin & den Dikken 1997, Benveniste 1966, Déchaine et al. 1994, Freeze 1992). With is a direct spellout of this preposition. The ill-formedness of *the man is with the book (despite the man with the book) follows if we assume that the head chain BE...HAVE is obligatorily spelt out with have. McIntyre (2005) defends the application of such ideas to get.

\[\begin{align*}
(11) & \quad \text{a. } x \text{ has } y & = \text{ BE } [\text{BE } x \text{ [PP HAVE [SC/DPy]]}] \\
& \quad \text{b. } x \text{ gets } y & = \text{ BECOME } [\text{BE } x \text{ [PP HAVE [SC/DPy]]}] \\
& \quad \text{c. } x \ldots [\text{PP without } y] & = x \ldots [\neg \text{PP HAVE [SC/DPy]]] \\
& \quad \text{d. } x \ldots [\text{PP with } y] \text{ (in relevant sense)} & = x \ldots [\text{PP HAVE [SC/DPy]]] \\
\end{align*}\]

A proposal for the interpretation of HAVE\((x,y)\) is given in (12).\(^3\) (Recall that \(x\) corresponds to the external argument of have/get/with(out) and \(y\) to its complement.)

\[\begin{align*}
(12) & \quad \text{HAVE}(x,y) \text{ asserts that } x \text{ is in some relationship to } y. \\
\end{align*}\]

Like the work on have cited above, (12) assumes that there is an underspecified meaning covering all uses of HAVE. HAVE does no more than assert that \(x\) has something to do with \(y\) or is somehow involved with \(y\). Fred has a book thus asserts primitively not that he possesses it but that he is in some relation to it. Cultural knowledge tells us that ownership or temporary access is a likely relation between people and books. With the relational use in A2, the semantics of the complement nominal specifies its relationship to certain classes of entities, priming the interpretation for the HAVE relationship. If \(y\) is relational, \(x\) is obligatorily interpreted as satisfying the relational argument of \(x\) (cf. obligatory relational interpretations in compounds like box lid). Now consider the experiencer-HAVE structure in (13a).

\[\begin{align*}
(13) & \quad \text{a. } Egbert \text{, has } \text{Gwendoline’s car on his driveway.} \\
& \quad \text{b. } Egbert \text{ has Gwendoline’s car on Cathbert’s driveway.} \\
& \quad \text{c. } \text{When the director got to Cathbert’s house, where the film was to be shot, he was furious. The film crew were late, the main actor was stoned, and to add insult to injury, he had Gwendoline’s car on Cathbert’s driveway with the keys locked in it, although he’d wanted it on the street.} \\
\end{align*}\]

Assuming that arguments are indiscernible with respect to their predicates (the Homogeneity Presupposition, Löbner 1990), (12) entails that if HAVE relates \(x\) to a situation, \(x\) will relate to the whole situation, so in (13a) Egbert relates to the dog’s death (not just the dog, as in (13b)). (13a) thus invites us to deduce some way in which Egbert could relate to the dog’s death. This is possible if the situation has consequences for Egbert, if it affects him somehow. Egbert cannot be affected by the dog’s death if he is unaware of it (for instance if the dog outlived him), and indeed (13a), unlike (13b) is not usable in this case. Thus, the maleficiary and beneficiary readings spoken of in the literature on experiencer HAVE follow from (12). We will see similar affectedness effects with German datives in section 5.2.\(^2\)

Having explored some of the main properties of the HAVE relation, we are now in a position to assess its relevance to various classes of German datives.

4. Geben ‘give’

The idea that give in the double object construction is a causative of have (e.g. Beck & Johnson 2004, Harley 2002, Krifka 2004, Richards 2001) has more in its favour than the fact that give and have are both ‘possessive’ in their best-known uses. I now apply this to German gebh ‘give’, which I see as a spellout of V^A into V^Z^Ae as in (2b), at least in ditransitive contexts.

Recall from section 3 that if the complement of have/get/with(out) is a relational noun, the subject may be inanimate. This is precisely what we find with geben and give, cf. (14). The direct objects in (14) are all possible in the contexts Das Haus hat/kann/bekommen... ‘The house has/gotten...’ Analyses not connecting give to have (or, perhaps more exactly, to the configuration expressed overtly in have-VPs) portray these parallels as arbitrary.

\[\begin{align*}
(14) & \quad \text{a. Sie haben dem Haus [einen Namen/einen Preis/eine neue Fassade/Charakter].} \\
& \quad \text{They gave the house [a name/a prize/a new façade/character].} \\
& \quad \text{b. Sie haben dem Projekt [Vorrang/Schwung/keine Unterstützung/eine Chance].} \\
& \quad \text{They gave the project [precedence/momentum/no support/a chance].} \\
\end{align*}\]

Brandt (2003:47) views (15a) as evidence against seeing give as a causative of HAVE. If this were so, we would have to abandon the less controversial idea that get is an inchoative of HAVE, für einen Kuss/Fußtritt kriegen ‘get a kiss/kick’ are possible. Fortunately, the objection is invalid because have is acceptable if untensed, as in (15b).\(^4\) He has a kiss is bad due to extraneous factors: kicks cease to exist once administered, which means that the state in which they are had holds for an interval to small to include a reference time.

