



2011

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

Effi Georgala  
*Cornell University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://repository.upenn.edu/pwpl>

---

### Recommended Citation

Georgala, Effi (2011) "Scrambling Verb-Final Languages and the Underlying Order of Objects in Ditransitive Constructions," *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics*: Vol. 17 : Iss. 1 , Article 13.  
Available at: <https://repository.upenn.edu/pwpl/vol17/iss1/13>

This paper is posted at ScholarlyCommons. <https://repository.upenn.edu/pwpl/vol17/iss1/13>  
For more information, please contact [repository@pobox.upenn.edu](mailto:repository@pobox.upenn.edu).

---

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

### Abstract

In this paper I provide evidence from depictive stranding to show that German and Turkish, scrambling verb-final languages which have been assumed to be an exception to the crosslinguistic generalization of IO>DO base order in double object constructions, in fact support the generalization.

Following Georgala's et al. (2008) analysis of applicative constructions, which predicts that indirect objects (IOs) originate higher than direct objects (DOs), I argue that German and Turkish have two types of applied arguments (thematic and raising) with different underlying but the same surface position, namely [Spec, ApplP]. By showing that IO>DO is the base order of Turkish double object constructions, I also contribute to the discussion of the nature of scrambling in Turkish. In particular I corroborate Öztürk's (2005) view that scrambling in Turkish can be treated as either A-bar or A-movement.

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

Effi Georgala\*

## 1 Introduction

Among scrambling verb-final languages there have been a number of different proposals about the syntactic structure of double object constructions (DOCs) and the underlying order of objects. In this paper, I focus on German and Turkish.

German and Turkish have a variety of DOCs with dative indirect objects (IOs) and accusative direct objects (DOs), as in examples (1–2).

### (1) *German*

- a. Ich habe dem Kind das Bombon gegeben  
I.NOM have the.DAT child.DAT the.ACC candy.ACC given  
'I gave the child the candy.'
- b. Ich habe das Kind einer Gefahr ausgesetzt  
I.NOM have the.ACC child.ACC a.DAT danger.DAT exposed  
'I exposed the child to a danger.'

### (2) *Turkish*

- Ben çocuğ-a şeker-i verdim  
I child.DAT candy.ACC gave  
'I gave the child the candy.'

In the recent literature on ditransitive constructions it has been claimed that German (den Dikken 1995, Müller 1995, McGinnis 1999, Tungseth 2008, among others) and Turkish (Issever 2003, Kornfilt 2003, Simpson et al. 2008) counterexemplify the generalization that IOs merge higher than DOs (Marantz 1993, Pesetsky 1995, Bowers 2010, among others). In this paper, I provide evidence from previously unnoticed data from stranded depictives in support of the view that IO>DO is the underlying order in German and Turkish, thus showing that the German and Turkish data in fact support <IO, DO> as the universal underlying order in DOCs.

Following Georgala et al.'s (2008) account of applicative constructions which predicts IO>DO as the underlying order, I propose that German and Turkish have both low- (raising) and high-type (thematic) applicative constructions, but a single applicative head above the lexical VP. The depictive stranding facts strongly support the view that in the low-type applicative construction, ApplP has a strong EPP feature that attracts the recipient IO from its underlying position in [Spec, VP].

Section 2 gives a brief overview of Georgala et al.'s (2008) raising/thematic applicative hypothesis and shows how it applies to German and Turkish. In Section 3 I discuss the depictive stranding data, while in Section 4 I provide a new argument from DOCs in support of the view that Turkish has both A- and A-bar scrambling. In Section 5 I conclude.

## 2 Raising/Thematic Applicative Hypothesis and the Syntax of German and Turkish DOCs

### 2.1 Raising/Thematic Applicative Hypothesis

Marantz (1993), based on evidence from Bantu languages with morphological applicatives, argues that in DOCs the IO is introduced by a (potentially silent) applicative head (3).

---

\*Many thanks to Molly Diesing, Jaklin Kornfilt, John Whitman, and the audience of PLC 34 for valuable feedback. I am grateful to Waltraud Paul and Michael Wagner for the German judgments, and Esra Kesici and Jaklin Kornfilt for the Turkish judgments.

- (3) [<sub>VP</sub> IO [<sub>V'</sub> APPL [<sub>VP</sub> DO V]]] (Marantz 1993)

Pylkkänen (2002, 2008) extends Marantz's approach by motivating two kinds of Appl heads: a "high" applicative which denotes a relation between an individual and the event denoted by VP (4a), and a "low" applicative which denotes a dynamic relation of transfer of possession between IO and DO (4b).

