

DECOMPOSING AFFECTEDNESS: TRUTH-CONDITIONAL NON-CORE DATIVES IN MODERN HEBREW*

ELITZUR BAR-ASHER SIEGAL

NORA BONEH

The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

1 Introduction

There is a vast literature on constructions containing non-core datives in languages of the world in general and among them Modern Hebrew (MH). In this paper we propose a novel way to classify non-core datives in MH relying on whether or not they make a truth conditional contribution to the meaning of the sentence. It is possible to determine this when examining non-core datives in context and not as isolated sentences, as is often, if not always, done in the literature. We, therefore, argue that the main classification of non-core datives should be between two major types: those that make a truth-conditional contribution to the meaning of the clause they are part of, and those that do not. Thus, at least for MH, truth conditional non-core datives should be grouped under one category, which we dub the Affected Dative, whereas non-truth conditional non-core datives are of two types: Discursive Dative and Reflexive/Co-referential Dative. In this paper, we deal with the latter two only for the purpose of separating them from the Affected Dative, which stands at the heart of the current discussion.

By taking contribution to truth conditions to be the main criterion in the classification of the datives, this paper differs from previous studies on non-core datives in that it demonstrates the following: 1) sub-divisions prevalent in the literature, e.g. Possessor Dative,

*We wish to thank the following people Luka Crnic, Edit Doron, Yael Greenberg, Eitan Grossman, Mira Ariel, Yael Reshef, Aynat Rubinstein, Ivy Sichel, Yael Ziv and the audiences of the Morphology and Interpretation Workshop, University of São Paulo, of RALFe3 at the University of Paris 8 and of IATL30 at Ben-Gurion University of the Negev. This research is supported by an ISF grant #1366/14 to Nora Boneh and the European Union grant IRG 030-2227 to Elitzur Bar-Asher Siegal.

Beneficiary/Maleficiary Dative, *Dativus Commodi/Incommodi* and some instances of what is referred to as the Ethical Dative should be subsumed under the Affected Dative, since what is common to all these denominations is that they designate an additional event participants, and thus have a truth conditional contribution to the meaning of the clause; 2) in the definition of the Affected Datives, it is insignificant whether the effect is a material one or a psychological one.

The second point is especially crucial for the so-called Ethical Dative. For some authors, Ethical Datives are those where the referent of the dative is mentally or emotionally affected by the occurrence described by the clause, even when the dative can be shown to contribute to truth conditions (e.g. Borer & Grodzinsky 1986, Rákosi 2008, for Hungarian), others take it to be non-truth conditional (e.g. Gutzmann 2007, for German). We stress that the question of the type of effect plays no role as long as both materially affected individuals and psychologically affected ones count for the truth conditions of the clause under the definition of affectedness we provide.

We distinguish two types of non-truth conditional non-core datives: the Discursive Dative and the Reflexive/Co-referential Dative. The former is briefly described in the next section but then set aside (see Bar-Asher Siegal & Boneh 2015, for an elaboration concerning the semantics of the Discursive Dative, which complements the present study). The latter is entirely discarded in this paper since it is easily identifiable due to the fact that its phi-features match those of the subject DP.¹

In light of this, the first goal of this paper is to show how context helps elucidate the different meanings a datival expression can give rise to (Section 2), then we provide means to distinguish between non-core datives that contribute to a clause's truth conditions from those that do not (Section 3). Consequently, we demonstrate that with respect to truth-conditional non-core datives, this is the only significant distinction, since all such datives behave similarly both at the syntactic and at the semantic levels. Therefore, there is no reason for a further classification of non-core datives (Section 4). We then provide a precise semantic definition of the notion of affectedness, which is set up in such a way that encompasses all the previously assumed types of dative. We suggest that affectedness involves a causal relation between the eventuality described by the sentence and a contextually available eventuality in which the added dative marked participant is an argument (Section 5). In Section 6 we adduce evidence that, unlike what has been previously claimed in the literature, the added affected participant is not part of the eventuality described by the proposition without the dative, but is introduced separately. Section 7 concludes.

2 The Importance of the Context in Identifying Classes of Non-Core Datives

Constructions containing non-core datives, which are distinguished from those containing core datives,² are customarily divided into several groups labeled, in an overlapping manner, Possessor Dative, Beneficiary/Maleficiary Dative, *Dativus Commodi/Incommodi*, Affected

¹ (i) dani₁ tas lo₁ lexul Reflexive/Co-referential Dative
 dani flew to.him abroad
 'Dani flew abroad.'

² Namely the ones associated with the verbs *give, hand, send, throw, show, introduce, etc.*

Dative, Ethical Dative, Attitude Holder Dative, Personal Dative (*inter alia* Al-Zahre & Boneh 2010, Berman 1982, Borer & Grodzinsky 1986, Boneh & Nash 2011, Bosse, Bruening & Yamada 2012, Cuervo 2003, 2010, Herslund 1988, Horn 2008, Lamiroy & Delbecque 1998, Payne & Barshi 1999, Pykkänen 2008, Rákosi 2008, Franco and Huidobro 2008, Roberge & Troberg 2009, Shibatani 1994, Zúñiga & Kittilä 2010, Michelioudakis and Kapogianni 2013, Dattner 2014, Ariel et al. 2015).

The main challenge for these classifications stems from the fact that morphologically speaking all constructions are the same. They share whichever form a given language uses to express dative case, or the equivalent of the dative case in languages with no overt nominal cases (in Hebrew the form is *le-DPs*). Moreover, when it comes to criteria for classifying non-core dative into the categories evoked in this abundant literature one realizes that these are based mainly on paraphrases to their meaning and on distributional properties. Bar-Asher Siegal & Boneh (2014) show that these criteria are not adequate enough. Paraphrases are impressionistic and are suitable only as a general description of contexts in which constructions containing non-core datives are felicitous. Therefore, paraphrases cannot be used as a means to identify and classify these constructions. We will briefly elaborate on this in the next section.