\[\begin{align*}
(15) & \quad \text{a. Sie gab Otto einen Kuss/Fußtritt.} \\
& \quad \text{She gave Otto a kiss/kick.} \\
& \quad \text{vs. * Otto hat einen Kuss/Fußtritt.} \\
& \quad \text{vs. * Otto has a kiss/kick.} \\
& \quad \text{b. Otto wollte keinen [Kuss/Fußtritt] haben.} \\
\end{align*}\]
5. Pertinence (possessor) and ficiary (beneficiary/maleficiary) datives

5.1. Pertinence and ficiary datives as event-related and affected

I now discuss datives I see as event-related, i.e. as relating to events, not entities. That German has event-related datives is not opinio communis. Wunderlich (1996, 2000) and Pylkkänen (2002) treat all German datives as entity-related, as relating (e.g. by possession) to entities. Yet entity-related analyses for (16) are implausible on the readings in the glosses, since the datives are not possessors of the DPs, which is especially clear in cases like (16b) where the object’s possessor is DP-internal.

(16) a. Er machte mir (die Tür) auf.
   He made meDAT the doorACC open
   ‘He opened the door for me.’

b. Sie hat mir Bushs Ansprache aufgenommen/übersetzt.
   She has meDAT Bush’s speech recorded/translated
   ‘She recorded/translated Bush’s speech for me.’

c. Sie streckte dem Mann die Zunge raus.
   She stuck the manACC the tongue out
   ‘She stuck out her tongue at the man.’

(17) a. Sie hat mir [eine CD gebrannt/ein Buch auf den Tisch gelegt].
   She has meDAT [a CD burnt/a book on the table laid]
   ‘She burnt me a CD/She put a book on the table for me.’

b. Sie haben mir [das Zimmer vollgequalmt/das Leben kaputtgemacht].
   They have meDAT [the room full.smoked/the life ruined]
   ‘I had them [stink out my room with cigarette smoke/ruin my life].’

c. Mir lief jemand auf dem *frisch gestrichenen* Fußboden herum.
   MeDAT walked someone on the freshly painted floor around
   ‘I had someone walk on my *(freshly painted)* floor.’

The only other possibility I see is that the datives in (16) are event-related. The datives in (16) and (17) are pretheoretically benefactive or maleficiaries (German Dativus incommodati). I use the term ficiary datives to cover both. The datives in (17) c-command entities interpretable as possessed by the ficiary. If we overlook (16), the datives in (17) look like prime candidates for entity-related analyses, but the charm of entity-related analyses in (17) fades once we note (i) that entity-related analyses are implausible for (16), and (ii) that (16) and (17) allow a unified analysis in which the datives are entities experiencing negatively or positively evaluable effects of the situation. Seemingly related datives like (17) are commoner than clearly non-entity related ficiaries like (16). Rather than forcing us to analyse (16) and (17) differently, this follows from the fact that it is easy to an event to affect people positively or negatively if it results in the loss or gain of possessions, cf. (17a), or affects their possessions (cf. (17b,c)); in (17c), the AP ensures that the floor is affected by the walking. We discuss the affectedness of such datives in more detail shortly, but firstly I wish to introduce another pretheoretic class of dative.

(18) showcases what Germanists call pertinence datives (Pertinenzdatives). These c-command inalienably possessed DPs (either direct arguments or PP-internal DPs). 5

(18) Mir [zitterte eine Hand / zerriss ein Muskel / fiel ein Stein auf den Kopf].
   MeDAT [shook a hand/ tore a muscle/ fell a stone on the head]
   ‘I had [a hand shake/a muscle tear/a stone fall on my head].’

The case for the event-relatedness of pertinence datives gains strength from the availability of an event-related account which captures both pertinence and ficiary datives. Hole (2005), Lee-Schoenfeld (2006) and Wegener (1985, 1991) independently note that both types of datives are affected. I do not follow Wegener’s claim that secondary affectedness/involvement (Betroffenheit) holds for all datives, but it is a good descriptive starting point for pertinence and ficiary datives. Wegener stresses that the affectedness/involvement can be either physical or psychological. With pertinence datives, the dative referent is physically involved in the event because the event affects some part of the dative referent. If inalienable possessions are involved in the event, there is no physical effect on the dative referent, but the dative referent may still be affected psychologically, as with ficiary datives. 6

Support for the affectedness idea can be gleaned from (19). If the car is shot at, the dative is acceptable if its referent is in the car, since people in the car are endangered, hence affected. If the dative referent is not in the car, the shot must damage the car, so that the car’s owner is a maleficiary, hence negatively affected psychologically. If the son is shot at, the dative is felicitous only if the shot is fatal, since the dative referent is affected by the loss of her son. 7

(19) thus shows that what counts in determining the acceptability of a ficiary dative is not just the relation between the dative and another DP, but whether the situation expressed by VP affects the dative referent. Wegener (1985, 1991) offers much more data illustrating the affected character of datives. The next section tries to derive the affected character of the datives from their status as HAVE subjects.