- (4) a. **High applicative:** [<sub>VoiceP</sub> DP<sub>AGENT</sub> [<sub>Voice'</sub> Voice [<sub>AppIP</sub> DP<sub>BNF/LOC/INSTR...</sub> [<sub>AppI'</sub> Appl [<sub>VP</sub> V DP]]]]]]]  
 b. **Low applicative:** [<sub>VoiceP</sub> DP<sub>AGENT</sub> [<sub>Voice'</sub> Voice [<sub>VP</sub> V [<sub>AppIP</sub> DP<sub>GOAL/SOURCE</sub> [<sub>AppI'</sub> Appl DP<sub>THEME</sub>]]]]]]]

Georgala et al. (2008) reconcile the above two accounts by proposing that there is only one position for applicative heads above the lexical VP which come in two flavors: thematic and raising. Like Pylkkänen's high applicatives (cf. (4a)), thematic applicatives introduce an extra argument above the lexical VP. The extra argument is base generated in [Spec, AppIP] and is assigned a theta-role (e.g., beneficiary, maleficiary, instrumental) by Appl.

- (5) [<sub>VP</sub> SUBJ [<sub>V'</sub> V [<sub>AppIP</sub> IO<sub>BNF/LOC/INSTR...</sub> [<sub>AppI'</sub> Appl [<sub>VP</sub> V DO]]]]]]]

Unlike thematic applicatives, raising applicatives do not introduce an extra argument, but attract the recipient/possessor goal IO from its base position in [Spec, VP] to their specifier.

- (6) [<sub>VP</sub> SUBJ [<sub>V'</sub> V [<sub>AppIP</sub> IO<sub>REC</sub> [<sub>AppI'</sub> Appl [<sub>VP</sub> t<sub>IO</sub> [<sub>V'</sub> V DO]]]]]]]]]

The raising/thematic applicative hypothesis, thus, preserves Marantz's original structural insight, but at the same time it also accounts for Pylkkänen's ample evidence for two distinct types of extra objects, one originating outside the lexical VP, another inside it. In the raising/thematic applicative analysis both types are licensed with a single position for the licensing head.

## 2.2 German, Turkish, and the Raising/Thematic Applicative Hypothesis

In this section I present a syntactic analysis of dative DOCs in German and Turkish, focusing on showing how the raising/thematic applicative hypothesis applies to both languages.

### 2.2.1 Two Types of Dative DOCs in German

Before I proceed, I should stress that there is fairly general consensus in the literature that German has two structurally distinct classes of dative DOCs (Wegener 1991, McFadden 2004, Cook 2006, Meinunger 2006, McIntyre 2006, among others).<sup>1,2</sup> In this paper I show that German in fact has three structurally distinct classes of DOCs: (i) "low" dative DOCs,<sup>3</sup> (ii) raising applicative constructions, and (iii) thematic applicative constructions.<sup>4</sup> In previous literature raising and thematic

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Dvorak forthcoming for a similar distinction in Czech.

<sup>2</sup>Vogel and Steinbach (1998), Müller (1999), Fanselow (2003), among others, argue against two classes of dative DOCs, by attributing word order differences to an animacy constraint on word order, namely preference for animate arguments to precede inanimate ones. But McIntyre (2006) and Cook (2006) convincingly show that the animacy constraint does not explain the contrast between the two classes.

<sup>3</sup>"Low"/"high" dative refers to the position of the dative argument with respect to the direct object.

<sup>4</sup>German has two more types of dative, the so-called estimative and ethical datives. As Wegener (1989) and Draye (1996) observe, ethical datives have a restricted syntactic behavior (e.g., they can neither be stressed, negated or contrasted) and usually appear as 1<sup>st</sup> or 2<sup>nd</sup> person pronouns. Estimative datives typically co-occur with the degree modifiers *zu* 'too' and *genug* 'enough'. Both estimative and ethical datives may co-occur with dative arguments (Wegener 1985). Regarding the syntactic analysis of these two types of dative, there is agreement in the literature that they should not be treated on par with "low" and "high" datives. In fact most studies of German dative DOCs treat them as adjuncts (McFadden 2004, Cook 2006, among others).

applicative constructions are subsumed under one class, namely “high” dative DOCs (cf. Wegener 1991, McFadden 2004, Cook 2006).<sup>5</sup>

What is referred to as the “low” dative appears with verbs, such as *aussetzen* ‘expose to’, *entziehen* ‘deprive/withdraw’, *unterwerfen* ‘subject to’, *zuführen* ‘supply with/bring to’.<sup>6</sup> The class of “low” dative verbs is relatively small and displays less productivity and regularity in its behavior. The so-called “high” construction, on the other hand, occurs with prototypical ditransitives (e.g., *geben* ‘give’, *schicken* ‘send’, *austeilen* ‘distribute’) and a large number of verbs to which a dative argument can be freely added.

Evidence for the distinction between the two classes comes from a series of diagnostic tests. Here, I present the most reliable ones: topicalization and recipient passives (cf. Wegener 1991, Frey 1993, McFadden 2004, for more diagnostic tests for the distinction between the two classes).