As for the distributional properties that were proposed (for example, in Borer & Grodzinsky 1986),³ given the lack of clear morphological distinction, these observations are useless as long as one cannot tell to what they apply. In other words, in lack of a precise semantic means, distributional properties cannot elucidate the landscape of non-core datives.

In order to fill this lacuna, we resort in the next section to a classification based on contribution to truth conditions, but in order to capture this distinction, it is first methodologically necessary to consider non-core datives in their context of use and not in isolated sentences (see Bar-Asher Siegal & Boneh 2014). Analyzing the properties of non-core datives out of context, as is so often done in the literature, skews the picture. To illustrate this, consider first the following sentences without context:

- (1) hi parka li 'et ha-katef
she dislocated to.me ACC the-shoulder
- (2) hu tas li
He flew to.me

Both these sentences, one transitive, the other intransitive, feature a first person singular non-core dative. There are several possible types of contexts in which (1) could be expressed, for instance, the following alternative situations can be described by it:

- (1'a) hi (=ha-yalda) parka 'et ha-katef šeli
she (=the girl) dislocated ACC the-shoulder mine
'The girl had me dislocate my own shoulder.'
- (1'b) hi (=ha-yalda šeli) parka 'et ha-katef šela,

³ Recently Dattner (2014) and Ariel et al. (2015) proposed various syntactic, pragmatic and semantic distinctions between types of core and non-core datives in Hebrew. They, however, rely on the linguist's intuitions to identify the various classes of datives. We believe that such intuitions may be misleading and therefore must be independently justified semantically.

she (=the girl mine) dislocated ACC the-shoulder her,
 laxen 'ani lo yexola lalexet la-'avoda
 therefore I not can.SG.F go to.the-work

'My girl dislocated her shoulder. Therefore I cannot go to work.'

- (1'c) hi (=ha-sportait ha'ceira ba-televizya) parka 'et ha-katef,
 She (=the-athlete the-young in.the-TV) dislocated ACC the-shoulder
 ze mamaš muzar
 this really weird

'The young athlete (on TV) dislocated her shoulder. This was unusual.'

The first two differ as to whether the shoulder under question belongs to the speaker (1'a) or to the girl (1'b). According to the literature cited above, the dative fitting the interpretation arising from (1'a) would have counted as a Possessor Dative, whereas the one related to the interpretation of (1'b) would have counted as a Beneficiary/Maleficiary Dative. Crucially, however, the context makes clear whose shoulder got dislocated, and if the context is not rich enough, the addressee accommodates this bit of information.

The description to the event in (1) provided in (1'c) differs from the other two in that it does not portray a context in which the individual designated by the dative is a participant in the occurrence described by the clause.

Similarly, when (2) is given in context, several types of meaning may arise. Here are two attested examples, each highlighting a different meaning facet the datival expression may have.

- (2'a) 'axarkax hu tas li le-šana la-mizrax,
 Then he flew to.me to-year to.the-east,
 ve-hiš'ir 'oti xareda ve-lexuca (Internet)
 and-left me anxious and-stressed

'Then he flew on me to the Far East for a year, and left me anxious and stressed.'

- (2'b) 'eyze tas la-misxak? be-'aškelon [hu] lo holex,
 which fly to.the-game, in-Ashkelon he not go,
 pit'om tas li le-švaic?! (Internet)
 suddenly flying to.me 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?!'

Although both contexts might be considered as indicating psychological phenomena they are significantly different. In (2'a), the datival expression designates an affected individual, who is directly concerned by the underlying eventuality of flying to the Far East for a year. The type of effect is elucidated by the conjunct clause *and left me anxious and stressed*. The datival expression in example (2'b), on the other hand, does not indicate any type of concrete or emotional effect on the speaker caused by the underlying eventuality. Rather we consider the dative to be a discourse management device. As such its presence is tied to the fact that for the speaker the underlying eventuality constitutes an exception to a generalization prevalent in the conversational background, given her knowledge of things that ought to hold and acquaintance

with the individual referred to in the sentence. In other words, given the fact that the person will not leave his house to go to a soccer game in a nearby town, his flying abroad for such purposes is an exception to the generalization that this person never goes to watch a soccer game. In this environment the datival expression is inserted. Emotions such as surprise, irritation or amusement are by-products of this state of affairs.

Note that this is not tied to issues such as verb valance, but are due to the context of utterance. Going back again to example (1), if put in the right context, the effect on the speaker can be a psychological one, for instance in the following context:

(1''b)hi (=ha-yalda šeli) parka 'et ha-katef šela, laxen 'ani 'acuva
 She (=the-girl mine) dislocated ACC the-shoulder, her therefore I sad.F
 'My girl dislocated her shoulder. Therefore I'm sad.'

Examples (1) & (2) demonstrate the problems with previous classifications, which assume that sentences with a non-core dative have a single interpretation depending on the type of predicate (Borer & Grodzinsky 1986 and, to some extent, also Dattner 2014). Distinguishing between the uses by considering alternative states of affairs to the same sentence (as we did in (1)) or by identifying different types of attested contexts in which the same sentence appears (as illustrated in (2)) is a preliminary step. It is still necessary to have clear semantic tests that will allow us to determine whether there are significant differences between the sentences in (1)-(2) in their different contexts of use.