(19) Ihr wurde [aufs Auto geschossen / auf den Sohn geschossen / der Sohn totgeschossen].
   HefDAT was [at the car shot/at the son shot/the son dead.shot]
   ‘She had someone [shoot at her car/ shoot at her son/shoot her son dead].’

\[\text{5 Ficiary and pertinence datives are also termed } \text{free datives because they are fully productive given the right conditions, and require no mention in the verb’s permanent lexical entry. If a new verb zahb. ‘use a laser gun’ is coined, pertinence and ficiary datives like (i) are instantly acceptable.}
\]
\[
   \text{(i) Sie hat ihn \{den Kopf abgezabbt / in den Arm gezielt / die Türe aufgehen\},}
   \text{she has himDAT \{the head off.zabbed / in the arm zabbed / the door open.zabbed\}}
   \text{‘She zabbed his head off / zabbed him in the arm / zabbed the door open for him.’}
\]

\[\text{6 Lee-Schoenfeld (2006) captures affectedness effects with an applicative head that assigns an affected role to its specifier, which is filled by possessor raising. Possessor raising is argued for using the unacceptability of raising datives out of extraction islands. But (i) violates a complex NP island, and (ii) a coordination island. The left branch violation entailed by possessor raising out of spec.DP is perhaps also problematic. Lee-Schoenfeld accepts that the dative in (i) is not generated by possessor raising, but, coupled with the fact that Zeigefinger}
\]
\[
   \text{is interpreted as belonging to the dative, this calls into question the need for possessor raising in other cases.}
\]
\[
   \text{(i) Mir fiel der Hammer auf \{zu die Spitze \{zu des linken Zeigefingers\}\}
   \text{meDAT} \text{fell the hammer on the tip of the left index finger’}
\]
\[
   \text{(ii) Ihm, ha sie \{die Zunge,aus rausgestreckt\} and \{zu Gesicht, gespuckt\}.}
   \text{HimACC has she \{the tongue out.stuck\} and \{in the face; spat\}
   \text{‘She stuck out her tongue at him and spat in his face.’}
\]

\[\text{7 Werner Abraham (p.c.) noted that the relation between the dative referent and the son need not be kinship. The dative referent need only have an interest in protecting someone else’s son. It is unclear if possessor raising analyses predict this, for DP-internal possessors (as in ihr Sohn ‘her son’) force the kinship reading.}\]
5.2. Pertinence and ficiary datives as HAVE subjects

I now claim that, with pertinence and ficiary datives, V\textsuperscript{fehl} functions like ‘experiencer’-have (section 3, B2). (20) compares the underlying syntax assumed for the two constructions. In both cases, a morpheme expressing a HAVE relation relates a DP to a constituent expressing a situation.

(20) a. (weil) ihm ein Sohn starb: \[V\textsuperscript{fehl} \text{ihm} \ [VP \text{ein Sohn sterb-}] \ V\text{dat}\]

b. (since) he had a son die: \[BE \text{[}he \ [\text{VP HAVE} \text{[}a \text{son die}]]\]\n
The affectedness constraint found with datives is also seen with have. The dative and have structures in (20) are both bad if the referent of the dative/have-subject was dead, hence unaffected by the death of the son. Recall from section 3 that have-subjects are construed as affected because this is the only way in which they can relate to a situation as a whole. We can explain the affectedness of datives in the same way if we treat them as HAVE subjects.

Recall from section 3 the observation in the literature that the experiencer reading of have is subject to the link requirement, i.e. is most felicitous if its subject is represented somewhere in the complement of have. We find an analogous constraint with pertinence and most ficiary datives. (This led to the position I have argued against in which the datives are first and foremost possessors of entities. As noted section 5.1, the link requirement exists because this makes it easier for the dative/have-subject to be in a relation to the event.

A consequence of the link requirement is that datives and have-subjects are interpreted like binders of the possessor variables of indefinite DPs: the son in (20) is the son of the have-subject/dative referent (see Hule 2005 on this). In German but not English, this is also possible with defines (ihm starb der Sohn vs. He had \{'his\'-} the \{son die\}). (17b) and (18) also illustrate this.) I will not try to explain this Anglo-German contrast (see Vergnaud & Zubizarreta 1992 for a proposal), except to note that it is not due to differences between the datives and have-subjects, but is part of a generalisation about English articles, cf. (21a).

Possessed defines like (21b) are apparently confined to PPs in English.\footnote{Readers still tempted to see the binding of possessor variables by pertinence datives as evidence for a possessor semantics for datives should note that the nominative agent in (i) is interpreted as binding the arguments of \emph{Freund} and \emph{Hand}, although possession is rightly never written into descriptions of agents.}

(21) a. I broke/injured/shook/raised \{arm\} the ship tore \{wave\} sail.

b. Damage to the left hand ruined the pianist’s career.

A final point pertaining to the equivalence of datives and have subjects concerns English glossing. Most pertinence and ficiary datives seen above can be glossed with have-constructions, but there are exceptions. Thus, (16c) is not glossable by \emph{he had her stick out her tongue} because this wrongly favours the causative reading where the man asks her to stick out her tongue. The maleficiary interpretation is possible if we add a PP fulfilling the link requirement (He\text{ had her stick out her tongue at him}).\footnote{\textit{(16a,b) and (17a) cannot be glossed by \textit{I had him open the door for me}, \textit{I had her translate the speech for me}, \textit{I had her burn a cd for me}. These strongly favour the causative reading although the link requirement is fulfilled by the complement of \textit{for}. This is because deliberate causers of events are always beneficiaries.} This raises the question as to why German datives like (16c) can circumvent the link requirement while the corresponding have construction cannot. I suggest that the link requirement is observed more stringently with have because it serves to distinguish the experiencer reading from the causative reading. This ambiguity problem does not exist with the datives. Since a single event cannot have two causers, datives will not be interpretable as causers if an agent is also present, as in (16c). (In contexts without a competing causer, a causer reading for datives is possible, see section 9.)