By applying a traditional constituency test, topicalization, Wegener (1991) and McFadden (2004) show that “low” and “high” dative verbs pattern differently, as illustrated in (7–8).

- (7) a. [Blumen kaufen]<sub>i</sub>; kann man einer Frau immer t<sub>i</sub>  
 flowers.ACC buy can one.NOM a.DAT woman.DAT always  
 ‘One can always buy a woman flowers.’  
 b. \*[Einer Frau kaufen]<sub>i</sub>; kann man Blumen immer t<sub>i</sub>  
 a.DAT woman.DAT buy can one.NOM flowers.ACC always
- (8) a. [Der Kälte ausgesetzt]<sub>i</sub>; hat er das Kind t<sub>i</sub>  
 the.DAT cold.DAT exposed has he.NOM the.ACC child.ACC  
 ‘He exposed the child to the cold.’  
 b. \*[Das Kind ausgesetzt]<sub>i</sub>; hat er der Kälte t<sub>i</sub>  
 the.ACC child.ACC exposed has he.NOM the.DAT cold.DAT  
 (McFadden 2004:106)

Furthermore, these two verb classes behave differently regarding the so-called recipient passive, in which *bekommen* ‘receive’, *erhalten* ‘obtain’ and *kriegen* ‘get’ seem to function like passive auxiliaries in a construction in which the nominative subject corresponds to the dative IO in an active clause. Recipient passive is grammatical with “high” dative verbs, but not with “low” dative verbs, as examples (9b) and (10b) show respectively.

- (9) a. Die Mutter schickt dem Jungen das  
 the.NOM mother.NOM sends the.DAT boy.DAT the.ACC  
 Paket  
 parcel.ACC  
 ‘The mother sends the boy the parcel.’  
 b. Der Junge kriegt das Paket geschickt  
 the.NOM boy.NOM gets the.ACC parcel.ACC sent  
 (von der Mutter)  
 by the.DAT mother.DAT  
 ‘The boy gets sent the parcel (by the mother).’ (Cook 2006:145)
- (10) a. Die Mutter setzt das Kind der  
 the.NOM mother.NOM exposes the.ACC child.ACC the.DAT  
 Kälte aus  
 cold.DAT out  
 ‘The mother exposes the child to the cold.’  
 b. \*Die Kälte kriegt das Kind ausgesetzt  
 the.NOM cold.NOM gets the.ACC child.ACC exposed  
 (Cook 2006:145)

<sup>5</sup>Similar to my account, McIntyre (2009) classifies “high” dative DOCs into two different types, namely Pyllkkänen’s (2002, 2008) high and low applicatives.

<sup>6</sup>Cook (2006) argues that that *entziehen* ‘deprive/withdraw’ and *zuführen* ‘supply with/bring to’, depending on their reading, can be classified as either “low” or “high” dative verbs.

Most German scholars agree that the base order of “low” dative DOCs is ACC>DAT and the dative argument is an oblique (McFadden 2004, Meinunger 2006, among others) (11).

(11) [<sub>VP</sub> DP<sub>NOM</sub> [<sub>V'</sub> V [<sub>VP</sub> DP<sub>ACC</sub> [<sub>V'</sub> [<sub>?</sub>P (P) DP<sub>DAT</sub>] V]]]]

For the remainder of this section I focus on thematic and raising applicatives in German and Turkish. For simplicity, I will talk in terms of DOCs in German, but the claims to be made apply only to “high” dative DOCs. In the following section I show that German and Turkish have applicative constructions which should be divided into two types: thematic and raising.

### 2.2.2 Thematic Applicatives in German and Turkish

In this section I first argue that German and Turkish have thematic applicatives, and then I describe how they are syntactically licensed.

Two diagnostic tests emerge from Pylkkänen’s applicative theory in (4): (i) Only high applicatives can combine with unergative predicates, since the semantics of low applicatives requires the presence of a DO, and (ii) only high applicatives can combine with static verbs, such as *hold*, since the type of event denoted by statives is inconsistent with the DO undergoing change of possession.

Based on Pylkkänen’s second diagnostic, German and Turkish dative DOCs can be high (thematic) applicative constructions, since the dative IO combines with the static predicate *hold* in both languages, as examples (12a) and (12b) show.<sup>7,8</sup>

- (12) a. Ich habe dem Kind deinen Rucksack gehalten  
 I.NOM have the.DAT child.DAT your.ACC backpack.ACC held  
 ‘I held your backpack for the child.’  
 b. Ben çocuğ-a çanta-n-ı tuttum  
 I child-DAT bag-POSS.2SG-ACC held  
 ‘I held your bag for the child.’

Lee-Schoenfeld (2006), McIntyre (2006) and Tungseth (2008) for German and Kesici (2008) for Turkish also provide many examples of event-related (high) applied arguments.