We claim that for the cases associated with the interpretations in (1'a), (1'b), (1''b) and (2'a), the dative makes a truth conditional contribution to the meaning of the sentence. We use the term Affected Dative (AD) for this class of dative, adapting terminology by Hole (2005, 2006) and Bosse *et al.* (2012). The dative associated with the interpretations in (1'c) and (2'b) is dubbed the Discursive Dative (DD).

The Discursive Dative (DD), as alluded to in the description of the examples above, is a sort of a discourse management device (cf. Bar-Asher Siegal & Boneh 2015). It appears in clauses where the asserted proposition constitutes an exception to a generalization acknowledged by the speech event participants in the conversational background. To recall, in example (2'b), the event of flying abroad to watch a soccer game is exceptional given the shared knowledge that is expressed in that context "even to Ashkelon he won't go". Similarly in (1'c), watching a young athlete on TV, the dislocation of her shoulder is an exceptional occurrence. In both these cases, the datival expression is not part of the assertion (see below ex. (4)), but indicates that while the underlying proposition is asserted, it was unexpected at the time of the utterance. It can be shown that in a sentence stating a generally accepted truth the DD is not felicitous:

(3) #ha-šemeš zoraxat li ba-mizrax
 The-sun rises to.me in.the-east
 Intended: 'The sun rises in the East. #That's weird!'

This sentence may only become felicitous in a science fiction scenario, where the course of planets may be altered.

As for the Affected Dative (AD), the main goal of this paper is to define the semantics of this type of dative, and since at this point we only wish to distinguish it from the DD, it will be sufficient for the time being to mention that the individual designated by the dative is an

additional participant associated with the occurrence described by the clause in a way that will be elucidated in Section 5. In other words, our preliminary descriptive tool to distinguish between the two types of datives is related to the role of the dative, one has a discursive role, and the other indicates an additional event participant.

3 Truth Conditional and Non-Truth Conditional Non-Core Datives

The sentences related to examples (1) and (2) have in common the fact that a datival expression is added to the underlying proposition. Schematically, this will be represented as ψ^D , where ψ marks the bare proposition to which the dative D attaches. The preliminary definitions to AD and DD provided at the end of the previous section will now allow us to identify them in a given context, and to provide several tests that indicate how each stands with respect to contribution to truth conditions, namely, whether ψ^D and ψ have different truth conditions.

A direct result of the difference between the AD and the DD outlined at the end of Section 2, which also demonstrates the difference between the two types of datives with respect to the contribution to truth conditions, comes from the possibility to replace the 1st person singular pronoun in (2'b) with a 2nd person singular pronoun or a 1st person plural pronoun in the same context.

- (4)pit'om tas li/lexa/lanu le-švaic (cf. 2'b)
... suddenly (he) flies to.me/you/us to Switzerland?! 'Unbelievable!'

The referent of the DD can be either one of the speech event participants; the pronoun in the datival expression does not indicate a participant in the event described by ψ ("he flies to Switzerland"). Consequently, there is no truth conditional effect to this choice. Importantly, the DD cannot be a third person or full DP (see Borer & Grodzinsky 1986, Bar-Asher Siegal & Boneh 2014, 2015).

Contrary to the DD, a change in the referent of AD alters truth conditions, as expected in the case of referential expressions:

- (5) hu tas li/#lexa/#lanu le-šana la-mizrax (ve-hiš'ir 'oti xareda) (cf. 2'a)
'He flew to the Far East for a year, affecting me/you/us (and left me anxious).'

Here, the individual that is left anxious is the speaker, not the addressee nor any other individual; otherwise the truth conditions would be altered. It is expected that if the datival pronoun indicates a participant affected by ψ ("he flew to the Far East for a year"), a change of reference should also affect the truth conditions.

Other environments that illustrate the contribution of the dative (^D) to the truth conditions of its clause (ψ^D), are the following:

- (6) a. hu tas [li]_{FOCUS} le-šana la-mizrax, lo lexa,
 he flew [to.me] to-year to.the-east, not to.you,
 ‘ani zot še-lexuca
 I this.F that-stressed.F
 ‘I am the one affected by his flying away to the Far East, not you, I am the one who’s stressed.’
- b. hu tas **gam li** le-šana la-mizrax, (ve-hiš’ir gam ‘oti xareda)⁴
 He flew too to.me to-year to.the-east (and-left too me anxious)
 ‘He flew to the Far East, affecting me too (and left me anxious too).’
- c. hu **davka** tas **li** le-šana la-mizrax,
 he on-purpose flew to.me to-year to.the-east,
 hu yada ma ze ya’ase li
 he knew what it will.do to-me
 ‘He flew to the Far East for a year affecting me on purpose; he knew what it would do to me.’

In (6a), placing a focus intonation on the dative pronoun stresses that this is the particular individual affected by the occurrence and not any other. Similarly in (6b), the additive expression *gam* ‘too’ indicates that there is an additional individual affected by the flying event. Finally, the expression *davka* which can be roughly translated as ‘on purpose’, can be read in such a way that it makes clear that the agent of the described event *flying to the Far East for a year* is aware of the repercussions of his actions on the referent of the dative. Thus in all three cases illustrated here, for the sentence to be true, the referent of the datival expression needs to be part of the truth conditions.

The examples in (6a-c) can be read only as AD. The DD, on the contrary, cannot be placed under focus; the fact that any of the speech event participants can replace the 1st person pronoun concords with the impossibility to place contrastive focus on a DD. Following Rooth (1985, 1992), focus introduces a set of alternatives that contrasts with the ordinary semantic meaning of a given sentence. In our case, the set of alternatives differs in pronouns. While this is relevant in the case of the AD, it is irrelevant in the case of the DD, since as (4) indicates, these replacements are always available. The same goes for the additive *gam* ‘too’. Since the occurrence described in the clause constitutes an exception to a generalization shared by the speech event participants, therefore the additive adverb has no particular individual to operate on. As for (6c), with a DD, there is no reading where the agent is aware of the fact that the speaker perceives the proposition as an exception to a contextually available generalization, analog to the reading in the case of the AD, where the agent is aware of the effect his actions have on the added participant.