6. Private datives

Structures like (22) with ‘private’ or ‘source’ datives entail that the dative lacks or loses the direct argument. I argue that this is not expressed explicitly by the semantics of the structures, but is inferred from a semantics in which the dative is in a HAVE relation to a situation.

(22) a. Maria fehlt mir.

\textit{Maria lacks me.}

‘I miss Maria.’

b. Dem Tisch \textit{fehl} ein Bein.

\textit{The table lacks a leg.}

‘The table has a leg missing.’

c. Er hat \{es mir\} geklaut/genommen.

\textit{He has it (me) stolen/taken}

‘He stole/took it (from me).’

Seeing the datives in (22a,b) as entity-related would raise awkward questions for my syntax. Are fehl-VPs projected from a single head which means roughly ‘not have’ and has the same case-assigning properties as V\textsuperscript{fehl} (which would be a coincidence in my theory), or is fehl-a spellout of V\textsuperscript{fehl} incorporated into a negation head whose existence would be hard to verify? Fortunately, there is independent motivation for an account where this theory-internal dilemma does not arise. The datives in (22a,b) can be omitted, yielding a sort of lexically negated existential construction asserting that the nominative DP is ‘not there’, i.e. absent or non-existent. If we treat the datives, when they occur, as relating to this absence state rather than to an entity, we simplify the treatment of fehl. Recall that V\textsuperscript{fehl} asserts merely that the dative is in some relationship to the embedded situation. This yields the right interpretation for (22a,b). (22a) implies that the dative is emotionally affected by Maria’s absence. That precisely this reading occurs is less due to properties of the dative than to priming by the VP in the complement of V\textsuperscript{fehl}. We can detect this from the fact that fehl- without the dative allows constructions like Maria \textit{fehlt sehr ‘Maria lacks much’}, i.e. ‘Maria is sorely missed’), where the emotional effects of the absence are quantified by a degree modifier. An absence situation can be relevant to inanimates if the missing entity is relational, as in (22b). Note that the same applies to the idiomatic gloss with have.

A similar approach extends to the optional dative in (22c). I take (22c) to assert merely that the dative in a HAVE relation to an event of theft/taking, i.e. that the event is somehow relevant to the dative, and that the implication that the dative loses the object is a by-product of this, since this is the most salient way in which someone can be related to the taking/theft. This is plausible given that the subject in the non-causative reading of I \textit{had someone take/steal a book} is also interpreted as a thief/victim/source. The privative reading is not obligatory. In contexts like (23) (see also Wegener 1991:74) datives can be interpreted as beneficiaries because the otherwise strongly primed maleficiary reading is ruled out.\footnote{The proposal for (22c) applies to the privative datives in (i), except that in (i) a prefix/ particle/ PP encodes motion away from (the hands of a person who is identified with the dative referent. (See section 8.)

(1) \textit{Er hat es mir \{entrennen/weggenommen/abgeschwacht/aus den Händen gerissen\}.}

\textit{He has it \textit{me} stolen/taken/from talked/ out of the hands ripped}
(23) Er hat sich Ottos Auto geklaut/genommen.
he has himselfDAT Otto’s car stolen/taken
‘He stole/took Otto’s car for himself.’

I thus query whether German has structures explicitly characterising a dative as a source or an individual (who ends up) not having something. This is theoretically welcome, as it obviates the need for arbitrary disjunctions where datives are described as ‘sources or goals’ or as ‘having or not having’, or enumerations of source and goal applicative morphemes (Pylkkänen 2002, Cuervo 2003). I do not deny tout court the possibility that dative/ditransitive structures in other languages may have a source or NOT HAVE semantics –this seems necessary in Chinese, where most double object structures are privative (Zhang 1998)– but it would be worth testing the claim about German on other languages.

7. Datives in various recipient and possessive constructions

The analysis of give in section 4 is not applicable to all cases involving recipients or verbs which seem to encode possession. I now suggest some analyses for these verbs.

7.1. Embedded VdatP

The first type of analysis I wish to suggest is one where a VdatP with a DP complement is complement of an audible verb. Wegener (1985:148) mentions disapprovingly an analysis in which (24a) is derived from (24b) transformationally. This type of analysis captures the semantic similarities between (24a) and (24b), but the requisite deletion transformations have fallen by the wayside with the search for principled constraints on transformations. In the present theory we can capture the semantic parallels without transformations, since the silent VdatP in (24a) expresses a HAVE relation between entities. The difference between (24a) and (24b) is simply a difference in complement selection. (Similar remarks apply to English alternations of the type allow/permit me to enter vs. allow/permit me entry.)

(24) a. Sie ließ [VdatP den Pflanzen kein Licht VdatP].
She let the plantsVACC no lightVACC
‘She did not let the plants have any light.’
b. Sie ließ [dienP Pflanzen kein Licht haben].
She let the plantsVACC no lightVACC
‘She did not let the plants have any light.’
c. Ihm gehört das Buch.
himDAT belongs the book
‘The book belongs to him.’
d. Er gehört [eingesperrt/in die Klappe].
HeACC belongs [locked up/in the loony bin].

The hypothesis that gehört in (24c) is a spellout of VdatP is dubious because it does not cover the uses in (24d), which must be related to (24c) given that the non-cognate belong has both uses. A more explanatory account would treat gehört– as a raising verb expressing deontic modality which selects either a VdatP (as in (24c)) or a small clause headed by a participle/PP, as in (24d). The restriction of uses like (24c) to alienable possession of entities (and for some speakers, nominals like a slap, a punishment) presumably follows from the appropriacy code by which deontic modality is judged.