- (13) a. *Benefactive dative in German*  
 Er klopfte und sie machte ihm (die Tür) auf  
 he.NOM knocked and she.NOM made him.DAT the.ACC door.ACC open  
 ‘He knocked and she opened the door for him.’  
 b. *Malefactive dative in German*  
 Sie haben mir das Leben kaputtgemacht

<sup>7</sup>Pylkkänen’s transitivity diagnostic is inapplicable in German (Hoekstra 1988, Tungseth 2008, among others) and Turkish, as shown in (i) and (ii) respectively.

- (i) \*Fritz hat seinem Bruder geschwommen  
 Fritz.NOM has his.DAT brother.DAT swum  
 ‘Fritz swam for/on his brother.’

- (ii) \*Orhan abi-si-ne yüzdü  
 Orhan.NOM brother-POSS3SG-DAT swam

(Tungseth 2008:110)

<sup>8</sup>Dative arguments in German and Turkish do not appear with all types of static predicates. Dative arguments cannot be added to verbs of perception (e.g., *see*), psych verbs (e.g., *love*) and verbs of existence (e.g., *live*). The following examples are examples with a verb of perception. Example (ia) is from Tungseth 2008:111.

- (i) a. \*Maria hat ihm das Foto nicht gesehen  
 Maria.NOM has him.DAT the.ACC photo.ACC not seen  
 ‘Maria saw the photo for/on him.’  
 b. \*Orhan o-na resm-i gör-dü  
 Orhan.NOM him/her-DAT photo-ACC see-PAST.3SG  
 ‘Orhan saw the photo for/on him/her.’

- they.NOM have me.DAT the.ACC life.ACC ruined  
 ‘I had them ruin my life.’ (McIntyre 2006:193)
- (14) a. *Benefactive dative in Turkish*  
 Emira ban-a kapı-(y)ı açtı  
 Emira.NOM me-DAT door-ACC opened  
 ‘Emira opened the door for me.’
- b. *Malefactive dative in Turkish*  
 Ben Orhan’a evde kalıp çocuklara bakmasını söyledim,  
 ‘I told Orhan to stay at home and watch the kids,’  
 ama o gitti bana televizyon karşısında uyuyakaldı  
 but he went me.DAT television in.front.of fell.asleep  
 ‘but he fell asleep on me in front of the television.’ (Kesici 2008:20)

The syntactic licensing of thematic applicatives is straightforward. The applied argument merges in the specifier of ApplP, where it receives a theta-role (beneficiary/maleficiary) and is assigned inherent dative Case by Appl.<sup>9</sup> The DO is licensed by *v*. Once inherent Case is assigned to the applied argument, it can no longer move to [Spec, TP] to check Case in a passive construction. Since inherent Case does not count as an intervener (McGinnis 1998, Legate 2008, among others), theme passivization is what is predicted by the analysis and supported by the data in (15) (German) and (16) (Turkish).

- (15) a. Die Türen wurden den Kindern geöffnet  
 the.NOM doors.NOM were the.DAT children.DAT opened  
 ‘The doors were opened for the children.’
- b. \*Die Kinder wurden die Türen geöffnet  
 the.NOM children.NOM were the.ACC doors.ACC opened
- (16) a. Kapı-lar çocuk-lar-a aç-ıl-dı  
 door-PL child-PL-DAT open-PASS-PAST  
 ‘The doors were opened for the children.’
- b. \*Çocuk-lar kapı-lar-ı aç-ıl-dı  
 child-PL.NOM door-PL-ACC open-PASS-PAST

### 2.2.3 Raising Applicatives in German and Turkish

Raising applicatives appear in the same surface position as thematic applicatives. However in the case of raising applicatives, instead of hosting a dative DP in its specifier, Appl attracts the dative possessor/recipient goal from [Spec, VP]. This pattern captures the semantic properties of a goal-theme double object construction, which corresponds to Pylkkänen’s low applicative construction in (4b).

What is crucial in the raising applicative hypothesis is the surface position of the IO outside the VP (6). Evidence that the IO raises from [Spec, VP] to [Spec, ApplP] in German and Turkish comes from the position of manner adverbs, as shown in (17a) and (17b), respectively. Under the standard assumption that *secretly* is positioned on the left edge of VP, the order in (17a–b) is exactly the order predicted by the raising applicative hypothesis.<sup>10</sup>

- (17) a. Er hat jemandem heimlicheinen alten Test gegeben  
 he.NOM has someone.DAT secretly an.ACC old.ACC Test.ACC given  
 ‘He secretly gave someone an old test.’
- b. O birisin-e gizlice eski bir sınav ver-di  
 he someone-DAT secretly old a test give-PAST.3SG

<sup>9</sup>Cf. Vogel and Steinbach 1998, McFadden 2004, and McIntyre 2006, among others, for arguments in support of a non-structural-Case account of German “high” datives.