Similarly, the contexts in which example (1) can be interpreted. If we take the context in (1’c), where the speaker perceives an unexpected event of a young athlete dislocating her shoulder on TV, there is no consequence to replacing the first person singular with a second person singular or a first person plural:

⁴ Test adapted from Rákosi (2008).

- (7) pit'om ha-sportait ha-ce'ira parka li/lexa/lanu 'et ha-katef
 Suddenly the-athlete.F the-young.F dislocated to.me/you/us ACC the-shoulder

However, in contexts such as the ones illustrated by (1'a), (1'b) or (1''b), such a replacement necessarily leads to altering the truth conditions. In a case such as (1'a), there is a different person that dislocated her shoulder, and in (1'b), a different person that has to rush now to hospital with a girl whose shoulder got dislocated, or a different person that is saddened by the underlying occurrence (1''b).

To sum up, a context-less sentence of the form ψ^D where the dative is a 1st or 2nd person pronoun can be either ψ^{DD} or ψ^{AD} ; the true nature of the dative is established in context; once it is, the particular properties discussed here are manifest. Importantly, an AD is truth-conditional irrespective of whether the effect on the added participant is material or psychological. In what follows, we set aside the DD and focus on truth-conditional non-core datives. For ease of exposition, and so as not to raise the possibility that we are dealing with a DD, we will only discuss examples where the dative is 3rd person, unless referring back to the sets of examples in (1) and (2) (see Bar-Asher Siegal & Boneh 2015 for an illustration that the DD does not apply to full DPs and 3rd person pronouns).

4 One Group of Truth Conditional Non-Core Datives

The purpose of this section is to establish the claim that in Modern Hebrew (and maybe in other languages as well) truth-conditional non-core datives are to be grouped together under the cover term Affected Datives. This means that non-core datives, known as Possessor Datives, Beneficiary/Maleficiary Datives, *Dativus Commodi/Incommode*, and for some authors, the Ethical Dative, are in fact of the same type. They share the same interpretative and distributional properties, namely they are all event participants that are affected in some contextually determined way by the happenings in the described eventuality. Thus, the argument is mostly negative: we find no positive reasons to maintain these sub-classifications, as we show the absence of a grammatical distinction between the alleged sorts of datives.⁵ Furthermore, in the next section we will present a precise definition of affectedness, and, as will become clear, all the sorts of non-core datives enumerated above fit this definition equally well.

The separation between these types of datives, which is widely accepted in the literature (but see Al-Zahre 2003, Hole 2005, Lambert 2010), is probably due to the fact that sentences containing non-core datives are always considered in isolation and never in context. Recall the examples we started out with, in (1'a) and (1'b) and (1''b). According to the received classification, the dative in (1'a) would be dimmed a Possessor Dative, where the shoulder is understood as belonging to the referent of the dative; the dative in (1'b) would be taken to be a Maleficiary Dative, where the referent of the dative is negatively affected by the described occurrence; the one in (1''b) would probably come out as an Ethical Dative, since the effect is psychological. However, the exact nature of the possession relation between the shoulder “owner” and the “shoulder” is not what is asserted. Rather, it is part of the background

⁵ Cf. Ariel et al. (2015) for a different view.

information shared by speakers, or is subject to speaker accommodation (see Hole 2005 for similar observations).

Instead, the assertion in these sentences, according to our point of view, is that the individual designated by the dative expression is affected by the occurrence described in the clause without the dative. In this sense, there is no deep grammatical or interpretative difference between the dative expression in (1'a) and the one in (1'b) or (1''b), and all are similar to the one that appears in (2'a), where no possession relation can be established to begin with, since in this case the clause lacks a DP that can serve as a possessee. In the case of (2'a), information shared by the speaker and hearer in context makes it possible to understand why for the added participant, a trip to the Far East is the cause of worry (e.g. the speaker is a mother who is susceptible of worry, the Far East is an unknown territory therefore potentially dangerous, the person flying is reckless, etc.). Therefore, as stressed before, the common property to the dative expression in all these examples is the presence of an affected event participant, whose precise relation to the underlying eventuality is elucidated from the context of utterance.

In this respect, it is important to note that the common strategy of paraphrasing applied in the literature to classify non-core datives into groups is not a sound tool, and can only be used to describe the conveyed meaning. For instance, a sentence like (8):

- (8) dina kimta lo 'et ha-xulca
Dina wrinkled to.him ACC the-shirt

could either mean:

- (8a) Dina wrinkled his shirt “possessive” meaning
(8b) Dina wrinkled a shirt for him/instead of him “beneficiary” meaning

According to our claim, such paraphrases merely provide alternative descriptions to the context in which the sentence was uttered. We take this example to actually mean: *Dina wrinkled the shirt affecting him*. It must be given in context whether the shirt actually belongs to the referent of the pronoun. According to the current analysis, the possession relation between the DP marked by the dative and one of the other DPs in the clause must be given in the context of utterance, or accommodated, and this possessive relation stands in the background of the effect described in the sentence. Thus, in (8a) the fact that this is *his shirt* can be a reason why *the wrinkling of the shirt* affected *him*.