‘He {snatched it from me/took it from me/persuaded me to give it to him/snatched it out of my hands}.

they have meACC something sent/sold
‘They gave me something/sold it to me.’
b. [VcauseP DPnom [VdatP DVACC geschickt ] VdatP Vnom]
‘They gave something to me.’

However, there is evidence that (25a) requires an entity-related rather than an event-related analysis. I must pause to introduce the relevant test. In (26) wieder ‘again’ is in its post-object position where it has a restitutive reading, which expresses the restoration of the result state, not a repetition of an event (Stechow 1996, Beck & Johnson 2004). DPs whose variables are in the scope of restitutive operators like post-object wieder and its English equivalents re- and back must have the same referents in the asserted and the presupposed situations. Thus, I ressealed a window means that I caused a particular window that was formerly in a sealed state to be again in a sealed state, not merely that I brought it about that for a second time there was a sealed window which was not necessarily identical to the window(s) involved in the prior sealed window situation. #He rekilled someone is acceptable only in a fictive context where the same person can be dead more than once. (Contrast this with seal a window again or kill someone again, which have repetitive readings in which the referents of the objects need never have been sealed/dead before.)

(26) a. Ein Mann hat einer Frau ein Buch wiedergegeben.
A man has a womanACC a book again.given
‘A man gave a woman a book back.’
b. [VcauseP DPnom [VdatP DVACC geschickt ] VdatP Vnom]
‘A man resealed a window for a woman.’

Returning to datives, we note that (26a) entails that the book returns to its original owner (not just that some book has some owner again). This makes sense if we assume that wieder scopes over a HAVE predication, and therefore over the variables bound by the dative and accusative DPs. In (26b) wieder presupposes that there had been a period where the window was in a sealed state, but the woman need not have been in any relation to the window during that period. For instance, the window may not have been in a sealed state when she bought the building of which the window is part. Thus, variables of event-related datives are outside the scope of wieder. (27) applies the test just introduced to the recipient structures in (25a). Like the entity-related structure in (26a) and unlike the event-related one in (26b), (27) expresses restitution of a state in which a specific friend has a specific book once more.

(27) Er hat einem Freund ein Buch wieder[geschickt/verkauft].
he has a friendACC a book again [sent/sold]
‘He sent/sold his friend a book back.’
We must therefore reject the event-related semantics implied by the syntax in (25b) in favour of an entity-related analysis where V\textsuperscript{out} takes a DP complement. I see two ways of implementing this syntactically. One is the embedding structure in (28a), cf. Pykkänen (2002). A hidden consequence of this account is that, to capture the productivity of dative constructions, one would need a productive lexical rule changing the verb's selection from a DP to a V\textsuperscript{out}P (cf. theories like Hoekstra 1988 where DP complements are replaced by small clauses in resultatives: drink beer \textit{vs.} drink \textit{the bar empty}). I would rather look for alternatives because my (2004, 2005) studies commit me to testing a grammar without lexical operations and because it is unclear to me what characterisation of the relation of schick- to its complement would provide an interpretation for both DP complements (\textit{den Brief schicken} ‘send the letter’) and a V\textsuperscript{out}P complement, which in my theory denotes a stative relation between two entities.


Lao Zhang sell-give me one CLASSIFIER house

‘Lao Zhang sold me a house.’

An alternative is (28b), where the verb root is merged directly with V\textsuperscript{essive}, forming a type of compound or serial verb. Embick (2004) and McIntyre (2004) argue for compounding operations of this ilk with resultatives. The overall structure in (28b) expresses the causation of a HAVE relationship, with the causation asserted to be identical to the act of sending etc. expressed by the verb root. Chinese expresses the proposed structure overtly, cf. (28c).

Pykkänen (2002:20) sees incomplete transfers like (29a) as a problem for an analysis like mine involving causation of a HAVE relation. Pykkänen’s analysis does not block (29b), so incomplete transfer is a challenge to her theory as well as mine. Beck & Johnson (2004:115f) attribute (29a) to a progressive operator below the causative head, but it is unclear why there should be an inner aspect operator in (29a) but not (29b) and most other causative structures.

(29) a. \textit{Ich schickte ihm ein Buch, aber er bekam es nicht.}

b. \textit{Ich gab/reichte ihm ein Buch, aber er bekam es nicht}

I gave/passed him a book, but he didn’t get it.

c. \textit{Sie schickten Spioniens ins Land, aber sie kamen nie über die Grenze.}

They sent spies into the country but they never got past the border.

d. \textit{Mein Chef hat mich nach Rom geschickt, und ich komme morgen an.}

My boss has sent me to Rome, and I arrive there tomorrow.

e. \textit{He reads/hallucinates/imports values into the text that simply aren’t in it. I’ve never been in the Oval Office, but I’ve hallucinated my way into it.}

The behaviour of resultative constructions with schick- in (29c,d) suggests that (29a) is due to schick- itself rather than the ditransitive structure in which it appears. Schick- expresses manipulation of an object with the intention that it traverse some path. I surmise that the fact that the path is only envisioned somehow coerces the interpretation of the causative structure in which it appears. (Similar coercions seem to be at work in (29e), where the verbs license a counterfactually interpretation of the otherwise causative way- and resultative constructions.)