<sup>10</sup>Cf. Georgala forthcoming for a strong argument from adverbial floating quantifiers in support of raising of IO to [Spec, ApplP] in German. Quantifier floating is not attested in Turkish (Muysken 1989, among others).

‘He secretly gave someone an old test.’

As shown in the derivation of (17a–b) in (18), DO and V are first merged in V’ and then IO is merged in [Spec, VP]. Assuming that Appl bears an EPP feature in both languages, IO is attracted to [Spec, ApplP] to check the EPP feature of Appl. Appl also assigns inherent Case to all arguments in [Spec, ApplP] in German and Turkish. In the next step of the derivation, *v* is merged with Appl and Agree is established between *v* and DO, the closest DP with an unchecked Case feature.

(18) [<sub>VP</sub> Subj [<sub>v</sub> *v* [<sub>AppIP</sub> IO [<sub>AppI</sub>: Appl [<sub>VP</sub> [*secretly*] [<sub>VP</sub> *t*<sub>IO</sub> [<sub>V</sub>: DO V]]]]]]]]]

The proposed syntactic licensing predicts asymmetric theme passivization which is borne out by the data in (19–20). Since IO is assigned inherent Case by Appl, it does not qualify to undergo A-movement to [Spec, TP], which explains why IO passivization in (19b) and (20b) is ungrammatical. Assuming that inherently Case-marked DPs do not count as interveners, the theme DO is free to move to [Spec, TP] to check nominative Case. This renders theme passivization in both languages grammatical (19a and 20a).

- (19) a. Das Bombon wurde dem Kind gegeben  
 the.NOM candy.NOM was the.DAT child.DAT given  
 ‘The candy was given to the child.’  
 b. \*Das Kind wurde das Bombon gegeben  
 the.NOM child.NOM was the.ACC candy.ACC given  
 ‘The child was given the candy.’
- (20) a. Şeker çocuğ-a ver-il-di  
 candy.NOM child-DAT give-PASS-PAST  
 ‘The candy was given to the child.’  
 b. \*Çocuk şeker-i ver-il-di  
 child.NOM candy-ACC give-PASS-PAST  
 ‘The child was given the candy.’

In this section I argued that German and Turkish dative DOCs can be accounted for by the raising/thematic applicative hypothesis. In Section 3 I provide data from depictive stranding showing that IO>DO is the underlying order of dative DOCs in both languages, which is exactly what the raising/thematic applicative hypothesis predicts.

### 3 German, Turkish, and the Universal Order of DOCs

German and Turkish are alleged counterexamples to the crosslinguistic generalization that IOs are merged higher than DOs in DOCs (Marantz 1993, Pesetsky 1995, Bowers 2010, among others). In particular, in the recent literature on German DOCs it has been argued that the accusative DO originates higher than the dative IO, and the order <IO, DO> is derived either by A-bar scrambling (den Dikken 1995, Müller 1995) or A-scrambling (McGinnis 1999).<sup>11</sup> In Turkish it has been observed (Kornfilt 2003, Issever 2003) that native speakers usually judge <DO, IO> as the unmarked order. This observation has led Kornfilt (2003) to suggest that the accusative DO is positioned in a hierarchically higher position than the dative IO.<sup>12</sup> Also Simpson et al. (2008) suggest that DO>IO might be the underlying order in Turkish, based on reciprocal and anaphor binding facts (cf. footnote 17). However, previously unnoticed data from depictive stranding in dative DOCs support the hypothesis that IO>DO is the underlying order in German<sup>13</sup> and Turkish.<sup>14</sup>

<sup>11</sup>Tungseth (2008) also argues that <IO, DO> is a derived order in German, but she does not discuss the type of movement by which <IO, DO> is derived.

<sup>12</sup>According to Kornfilt (2003:140) “[...] the Accusative object is positioned in [Spec, AGRoP].” Notice, though, that AGRoP is typically taken to be a derived position.

<sup>13</sup>Cf. Lenerz 1977, Webelhuth 1989, Frey 1993, Sternefeld and Featherston 2003, and McFadden 2004 for further arguments in support of IO>DO base order in German “high” datives.

<sup>14</sup>Öztürk 2005 provides another argument in support of IO>DO in Turkish (cf. discussion on A-bar

In German, depictives can be predicated of DOs (21a), but not of IOs (21b), and can be stranded by A-movement, for example by passive (21c) or unaccusative (21d) movement.