Note now that the possession interpretation stemming from a dative construction, known also as external possession, and the one stemming from a possessive phrase inside a DP, known as internal possession are not to be assimilated. What sets apart internal possessive constructions from external ones is the issue of affectedness (cf. O'Conner 2007, Linzen 2014). A clear illustration that internal possessive constructions (9a) do not share the same meaning with external possessive constructions (9b) comes from contrasts such as the following:⁶

⁶ See Payne & Barshi (1999) for a literature review on the distinctions between internal and external possessive constructions.

- (9) a. ben šel 'ariel sharon nixnas la-politika
 Son of Ariel Sharon entered to.the-politics
 'A son of Ariel Sharon entered into politics.'
- b. #nixnas le-'ariel Sharon ben la-politka
 entered to-Ariel Sharon son to.the-politics
 'A son of Ariel Sharon entered into politics, affecting him.'

While in (9a), internal possession only identifies the son, the so-called external possession in (9b) requires an effect on the dative expression, in our case, Ariel Sharon. Being uttered nowadays, such an effect is impossible, since Ariel Sharon is deceased, hence the non-felicity of (9b). These contrasting examples reveal that in the case of the so-called Possessor Dative there is a further request of an effect on the object, marked by the dative, which is not part of internal possession.^{7,8}

Lastly, the so-called Possessor Dative is not linked to any particular argument in the clause and is subject to a large degree of underspecification in the absence of a context. Consider for instance:

- (10) ha-yeladim zarku lo 'et ha-kadur letox ha-gina alyad ha-mitbax
 the-children threw.to.him ACC the-ball into the-garden near the-kitchen
 'His kids threw the (his) ball into the (his) garden near the (his) kitchen, affecting him.'

In this example, it can very well be that the referent of the dative is understood as the possessor of any of the DPs that appear in the construction; again this would depend on the precise context of utterance, and not on the syntactic configuration. This goes against Borer & Grodzinsky (1986) and Landau (1999), who identified the Possessor Dative as being able to relate only to the internal argument as a possessor (see Bar-Asher Siegal & Boneh 2014 for a more detailed discussion).

The point to be made is even stronger, as there seem to be no constraint whatsoever on the type of VP predicates an AD can be associated with: unaccusative (11), unergative (12), ditransitive (13), stative (14) and even some stative APs (15). This makes clear that the dative participant is not exclusively related to one of the event participants (contra Borer & Grodzinsky 1986, Landau 1999, and Pylkkänen's 2008 low applicative account), and that any type of eventuality can be the source of affectedness for the added participant (see fn. 12).

⁷ Accounts that derive the Possessor Dative from DP possession (e.g. Landau 1999) would have to explain what the source of the affectedness attached to the dative construction is.

⁸Note further that affectedness is not necessarily related to animacy since one can very well find sentences such as the following:

- (i) piniti makom la-sfarim 'al ha-madaf
 I.cleared space to.the-books on the-shelf
 'I cleared some space on the shelf for the books.'

Interestingly such a sentence cannot be interpreted as *I cleared the space of the books on the shelf* illustrating again that even in the case of inanimate entities a possession relation is not the default interpretation.

- (11) ha-kelev ne'elam le-rina ba-supermarket Unaccusative
 the-dog disappear to-Rina in.the-supermarket
 'The dog disappeared in the supermarket, affecting Rina.'
- (12) hu tas la lexul le-šana Unergative
 He flew to.her abroad to-year
 'He flew abroad for a year, affecting her.'
- (13) yael šalxa lo mixtav la-menahel Ditransitive
 Yael sent to.him letter to.the-principal.F
 'Yael sent a letter to the principal, affecting him.'
- (14) ha-pasiflora makifa le-rina 'et ha-gina VP stative
 the-passion fruit surround to-Rina ACC the.garden
 'The passion fruit surrounds the garden, affecting her.'
- (15) meluxlax la ha-masax AP stative
 dirty.M to.her the-screen
 'The screen is dirty, affecting her.' (Linzen 2014, ex. 28a)

To reiterate the point we wish to stress: in all the above examples the referent of the dative is affected in some contextually determined way by the underlying eventuality. Therefore we group them together under one category, that of the Affected Dative. Having set the scene, we can now turn to outline the semantics of the AD and to present our definition of affectedness.

5 The Semantics of Affected Datives

In this section we make explicit our understanding of affectedness and in so doing detail the meaning components that are part of the asserted content of the clause and those that are presupposed.

We take the notion of affectedness to be related to a causal relation between the eventuality denoted by ψ , and the eventuality in which the affected entity participates.⁹ Similarly to Copley & Wolff (2014) we do not take causation to be a semantic primitive function. Instead, we apply Lewis' (1973) counterfactual theory of causation for the notion of affectedness, e must be *causa sine qua non* for e' , i.e. the eventuality without which e' could not have occurred. Thus (16) defines the notion of affectedness expressed by the Affected Dative:

⁹ Bosse *et al.* (2012) take the notion of affectedness to be related to notion of "source" and have in addition a conventional implicature that "says that any event that is of the type denoted by its sister would be the source of the experiencer's psychological experiencing event." (p. 1188). The notion of "source" and the universal quantifier over types of events is reminiscent of Hume's notion of causality that reduces causality to regularity. We propose, however, a weaker condition for the notion of causation relevant for this linguistic phenomenon, as we do not have any universal quantifiers over events.