7.3. Recipients co-occurring with directional PP complements

Some verbs with recipient datives like (25a) may also appear in configurations like (30a,b). Here an entity-related syntax like (28a,b) is wrong because it cannot accommodate the directional PPs (unless they are adjuncts, a claim I cannot motivate). I continue to maintain that (28b) is right for (25a), but that the structures in (30a,b) require the analysis in (30c). The proposal uses the compounding operation in (28b), but this time V\textit{root} selects a VP (whose head, V\textsuperscript{out}, is a light verb mediating a predication relationship between the theme and PP).

(30) a. \textit{Sie schickte ihm die Unterlagen nach Leipzig an seine Privatadresse.}

She sent \textit{him} DAT the documents to Leipzig to his private address.

b. \textit{Sie reichte mir das Tablet an.}

She passed DAT the tray to the bed

c. \textit{Kannst du mir diesen Brief bitte an Fritz schicken.}

Can you \textit{me} DAT this letter please to Fritz send

d. \textit{Bärbel hat Fritz ein Buch wieder nach Bitterfeld geschickt.}

Bärbel has \textit{Fritz} DAT a book again to Bitterfeld sent

e. \textit{Bärbel hat Fritz ein Buch wieder nach Bitterfeld geschickt.}

Bärbel has \textit{Fritz} DAT a book again to Bitterfeld sent

‘Bärbel sent a book back to Bitterfeld for/to Fritz.’

Treating the complement of V\textsuperscript{out} in (30c) as a VP (rather than a DP as in (28a,b)) predicts that the datives in (30a,b) are event-related. This seems correct. While the contexts in (30a,b) strongly favour a reading in which the datives are recipients, contexts like (30d) which exclude the recipient reading and thus force a beneficiary reading are grammatical. The preference for recipient readings in (30a,b) is due to the fact that the most salient way in which a person can relate to a sending event without being the agent is to be its beneficiary. (30e) applies the restitutive scope test. Here \textit{wieder} clearly has scope over the state of the book’s being in Bitterfeld. The most obvious construal is that Fritz owned the book when it was previously in Bitterfeld, but this need not hold. Imagine an interval \textit{j} in which Bärbel and her book were in Bitterfeld and in which she intends to give the book to Fritz. After \textit{i}, Fritz travels to Bitterfeld for the first time, but Bärbel has left Bitterfeld, taking the book with her. She sends it to his hotel in Bitterfeld. (30e) could be truthfully uttered in this context. This reading is not predicted if the dative in (30e) is taken to be primitively entity-related, but does make sense if it is event-related but is pragmatically construed as a recipient.

8. Datives with verb particles and locational HAVE

We now examine datives which at first glance seem to be identified with silent complements. This makes sense. While the contexts in (30a,b) strongly favour a reading in which the datives are recipients, contexts like (30d) which exclude the recipient reading and thus force a beneficiary reading are grammatical. The preference for recipient readings in (30a,b) is due to the fact that the most salient way in which a person can relate to a sending event without being the agent is to be its beneficiary. (30e) applies the restitutive scope test. Here \textit{wieder} clearly has scope over the state of the book’s being in Bitterfeld. The most obvious construal is that Fritz owned the book when it was previously in Bitterfeld, but this need not hold. Imagine an interval \textit{j} in which Bärbel and her book were in Bitterfeld and in which she intends to give the book to Fritz. After \textit{i}, Fritz travels to Bitterfeld for the first time, but Bärbel has left Bitterfeld, taking the book with her. She sends it to his hotel in Bitterfeld. (30e) could be truthfully uttered in this context. This reading is not predicted if the dative in (30e) is taken to be primitively entity-related, but does make sense if it is event-related but is pragmatically construed as a recipient.

We now examine datives which at first glance seem to be identified with silent complements of an intransitive preposition (particle). I sketch an analysis similar to that for locational HAVE constructions with particles like I had a coat on. I cannot hold forth on the topic at length here, but the following remarks should give some indication as to how my theory could analyse a given construction. See Olsen (1997) and Wunderlich (1996) for other ideas on the subject. Note before proceeding that the remarks in this section apply only to cases where the dative is higher than the theme argument in base word order. Another type of dative with particles is mentioned in section 10.3. (31a,b) illustrates some problems relevant here.

(31) a. Fritz \textit{baute dem Wagen einen Motor ein.}

Fritz \textit{built the car} DAT a motor ACC in

‘Fritz installed a motor in a car.’

b. \textit{Fritz baute einen Motor in den Wagen ein.}

Fritz \textit{built} the motor ACC in the car DAT
(31a) and (31b) are rough paraphrases. Inanimate datives of the type in (31a) are not used by all speakers, but are attested. (31b) overtly characterises the car as ground of an in-relation. German is fond of complex PPs where the preposition has a cognate copy in the (pre-)verb-final, pre-extraposition position typical of verb particles. (ein and in in (31) are allomorphs.) The dative in (31a) is not assigned by (ein), since directional assigns accusative, cf. (31b), and since there are cases like den Koffer einpacken ‘the case in.pack’ (i.e. pack the case) where the logical complement of ein receives accusative.11

The locational HAVE structure in (31c) is a way of describing the result state of (31a), suggesting that it is at least possible to treat the car in (31a) as an argument of HAVE. I exploit this possibility by analysing (31a) as in (32). The gloss should suffice to make the idea clear. The semantics converts straightforwardly into syntax. The verb root bau- is introduced using the compounding mechanism proposed for resultatives in McIntyre (2004) and Embick (2004) and used above in (28b) and (30c), but for present purposes it would also be possible to use a more standard approach where bau- heads the lowest VP.