- (21) a. Er hat Jan [das Bier]<sub>i</sub> lauwarm<sub>i</sub> serviert  
 he.NOM has Jan.DAT the.ACC beer.ACC lukewarm served  
 ‘He served the beer to Jan lukewarm.’  
 b. Er<sub>i</sub> hat Jan<sub>j</sub> das Bier nackt<sub>i/\*j</sub> serviert  
 he.NOM has Jan.DAT the.ACC beer.ACC naked served  
 c. [Das Bier]<sub>i</sub> wurde von dem Kellner  
 the.NOM beer.NOM was by the.DAT waiter.DAT  
 lauwarm<sub>i</sub> serviert  
 lukewarm served  
 ‘The beer was served lukewarm by the waiter.’  
 d. Eva<sub>i</sub> ist aus München müde<sub>i</sub> zurückgekommen  
 Eva.NOM is from Munich.DAT tired returned  
 ‘Eva returned tired from Munich.’

Turkish depictives behave similarly to German depictives, as illustrated in (22).<sup>15</sup>

- (22) a. Orhan turist-e bira-yı<sub>i</sub> ılık<sub>i</sub> servis etti  
 Orhan.NOM tourist-DAT beer-ACC lukewarm service did  
 ‘Orhan served the tourist the beer lukewarm.’  
 b. Orhan<sub>i</sub> turist-e bira-yı çıplak<sub>i/\*j</sub> servis etti  
 Orhan.NOM tourist-DAT beer-ACC naked service did  
 ‘Orhan served the tourist the beer naked.’  
 c. Arkadaş-lar-ımız<sub>i</sub> Münih-ten yorgun<sub>i</sub> döndü  
 friend-PL-POSS.1PL Munich-ABL tired returned  
 ‘Our friends came back from Munich tired.’  
 d. Bira<sub>i</sub> garson tarafından ılık<sub>i</sub> servis edildi  
 beer waiter by lukewarm service did  
 ‘The beer was served lukewarm by the waiter.’

My account of depictives is consistent either with the DO and the depictive forming a constituent (Marusic et al. 2008), or with the DO controlling PRO in the specifier of the depictive small clause (Bowers 1993, among others). In the latter case, no other eligible controller (DP) may intervene between the depictive and PRO due to the Minimal Distance Principle (Rosenbaum 1967). Crucially, depictives can be stranded by *ACC DAT depictive stranding* in both German and Turkish, as shown in (23a) and (23b) respectively: the depictive *lukewarm* is stranded in the base position of the DO *the beer*, which moves to the left of the IO.

- (23) a. Er hat [das Bier]<sub>i</sub> Jan t<sub>i</sub> lauwarm<sub>i</sub> serviert  
 he.NOM has the.ACC beer.ACC Jan.DAT lukewarm served  
 ‘He served the beer to Jan lukewarm.’  
 b. Orhan bira-yı<sub>i</sub> turist-e ılık<sub>i</sub> servis etti  
 Orhan.NOM beer-ACC tourist-DAT lukewarm service did  
 ‘Orhan served the beer to the tourist lukewarm.’

#### 4 A Note on Turkish Scrambling

Similar to Japanese (Miyagawa 2001 and subsequent work, among others), scrambling can be

---

scrambling in Section 4).

<sup>15</sup>Unlike German, the depictive predicate in Turkish always appears adjacent to the verb (only a few discourse particles, such as *de* ‘also’, and the question particle *mi* may intervene between the depictive and the verb, as Boeder and Schroeder 1998 observe). This has led Kornfilt (1997) and Boeder and Schroeder (1998) to suggest that the depictive is incorporated into the verb.

treated either as A- or A-bar movement in Turkish (Öztürk 2005). Below I provide evidence from DOCs to support this claim.

Simpson et al. (2008) interpret the anaphor binding facts in (24a–b) to show that both IO>DO and DO>IO are underlying orders in Turkish.<sup>16</sup>

- (24) a. Ali John ve Mary-ı birbirler-i-nin  
 Ali John and Mary-ACC each other-3POSS-GEN  
 arkadaşlar-i-na tanış-tir-di  
 friends-POSS-DAT meet-CAUS-PAST  
 ‘Ali introduced John and Mary to each other’s friends.’  
 b. Ali John ve Mary-e birbirler-i-nin arkadaşlar-i-ni  
 Ali John and Mary-DAT each other-3POSS-GEN friends-POSS-ACC  
 tanış-tir-di  
 meet-CAUS-PAST (Simpson et al. 2008:57)

Under the assumption that IO>DO is the base order in Turkish (24b here), example (24a) can be explained by assuming that DO A-scrambles from its base position inside the VP to the outer specifier of vP (Georgala submitted).

However, in a sentence in which DO contains a pronominal variable and IO is a quantificational operator, A-scrambling of the accusative DO with the embedded variable *his* does not lead to reconstruction, as shown in (25b).