(16) Affectedness

- a. To assert that a participant x is affected by an eventuality e , is to assert that (i) x is a participant in a **separate** eventuality e' ; (ii) with the *presupposition* that eventuality e' would have not taken place had e not taken place. (iii) The time of e is either simultaneous with that of e' or precedes it.
- b. $[[\text{Aff}]] = \lambda e. \lambda e'. \lambda F. \lambda G. \lambda x. [(e \leq e') \ \& \ (Fe \leftrightarrow_s Ge')] = 1. Fe \ \& \ \text{Participant}(x, e') = 1$

In this formula, Fe is an abbreviation for everything which ψ states to be true about the event it describes; Ge' is a description of the relevant state of affairs known or given by the context (contextual knowledge is indicated with $_s$) and $[(e \leq e') \ \& \ (Fe \leftrightarrow_s Ge')]$ is a way to capture the notion of counterfactual causation, which is presupposed and not asserted.¹⁰ In this formula, $(Fe \leftrightarrow_s Ge')$ describes the counterfactuality, and $(e \leq e')$ is an additional presupposition as to the order of the eventualities in time, a presupposition affiliated with causality in general (this will be elaborated on below).

Importantly, the individual affected by the underlying eventuality e is a participant in e' . Thus, as expected with causal relations, the eventuality about which ψ is a different eventuality than the one in which the referent of the affected argument participates.

In what follows we exemplify and then discuss each of the meaning components underlying affectedness (i-iii), we illustrate these components with example (2'a):

- (2'a) 'axarkax **hu tas li** le-šana la-mizrax,
 then he flew to.me to-year to.the-east,
 ve-hiš'ir 'oti xareda ve-lexuca (Internet)
 and-left me anxious and-stressed

'The he flew on me to the Far East for a year, and left me anxious and stressed.'

In this example, Fe stands for "he flew to the Far East for a year" and Ge' is provided by the context, in the conjunct clause "and left me anxious and stressed". The eventuality described in Fe is the cause for the eventuality described in Ge' , and the affected individual referred to by the dative expression – the speaker – is part of the eventuality described by Ge' ("and left **me** *anxious and stressed*").

Under this analysis, the description of e' which is either given by the context or accommodated, is the source for the various flavors of readings attached to non-core datives in the literature. For instance, a Possessor Dative reading arises when e' describes a change to something which belongs to the individual marked by the dative;¹¹ a beneficiary/maleficiary

¹⁰ Further elaboration is needed about the nature of Participant (x, e'), but this is beyond the scope of the current paper.

¹¹ Note that inanimate affectees usually give rise to a possessive reading, since this is the natural way in which they can be affected, for instance in (i), but this is not a requisite, as (ii) demonstrates:

- (i) horadeti la-ofanayim 'et galgalei ha-'ezer
 Took.off-1SG to.the-bicycle ACC wheels the-aid
 'I took off the training wheels of the bicycle.'
- (ii) piniti makom la-sfarim 'al ha-madaf
 Evacuate-1SG place to.the-books on the-shelf

reading arises when e' is an eventuality in which the individual marked by the dative either gains or loses some object or property, either materially or psychologically.¹²

Crucially now, the *sine qua non* causal relation between the eventualities ($Fe \leftrightarrow_{\circ} Ge'$) is presupposed. The fact that it is a presupposition can be shown when ψ^{AD} is negated, since $\sim\psi^{AD}$ entails $\sim\psi$, indicating that the causal relation itself projects under negation:

- (17) hu **lo** tas li le-šana la-mizrax, 'eyze mazal!
 'He didn't fly to the Far East for a year on me, lucky me!'

Under a similar context to the one in (2'a), (17) asserts that flying to the Far East for a year did not take place, but at the same time the causal relation ($Fe \leftrightarrow_{\circ} Ge'$) still holds, i.e., (17) states that had the person's flying to the Far East for a year taken place, the relevant $\circ Ge'$ would have taken place as well.¹³ In addition, it motivates the use of counterfactual analysis to causation, since ($Fe \leftrightarrow_{\circ} Ge'$) holds in the occurrence and in the non-occurrences of the relevant eventuality.

Note that the causal relation is not a conversational implicature, since it cannot be cancelled when not embedded.

- (18) hu tas la lexul #aval lo 'ixpat=la
 he flew to.her abroad but not care=to.her (=but she doesn't care)

This is also not a conventional implicature (contra Bosse et al. 2012) since, as we saw in Section 2, the AD contributes to the truth conditions of the proposition in which it appears. We return to negated constructions featuring the AD in section 6.1.

Another meaning component which is not part of the assertion is temporal order, commonly presupposed in clausal relations ($e \leq e'$). If one knows that event A occurs after event B, one knows that A is not a cause of B (*inter alia* Lagnado, Waldmann, Hagmayer & Sloman 2007). This is a presupposition, which we take to hold in every instance of causality.

Therefore, e and e' , which are causally related, can either precede one another, or partially overlap in such a way the starting point of the caused event e' never precedes the starting point of the causing event e : $e \leq e'$. This presupposition explains various interpretive facts of the AD. Consider the following example:

- (19) ha-tinok lo hertiv la-beybisiter ba-layla
 the-baby NEG wet to.the-babysitter in.the-night
 'The babysitter didn't have the baby wet himself at night, affecting her.'

Although, as we just saw, $\sim\psi^{AD}$ entails $\sim\psi$, the truth conditions of $\sim\psi^{AD}$ are not simply the truth conditions of $\sim\psi$ with the additional contribution of the AD. For $\sim\psi$ (without an additional AD) to be true, the baby must not wet himself during the entire night, while $\sim\psi^{AD}$ does not entail

'I made place for the books on the shelf.'

¹² Presumably, the reason why ADs are rather infrequent with stative predicates (cf. Landau 1999) is due to the fact that statives do not constitute a causing eventuality as commonly as events do.