(32) CAUSE ([DO(FRITZ,BUILD)], HAVE(CARi, GO(MOTOR, INTO, CARi)))]

‘Fritz does a building activity which causes the car, to have a motor go into it;’


The main query about (32) concerns the fact that (31a) does not visibly fulfil the link requirement, unlike in cases like the box; has mud on it; where an overt pronoun appears in the complement of P, and (31c) where the deictic d(at)-morpheme functions like a silent pronominal (cf. therein, in there). However, examples like I had a hat on show that implicit complements of intransitive prepositions can license locational HAVE without overt anaphora. I propose that the particle in (31a) functions analogously. (Here it is irrelevant whether the unpronounced anaphora is syntactically represented or merely in the semantics or argument structure of the preposition in some way."

Readers may ask whether some kind of entity-related analysis is possible which reflects in grammar the fact that the car in (31a) comes to have the motor. I bypass such analyses because of examples like (33). Here the soldiers/tanks come to have not stones, but stones being thrown at them, so an analysis parallel to (32) is clearly preferable.

11 The data just mentioned do not speak for a theory where dative links an intermediate argument, since this type of dative is found in two-argument structures like (i) and (ii): (i) Der Idee haftet ein Risiko an
the idea... sits a risk on.
The idea is not risk-free.’
(ii) Der Pflanze wohnen heilende Kräfte inne.
the plant... dwell healing powers in.
‘Healing powers indwell the plant.’
12 The inanimacy of the HAVE subject in (32) may seem problematic given the claim of Déchaine et al. (1994) that subjects of locational have with intransitive prepositions must be animate, cf. he has his false teeth in; people with hats on vs. the box has books in *(not)*; tables with lamps on *(not)*, but Belvin & den Dikken (1997: fn. 17) note British speakers who accept the table has a book on. I reject this but accept the tape player has a tape in and the box has no lid on. Thus, inanimate locational HAVE subjects with intransitive prepositions are possible, albeit unstable across varieties. The speaker variation perhaps speaks for my proposal, since inanimate datives like that in (31a) are also variety-specific.

A can of worms which should not go unopened is the comparison of (31a,b) with (34a,b). The inanimate DP in (31a,b) can appear either as dative or (as preferred by some speakers) as complement of in, while the animate DP in (34a,b) cannot appear inside a PP, making the dative structure de rigueur (cf. Olsen 1997:325f). The data superficially favour some type of animacy-based view of dative, but I deny that these facts say anything about the dative. The problem with (34b) is that in resists animate grounds (cf. *der Schrittmacher ist im Patienten ‘the pacemaker is in the patient’). The same problem exists with English in, witness the oddness of the lower glosses, though the German in (34b) is worse, comparable to animate grounds for English static at: *I stood at Mary. I know no good account for these animacy constraints on prepositional complementation, but they suggest that the implicit ground of the particle in (34a) is not the patient himself but some inanimate entity, an inalienably possessed item such as the patient’s body or a contextually inferred body part. (34c) clarifies the semantics; (B,x) stands for ‘body (part) of x’. Note in support of this analysis that B can appear in an overt PP, as in (34d), (34c,d) differ from (32) or (31d) in that the HAVE subject is not coindexed to the ground itself but to the argument of a relational noun. This is not problematic, since subjects of overt HAVE can be interpreted in the same way, cf. e.g. er hat einen Vogel auf dem Kopf ‘he has a bird on his head’.

(34) a. Der Arzt hat dem Patienten einen Schrittmacher eingepflanzt/eingepflanzt.
the doctor has the patient implanted a pacemaker implanted/implanted.
‘The doctor implanted/implanted a pacemaker in the patient.’
b. *Der Arzt hat einen Schrittmacher in ihn eingepflanzt/eingepflanzt.
the doctor has a pacemaker into him implanted/implanted.
‘The doctor implanted/implanted a pacemaker in the patient.’
c. CAUSE ([DO(DOCTOR, OPERATE)], HAVE(PATIENT, GO(MOTOR, INTO PATIENT))]
d. Der Arzt hat ihm ein Gerät ins Herz (in den Körper) eingepflanzt.
the doctor has him a device in the heart (in the body) implanted.
‘The doctor implanted a device in his heart/body.’

Though much more can be said about datives with particles, I hope to have shown that the HAVE theory, in particular an analysis analogous to locational have, is a promising way of dealing with the constructions.

9. Unintentional causer readings of datives with unaccusatives

This section briefly discusses the observation of Härtl (2003), Schäfer (2004) and Wegener (1985a: 99, 315-320) that datives with unaccusatives can be interpreted as unintentional causes of negatively evaluated events, cf. (35) on reading (a) and (36).

(35) Mir ist heute eine Vase zerbrochen.
mir is today a vase broken
a. I had a vase break (due to my clumsiness, carelessness, inactivity).
b. I had a vase of mine break (e.g. in my absence, due to an earth tremor).

(36) Herr Meyer ist dem Chirurgen unter der Hand gestorben.
Mr Meyer is the surgeon under the hand died
The unintentional causer reading of datives is not peculiar to German (Cuervo 2003:186f, Schäfer 2004), so it is not idiosyncratic, and must follow from general principles. That causative datives require unaccusative contexts follows from the assumption that a causer role for a dative is ruled out if the clause contains another causer/agent, since a single event cannot have two causers, but (37) raises problems.