- (25) a. Her adam-a<sub>i</sub> resm-in-i<sub>ij</sub> verdim  
 every man-DAT picture-3POSS-ACC gave-PAST-1SG  
 ‘I gave every man his picture.’  
 b. Resm-in-i\*<sub>ij</sub> her adam-a<sub>i</sub> ver-di-m  
 picture-3POSS-ACC every man-DAT gave-PAST-1SG  
 ‘I gave every man his picture.’ (Öztürk 2005:154)

As noticed by Kural (1992), under scrambling Turkish allows reconstruction in the presence of a contrastively focused element. Thus, when contrastive focus is introduced into a DOC, yielding A-bar movement effects, DO can reconstruct into a position below IO, as shown in (26). This suggests that IO is higher than DO (Öztürk 2005).

- (26) Resm-in-i<sub>ij</sub> her adam-a<sub>i</sub> DÜN ver-di-m  
 picture-3PS-ACC every man-DAT yesterday give-PAST-1SG  
 ‘I gave every man his picture YESTERDAY.’ (Öztürk 2005:154)

## 5 Conclusion

<sup>16</sup>The contrast between examples (i) and (ii) below, where the reciprocal is the head of the goal and theme respectively leads Simpson et al. to suggest that IO>DO might be a derived order in Turkish. Examples (i) and (ii) come from Simpson et al. 2008.

- (i) Ali Ayşe ve Mehmet-i parti-de birbirleri-ne tanış-tir-di  
 Ali Ayşe and Mehmet-ACC party-LOC each other-DAT meet-CAUS-PASS  
 ‘Ali introduced Ayşe and Mehmet to each other at the party.’  
 (ii) ?Ali Ayşe ve Mehmet-e parti-de birbirleri-ni tanış-tir-di  
 Ali Ayşe and Mehmet-DAT party-LOC each other-ACC meet-CAUS-PAST

Note, though, that the contrast between (i) and (ii) disappears, when the locative *partide* ‘at the party’ is omitted, as illustrated in (iii) and (iv).

- (iii) Ali Ayşe ve Mehmet-i birbirleri-ne tanış-tir-di  
 Ali Ayşe and Mehmet-ACC each other-DAT meet-CAUS-PAST  
 ‘Ali introduced Ayşe and Mehmet to each other.’  
 (iv) Ali Ayşe ve Mehmet-e birbirleri-ni tanış-tir-di  
 Ali Ayşe and Mehmet-DAT each other-ACC meet-CAUS-PAST

Using evidence from depictive stranding I have shown that German and Turkish, verb-final scrambling languages which have been assumed to be an exception to the crosslinguistic generalization of IO>DO base order in DOCs, in fact support the generalization. Following Georgala et al.'s (2008) analysis of applicative constructions, which predicts that IOs originate higher than DOs, I have argued that German and Turkish have two types of applied arguments (thematic and raising) with different underlying but the same surface position, namely [Spec, AppIP]. By showing that IO>DO is the base order of Turkish DOCs I have also contributed to the discussion of the nature of scrambling in Turkish. In particular I have corroborated Öztürk's (2005) view that scrambling in Turkish can be treated as either A-bar or A-movement.

## References

- Boeder, Winfried and Christoph Schroeder. 1998. Attribution und sekundäre Prädikate im Sprachvergleich: Deutsch, Englisch, Kurdisch, Georgisch, Türkisch. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 51:207–227.
- Bowers, John. 1993. The syntax of predication. *Linguistic Inquiry* 24:591–656.
- Bowers, John. 2010. *Arguments as Relations*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Cook, Philippa. 2006. The datives that aren't born equal: Beneficiaries and the dative passive. In *Datives and Other Cases*, ed. D. Hole, A. Meinunger and W. Abraham, 141–184. Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.
- Dikken, Marcel den. 1995. Particles: On the Syntax of Verb-particle, Triadic, and Causative Constructions. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Draye, Luk. 1996. The German dative. In *The Dative Volume 1: Descriptive Studies*, ed. W. van Belle and W. van Langendonck, 155–215. Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.
- Dvorak, Vera. Forthcoming. On the syntax of ditransitive verbs in Czech. Paper presented at Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics (FASL) 18, Cornell University.
- Fanselow, Gisbert. 2003. Free constituent order. A minimalist interface account. *Folia Linguistica* 37:191–231.
- Frey, Werner. 1993. Syntaktische Bedingungen für die Semantische Interpretation. Über Bindung, Implizite Argumente und Skopus. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Georgala, Effi, Waltraud Paul and John Whitman. 2008. Expletive and thematic applicatives. In *Proceedings of WCCFL 26*, ed. C. B. Chang and H. J. Haynie, 181–189. Somerville, Mass.: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
- Georgala, Effi. Submitted. Short object shift and ditransitive structure in Greek. In *Current Issues in Mediterranean Syntax*, ed. S. Özsoy and A. Gürel.
- Georgala, Effi. Forthcoming. Why German is not an exception to the universal base order of double object constructions. In *Proceedings of WCCFL 28*. Somerville, Mass.: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
- Hoekstra, Teun. 1988. Small clause results. *Lingua* 74:101–139.
- Issever, Selcuk. 2003. Information structure in Turkish. *Lingua* 113:1025–1053.
- Kesici, Esra. 2008. Ditransitives in Turkish. Ms., Cornell University.
- Kornfilt, Jaklin. 1997. *Turkish*. New York: Routledge.
- Kornfilt, Jaklin. 2003. Scrambling, subscrambling and case in Turkish. In *Word Order and Scrambling*, ed. S. Karimi, 125–155. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell.
- Kural, Murat. 1992. Properties of scrambling in Turkish. Ms., UCLA.
- Lee-Schoenfeld, Vera. 2006. German possessor datives: raised and affected. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 9:101–142.
- Legate, Julie. 2008. Morphological and abstract Case. *Linguistic Inquiry* 39:55–101.
- Lenerz, Jürgen. 1977. *Zur Abfolge Nominaler Satzglieder im Deutschen*. Tübingen: Narr Verlag.
- Marantz, Alec. 1993. Implications of asymmetries in double object construction. In *Theoretical Aspects of Bantu Grammar*, ed. S. Mchombo, 113–150. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Marusic, Frank, Tatjana Marvin and Rok Zaucer. 2008. Depictive secondary predication with no PRO. In *Formal Description of Slavic Languages*, ed. G. Zybatow, L. Szucsich, U. Junghanns, and R. Meyer, 423–434. Frankfurt a.M.: Peter Lang.
- McFadden, Thomas. 2004. The Position of Morphological Case in the Derivation: A Study on the Syntax-Morphology Interface. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.
- McGinnis, Martha. 1998. Locality and inert case. In *Proceedings of NELS 28*, ed. P. Tamanji and K. Kusumoto, 267–281.
- McGinnis, Martha. 1999. A-scrambling exists! In *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics: Proceedings of the PLC 23*, ed. M. Minnick and N. Han, 283–297.