¹³ Bosse *et al.* (2012) argue that languages can differ as to whether the Affected Dative is part of the presupposition or is asserted. Crucially for MH, they claim that the AD is part of the not at-issue content of the clause. The evidence in section 3 shows that the AD should be part of the at-issue content.

that the baby didn't wet himself during the entire night. For $\sim\psi^{\text{AD}}$ to be true the baby must not wet himself only while the babysitter was there. Thus, the relevant time of e is only when the babysitter can be affected (e'). Having the notion of causality in mind can explain this apparent lack of compositionality, as it allows us to understand how the identity of e is determined by the causal relation, since following Davidson, the causal relation attunes the perception of the identity of the relevant eventuality (Davidson 1967a,b). Thus, once the presupposition of causality is added, the presupposition of $e \leq e'$ is added, and it attunes the identity of e to be relevant to the causal relation (in our example, the time that the wetting may affect the babysitter).

Furthermore, the presupposition of $e \leq e'$ also clarifies the following example:

(20) A: lama Jane lo roca lacet 'im John?
 why Jane not wants to.got.out with John?

'Why doesn't Jane want to go out with John?' (said in 2014)

B: ki hu šeret la be-viyetnam.
 because he served to.her in.Vietnam

Roughly: 'Because he served in Vietnam, and that's affecting her.'

In this scenario, Jane is emotionally affected by John's serving in Vietnam, several decades ago, leading her not to want to go out with him. In this example, the eventuality e *John's serving in Vietnam* causes eventuality e' involving the affected participant Jane, where e and e' are not temporally adjacent. The importance of this example is in showing that this type of dative arises in a case where there is a significant temporal gap between the eventuality described by ψ (e), and the eventuality (e') subsequent to it, in which the affected individual is a participant and it is consistent with the way causality is defined in (16). The following section further substantiates the claim that the non-core dative is a participant in a different eventuality.

6 Substantiation

The present account differs significantly from previous accounts, which take the added participant to be part of the eventuality described by the clause. Prevalent syntactic accounts, such as Pykkänen (2008), Cuervo (2003), (2010), and to some extent Bosse et al. (2012), take non-core datives to be introduced by an applicative head as part of the same eventuality as the other event participants. Though we will not delve into the precise syntactic representation of the Modern Hebrew Affected Dative construction, we mention in passing that the AD in MH can be added to full clause idioms, which indicates that the dative attaches after the vP has been formed:

(21) a. xatul šaxor 'avar la beynehem
 black cat passed to.her between.them

'They quarreled, affecting her (e.g. she now had no one to go to the cinema with).'

- b. ?ha-kerax nišbar **la** beynehem
 the-ice broke to.her between.them

‘Their relationship warmed up, affecting her (e.g. she benefitted from the situation where they were distant).’

In (21a), the individual designated by the dative expression is affected by the idiomatic, global, meaning produced in the clause, namely the ‘quarreling’; similarly in (21b), the added participant endures the positive or negative outcome of warming up the relation. Presumably, if the dative participant is added relatively low in the structure, as is suggested in the literature,¹⁴ a non-literal meaning would not have been expected.

Setting aside for the time being syntactic considerations, in the remainder of the section we provide further substantiation to the claim that semantically there are two eventualities involved in constructions containing an AD, and that the added participant is not an argument of the occurrence described by the clause. In this, the AD sharply contrasts with core arguments in general, including core datives.

6.1 ADs and Negated Clauses

Comparing ADs to adjuncts and ordinary event participants in negated clauses turns out to be revealing, as it directly supports the semantic account laid out in the previous section.

We would like to demonstrate first that not all adjuncts pattern alike in negated clauses. Some are like event participants – scoping under negation, whereas others can scope above it. The latter, we argue, are cause and purpose adjuncts. We then show that ADs pattern like them, contrary to adjuncts such as comitatives and instrumentals, which resemble plain event participants in this respect.

We take as our starting point the hypothesis that adjuncts which are always under the scope of clausal negation are mono-eventive adjuncts, i.e. they are relations of two arguments: the additional argument and the same event of the main predication; whereas adjuncts which can be above the scope of negation are adjuncts that express some causal relation with the introduction of another eventuality (cf. Johnston 1994).

Let us now consider the different types of adjuncts in negated clauses. First, negated clauses featuring cause and purpose adjuncts as in (22)-(23) are ambiguous. According to one reading, the adjunct phrase scopes under negation, and according to another reading, the adjunct is outside the scope of negation, i.e. the non-occurrence of the event, does not include the cause phrase or the purpose phrase.

¹⁴ The major available options are: Landau’s (1999) possessor raising account, raising the dative DP from within the DP to SpecVP; Pykkänen’s (2008) low applicative construction, where the applied argument is attached below V; The high applicative (Pykkänen 2008, Cuervo 2003, 2010) attaching between *v* and VP.

- (22) dani lo tas biġlala lexul **Cause PP**
 Dani NEG flew because.of.her abroad

READING I: 'It was not the case that Dani had a flight abroad whose reason was her (Dani either didn't fly abroad, or she was not the reason for his flying abroad).'

READING II: 'She was the reason he didn't fly; he didn't fly & it was because of her.'

- (23) dani lo tas bišvila lexul **Purpose/Beneficiary PP**
 Dani NEG flew for.her abroad

READING I: 'It was not the case that Dani had a flight abroad for her (Dani either didn't fly, or he flew but not for her).'

READING II: 'It was for her that Dani didn't fly abroad (i.e. he stayed home for her sake).'

In example (22), either the reason of Dani's flying abroad wasn't her, or the reason why he did not fly abroad was her. In example (23), either Dani flew abroad but not for her sake, or he didn't fly abroad for her sake. In other words, in both examples, (at least) two possibilities exist to interpret the sentence: either she was the cause/purpose of a negative event, or she wasn't the cause purpose of a positive event. These adjuncts will be named, for the purposes of this paper, 'Group 1' adjuncts.