(37) a. Mir öffnete sich die Tür.
me_{caus} opened on me
'The door opened on me.'

b. Mir ging die Tür auf.
me_{caus} went the door open
'The door opened on me (and this was my fault)'

The dative in (37b) can have the causer reading, making it compatible with adverbials like versehenlich 'by accident', but Härtl (2001) and Schäfer (2004) note that 'anticausatives' (inchoatives formed with reflexives) like (37a) disallow causative datives, although (37a) and (37b) seem near-synonymous if the datives are removed. An obvious response is that the dative cannot be a causer in anticausatives because these have causative structure lacking in the unaccusative variants. However, Schäfer notes that the evidence against implicit causes with unaccusatives is equally applicable to anticausatives, and leaves the problem unsolved. A solution would emerge if it could be shown that the semantics of anticausatives characterises the event as caused by the theme (cf. Brousseau & Ritter 1991:58) or as uncaused, while unaccusative VPs do not encode causation in their semantics. This approach predicts the (im)possibility of a causative dative in the respective structures, whilst capturing similarities between (37a) and (37b).

I cannot yet explain the unintentionality of the causation and the restriction to negatively evaluated events, but the existence of a causer reading of datives is expected in the theory recommended here, since have also has causative uses. Recall from section 3 that causative have need not obey the link requirement, unlike experiencer have. This has an analogue in (35) in that the causative reading is strongly favoured if the vate is a possession of someone other than the dative referent, so that the link requirement is unfulfilled. The explanation for this is trivial: if the vate is not mine, the event will not affect me, but I can be related to the event via causation.

10. Other datives not analysed here
To make this piece serviceable as an overview of the German dative, I now note some types of datives not addressed here.

10.1. Probable candidates for a HAVE analysis
Some psych verbs have dative experiencers, cf. (38a,c). A satisfactory discussion would have to discuss accusative experiencers, which is impossible here. Suffice it to note that the HAVE theory leads one to expect there to be psych datives, since experiencers can appear as overt have subjects, cf. rough equivalence between (38a) and (38b) and between (38c) and (d).

(38) a. weil der Frau_{experiencer} das Bild gefällt
since the woman_{experiencer} the picture pleases
'I have a horror of spiders.'

b. weil die Frau am Bild Gefallen hat
since the woman on the picture pleasure has
'I have a horror of spiders.'
b. weil sie ein Kind einer Gefahr aussetzte  
   since she exposed a child to a danger  
   ‘since she exposed a child to a Danger’

c. weil sie Priester/gleichzeitig  
   since she is a priest/gain  
   ‘since she is a priest/gain’

Here I note here the essential points about low datives which, though not well-known, should in my view be part of any overview of the German dative. Low datives fall into three distinct classes. One is the similarity/proximity dative. Here dative marks an entity whose similarity is judged to be similar (cf. (41c) or structures like *x ähnelt y gleich‘like a god’), or, in a configuration which is metaphorical in the basis of the similarity of the entities, an entity to which the proximal (x kommt y nach nah, ‘x approaches y’), another class of low dative I call the influence dative. Here the theme referent is influenced or controlled by the dative referent. Influence and similarity/proximity datives mostly gloss in English with PPs appearing lower in the structure than themes, never with double object constructions.

Another type of low dative, which I call the stranded ground dative, is the conceptual ground of a particle doubling as a dative-assigning adposition. Instances of particles involved are zu’to’ (dem Ort zwei ‘hurry toward the place’) and hinterher ‘after’ (dem Bus ‘run after the bus’). These datives may strand from the adposition. (Stranded ground datives are distinct from the datives with particles discussed in section 8, where the dative is higher than the theme in base order, though nothing precludes cases where one verb-particle combination can project either a high or a low structure.) Miyagawa & Tsujigk (2004) note that Japanese has high and low datives, though the low datives are not as restricted as in German. On the German high-low contrast, see Czepluch (1996), McFadden (2003), Mohnari (1998), Wogen (1991). Some writers (e.g. Fanadzov 2000, Müller 1999, Vogel & Steinbach 1998) try to capture the contrast using a stipulation favouring the positioning of animates before inanimates. The animacy-based view is said to be supported by the correlation in (42) between the (in)animacy of the dative and its position. However, note that the dative in (42a) is a HAVE subject (cf. she had her custody rights withdrawn) while that in (42b) is not (cf. the influence had a child rescued from it). (42b) is arguably a stranded ground dative, ent ‘from’ being a preposition incorporated into the verb.)

(42) a. dass sie der Mutter das Sorgerecht entzogen [High]  
   that they the mother’s custody from.pulled  
   ‘that they withdrew/took away the mother’s custody rights’
   b. dass sie ein Kind einem schlechten Einfluss entzogen [Low]  
   that they a child, a bad influence from.pulled  
   ‘that they rescued the child from a bad influence’

(43) is intractable under the animacy theory. Here zuordnet ‘assign’ appears with a high or a low dative with the same two objects. Comparison of (43a) and (43b) with (43c) and (43d) shows that the high dative is possible if the dative can be in a HAVE relation to the object or the event.11

11 (14) and (31a) also show that high datives can be inanimate, provided they are arguments of HAVE. The animacy theory of dative/accusative order in German reminds one of the alleged animacy constraint on English indirect objects usually enlisted to ‘explain’ data like send (me=+my address) the book. The real explanation is that people, but not addresses, can have books sent to them. Inanimates can be indirect objects provided they can be in a HAVE relation, cf. the glosses in (14) and (43a,b).