- McIntyre, Andrew. 2006. The interpretation of German datives and English *have*. In *Datives and Other Cases*, ed. D. Hole, A. Meinunger and W. Abraham, 185–211. Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.
- McIntyre Andrew, 2009. High and low datives in German. Handout. Paper presented at the University of Tübingen.
- Meinunger, André. 2006. Remarks on the projection of dative arguments in German. In *Datives and Other Cases*, ed. D. Hole, A. Meinunger and W. Abraham, 79–102. Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.
- Miyagawa, Shigeru. 2001. EPP, scrambling, and wh-in-situ. In *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*, ed. M. Kenstowicz, 293–338. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Müller, Gereon. 1995. *A-bar Syntax. A Study of Movement Types*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Müller, Gereon. 1999. Optimality, markedness, and word order in German. *Linguistics* 37:777–818.
- Muysken, Pieter. 1989. Predication chains: Case and argument status in Quechua and Turkish. *Linguistic Inquiry* 20:627–645.
- Öztürk, Balkiz. 2005. *Case, Referentiality and Phrase Structure*. Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.
- Pesetsky, David. 1995. *Zero Syntax*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Pylkkänen, Liina. 2002. Introducing Arguments. Doctoral Dissertation, MIT.
- Pylkkänen, Liina. 2008. *Introducing Arguments*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Rosenbaum, Peter. S. 1967. *The Grammar of English Predicate Complement Constructions*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Simpson, Andrew, Heeju Hwang and Canan Ipek. 2008. The comparative syntax of double object constructions in Japanese, Korean, and Turkish. In MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 58: Proceedings of the 5th Workshop on Altaic Formal Linguistics (WAFL5), ed. R. Vermeulen and R. Shibagaki, 41–62.
- Sternefeld, Wolfgang and Sam Featherston. 2003. The German reciprocal *einander* in double object constructions. In *Arbeiten zur Reflexivierung*, ed. L. v. Gunkel, G. Müller and G. Zifonun, 239–266. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- Tungseth, Mai E. 2008. *Verbal Prepositions and Argument Structure*. Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.
- Vogel, Ralf and Markus Steinbach. 1998. The dative – an oblique case. *Linguistische Berichte* 173:65–90.
- Webelhuth, Geert. 1989. *Syntactic Saturation Phenomena and the Modern Germanic Languages*. Doctoral Dissertation MIT.
- Wegener, Heide. 1985. *Der Dativ im Heutigen Deutsch*. Tübingen: Narr Verlag.
- Wegener, Heide. 1989. Ein Modalpartikel besonderer Art: Der Dativus Ethicus. In *Sprechen mit Partikeln*, ed. H. Weydt, 56–73. New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Wegener, Heide. 1991. Der Dativ - ein struktureller Kasus? In *Strukturen und Merkmale Syntaktischer Kategorien*, ed. G. Fanselow and S. Felix, 70–103. Tübingen: Narr Verlag.

Department of Linguistics  
 Cornell University  
 Ithaca, NY 14853-4701  
 eg99@cornell.edu