Modern Hebrew Discursive Datives
Elitzur Bar-Asher Siegal & Nora Boneh
The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

CLAIM AND BACKGROUND. In this talk we claim that Modern Hebrew has a non-truth conditional non-core dative, exemplified in (1), which we term the Discursive Dative (DD). This dative is a discourse management device signaling a particular structuring of the conversational background (adopting terminology employed by Krifka 2008, Repp 2013, Murray 2014). The DD is felicitous when the asserted proposition constitutes an **exception** to a generalization available to the speech event participants in the Common Space (to be defined below, following Portner 2007).

(1) a. 'eyze tas la-misxak?   be-'aškelon [hu] lo holex, **tas li_DD{/lexa/lanu}** le-švaic?!
         which fly to.the-game, in-Ashkelon he not go,   flying to.me/you/us to-Switzerland
         'What do you mean fly to the (soccer) game, this is unusual since even to Ashkelon he won't go, suddenly he's flying to Switzerland?!

     b. 'axšav, 'al kol falcan   hem yešalmu   **li_DD{/lexa/lanu}** po   milyon yuro
         now, on every stuck up   they pay   to.me   here million euro
         'Now, they'll be willing to pay a million euros for every stuck up (soccer player). (contrary to what's appropriate to pay for these type of players)'

In (1a), the statement: *pit'om **tas li** le-švaic* 'suddenly he's flying to Switzerland', relies on the epistemic generalization that 'the relevant person never goes to soccer games'. The statement in (1b) relies on the moral generalization that one shouldn't pay such sums for just any soccer player. For both cases, it is significant that the fact signaled by the dative-less preposition (his flying to the game in Switzerland, and their eventual paying of a million euros for just any soccer player) does not alter the generalization, explicitly stated in (1a) as: *be-'aškelon [hu] lo holex* 'even to Ashkelon he won't go', and accommodated in the case of (1b).

The dative we name here DD has been sometimes described in the literature as the Ethical Dative (ED). As such, it is a type of non-core dative typically restricted to 1st and/or 2nd person, but there is very little agreement in the literature as to what the ED stands for. In Ancient Greek grammars (e.g. Smyth 1920), the ED is described as having to do with the expression of surprise. Others (e.g. Leclère 1976, Berman 1982, Juitteau and Rezac 2007) describe the ED as holding the addressee as witness. Although it has been described by some as an element that bears no truth conditional contribution to meaning, differing in this respect from other non-core datives (e.g. Juitteau & Rezac 2007, Horn 2008, Bosse et al. 2012), various authors use the term ED in a rather loose way to refer to a range of phenomena (e.g. Borer & Grodzinsky 1986 (Modern Hebrew), Gutzmann 2007 (German), Rákosi 2008 (Hungarian), Franco and Huidobro 2008 (Spanish), Roberge & Troberg 2009 (for Romance) Michelioudakis and Kapogianni 2013 (Modern Greek)).

ANALYSIS. Following, among others, Portner (2007), Murray (2014), we assume that besides the classical **Common Ground** (CG, Karttunen 1974, Stalnaker 1978, Lewis 1979), conversations also rely on the acceptance of various modal generalizations. These generalizations allow expectations as to which possible worlds should obtain. The set of worlds which consists of these generalizations is the **Common Propositional Space** (CPS). We suggest the following definition for the DD as a discourse management device:

(2) $[[DD]]^s = \lambda p_{<s,t>} \lambda w. \forall w' \in Epi_s (w) (p \notin CSw').p$
     In all words w' that conform to the speaker's knowledge in w it holds that the proposition in question, which is true in w, is not in the CS.

Semantically, $[[DD]]^s$ takes a proposition with its truth value and never alters it. As a discourse management device, the DD only adds information about the status of the proposition with respect to the CS, namely that this set of worlds is not a subset of the CS; by knowledge, we mean

epistemic knowledge that derives from various generalizations, stated as universals in the CS, about *w*. The ordering source can be also deontic, or stereotypical. For example, (1a) is epistemic.

Crucially, according to this definition, the DD is infelicitous in cases in which the CG is included in the CPS, like in (3):

(3) #ha-šemeš zoraxat **li**$_{ED}$ ba-mizrax
     The-sun   rises   to.me   in.the-east
     Intended: 'Unbelievable! The sun rises in the East.'

The present proposal makes it clear that the DD is not primarily used to express the speaker's stance towards the underlying proposition (as has been suggested for German by Gutzman 2007, who dubs these datives Attitude Holder Datives); the DD also cannot be characterized as having a "subjective" meaning contrasting with an "objective" one, which have been proposed as an axis of meaning non-core datives are aligned on (cf. Ariel et al. 2015, Dattner 2014). In other words, the connotations of surprise and irritation often used in the literature to describe the DD are by-products of its essential property, which is to draw attention to a particular relationship of non-inclusion between the CPS and the CG.

FURTHER SUBSTANTIATION. The possibility to substitute the 1st person pronoun with other pronouns without altering the meaning of the sentence indicates that the datival expression has no truth-conditional contribution (for similar indications see Bar-Asher Siegal & Boneh 2014). The DD then radically differs from another type of non-core dative in MH, which adds an affected event participant and, therefore, which has a truth-conditional meaning, more widely known as possessor datives & beneficiary datives (see Bar-Asher Siegal & Boneh 2014, Bosse et al. 2012).

Being a discourse management device, the DD is not expected to occur in embedded clauses:

(4) dani šama še-**hu**   tas   **li**$_{DD}$ le-švaic
     Dani heard that-he   flying   to.me   to-Switzerland
     'Danny heard that he is flying to Switzerland, #unbelievable! (when taking scope only in the embedded clause).'

Note that the DD can be embedded when the reference of the dative is one of the speech event participants, or when it appears in a relative clause, this is presumably not surprising if the relative clause is added separately (cf. Fox & Nissenbaum 1999/2006; also compare to the lack of SOT phenomena in relative clauses):

(5) šama'ti   še-hu   tas **li/lexa/lanu**$_{DD}$ le-švaic
     heard.1SG   that-he   flew to.me   to-Switzerland
     'I heard that he flew to Switzerland, unbelievable!'

(6) hine ha-'iš   še-pitom   tas **li/lexa/lanu**$_{DD}$ lexul
     Here the-man   that-suddenly flew to.me/you/us   abroad
     'Here's the man who suddenly flew abroad, contrary to what we would have thought.'

Finally, to stress the point that the DD is not about surprises, it is interesting to observe its occurrence in exclamatives and exclamations (declaratives), cf. Zanuttini & Portner (2003), Rett (2012). Consider the following pair:

(7) a. wau,   hu nice'ax   ba-taxarut!
         Wow,   he won   in.the-competition
         'Wow, he won the competition!'
     b. wau,   hu nice'ax   **li/lexa**$_{DD}$ ba-taxarut!
         Wow,   he won   to.me/you/us   in.the-competition
         'Wow, he won the competition!'

(7a) is uttered against a neutral background. There is no *a priori* reason why 'he' should not win. (7b), on the contrary, is uttered against a background containing a generalization of which *p* is not part, giving rise -to an interpretation where he stood no chance of winning, given the background generalization, but he eventually did. The truthfulness of *p* is part of the CG whether it is presupposed (in exclamatives) or asserted (in exclamations), see (Rett 2012). Although felt quite

similar to constructions containing DDs (see example 1), exclamatives and exclamations differ from the DD since they are not about **exception**s to a given background generalization, where the CG is enriched with a proposition that stands in contradiction to a generalization, which is part of the CPS. ● In the talk we will show that the same holds when the DD combines with modal and imperative propositions. We will additionally show how precisely the DD differs from other non-core datives. Time permitting, we will consider parallel phenomena from other languages.

SELECTED REFERENCES. **Ariel**, M. , E. Dattner, J. W. Du Bois, & T. Linzen. 2015. Pronominal datives: The royal road to argument status. *Studies in Language* 39: 2. **Bar-Asher Siegal**, E. A, & N. Boneh. 2014. "Modern Hebrew non-core dative in their context." *Ləšonénu* no. 74:461-495. **Bosse**, S., Bruening, B. & Yamada, M. 2012. "Affected Experiencers." *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* no. 30:1185–1230. **Gutzmann**, D. 2007. "Eine Implikatur konventioneller Art: der Dativus Ethicus." *Linguistische Berichte* no. 211:277–308. **Horn**, L. R. 2008. I Love Me Some Him: The landscape of non-argument datives. In *Empirical Issues in Syntax and Semantics*, edited by O. Bonami and Cabredo Hofherr. **Murray**, S. E. 2014. "Varieties of Update". *Semantics and Pragmatics* 7: 2:1-53. **Portner**, P. 2007. "Beyond the CG: The semantics and pragmatics of epistemic modals. Talk. *International Conference on Linguistics in Korea.* **Repp**, S.. 2011. "Common Ground Management: Modal particles, Illocutionary Negation and VERUM". Daniel Gutzmann & Hans-Martin Gärtner (eds.), *Expressives and beyond. Explorations of Conventional Non-Truth-Conditional Meaning.* Oxford: Oxford University Press. **Rett**, J. 2009. "A degree account of exclamatives". *SALT* 18: 601–618.