Consider now a different group of adjuncts – Group2 – which cannot interact in the same way with negation. In example (24), the comitative phrase cannot be severed from the underlying eventuality when negation is present; namely, a reading where the adjunct escapes the scope of negation and only the underlying eventuality is negated is not possible. Similarly in (25), an instrumental adjunct cannot escape the scope of negation. In both (24) and (25) the adjunct cannot be added to the negated eventuality.

- (24) dani lo tas 'ita lexul **Comitative PP**
 Dani NEG flew with.her abroad

READING I: 'It is not the case that Dani flew with her abroad (either he did not fly, or that he flew without her).'

READING II **unavailable**: Dani's not flying was with her.

- (25) dani lo 'axal suši be-mazleg **Instrumental PP**
 Dani NEG ate Sushi with-fork

READING I: 'It is not the case that Dani ate sushi with a fork (either he didn't eat, or he ate sushi without a fork).'

READING II **unavailable**: Dani's not eating sushi was with a fork.

Group 2 adjuncts pattern like Patients/direct objects. They too cannot escape the scope of negation. In (26) the patient cannot be added to a negative event.

- (26) dani lo pagaš/ra'a/hiker 'ota bexul **Patient/Direct object**
 Dani NEG met/saw/knew her abroad

READING I: 'It is not the case that Dani met/saw/knew her abroad.'

READING II **unavailable**: Dani's not meeting/seeing/knowing abroad was of her.

Summary:**Group 1:** cause, purpose:NEG[ψ + Adjunct]; Adjunct NEG[ψ]**Group 2:** comitative, instrument, patient:NEG[ψ + Adjunct]; *Adjunct NEG[ψ]

While it is possible to assert a causal relation with the non-occurrence of an event (hence the possibility to be above the scope of negation), it is meaningless to add information about an event which did not take place.

The intuition behind this observation is the following; there are two types of adjuncts: those of Group 2, which add information about the eventuality of the main predication, and adjuncts of Group 1 that involve a causal relation between the eventuality of the main predications and other eventualities. It is beyond the scope of this paper to discuss the issue of absence as a cause. For our purposes, it is sufficient to mention that even philosophers who deny that absence can be a cause admit that we often explain causal relations with the non-occurrence of certain events, see for example Beebe (2004).

In other words, adjuncts like *with*-PP (24) behave similarly to an argument of a predicate (26) as they add a participant to the same event, while *because.of.someone* and *for.someone*¹⁵ add either the cause for the event described by the main predication (22), or the event caused by the main predication (23).

For our purposes, it is of significance that AD patterns with Group 1 adjuncts:

(27) dani lo tas **la** lexul
Dani NEG flew to-her abroad

READING I: ‘It is not the case that she was affected by Dani’s flying abroad, (either because he didn’t fly, and in this case if he had flown abroad she would have been affected, or because she was not affected but someone else was)

READING II: ‘She was affected (positively/negatively) by Dani’s not flying abroad.

Similarly, (28) is uttered in a context where everyone should stand when the commemorative siren is heard in remembrance of fallen compatriots.

(28) ha-yeled lo ‘omed **la** ba-cfira
The-kid NEG stand to-her in.the-siren

‘She is affected (positively/negatively) by the kid’s not standing during the commemorative siren.’ (READING II)

¹⁵ *because.of.someone* and *for.someone* provide an entity, however in a given context it is clear what is the relevant state of affairs for the causal relation.

The non-occurrence of eventuality *e* is the source of material or psychological effect on the individual designated by the datival expression, which can be either positive or negative. In a different context READING I can also be made available.

As (27)-(28) demonstrate, AD behaves similarly to the adjuncts in examples (22) and (23), which require a second eventuality and a causal relation between this eventuality and the eventuality of the main predication, and unlike comitatives and instrumentals (24)-(25). Since ADs pattern with those adjuncts that can be above the scope of negation, it supports our hypothesis that it involves a causal relation, where the added participant is not part of the causing eventuality.

Furthermore, AD non-core datives radically differ from core datives in this respect, as the latter pattern with Group 2 adjuncts and event participants:

- (29) dani lo natan **la** matana
 Dani NEG gave to-her gift

READING I: 'It is not the case that Dani gave her a gift.'

READING II **unavailable**: Dani's not giving of a gift was to her.

6.2 ADs in Habitual Clauses

In line with the previous set of data involving negation, habitual clauses are also telling as they too obviate the difference between ADs and core datives, substantiating our view of affectedness and affected datives. Consider the contrast between (30) and (31).

- (30) be-yesodi, hu haya me'abed la 'et ha-ravkav šelo
 In-primary school, he was lose.PTCP to-her ACC the-travel.card his
 kol šeni va-xamiši
 every Monday and-Thursday

'In primary school, he used to lose his bus travel card ever so often, affecting her.'

- i. She was affected after each episode (e.g. She had to come pick him up)
- ii. She was affected by his habit (e.g. She went broke)

- (31) be-yesodi, hu haya noten la 'et ha-ravkav šelo
 In-primary school, he was give.PTCP to-her ACC the-travel.card his
 kol šeni va-xamiši
 every Monday and-Thursday

'In primary school, he used to give her his bus travel card ever so often.'

Whereas ADs in (30) can be affected by the entire habit, as well as by the individual episodes constituting it, core datives, as in (31), can only be related to the individual instantiating episodes. Out of context, (30) can be read as indicating that the dative participant can either be affected by the habit of losing the travel card, i.e. a cumulated effect having repercussions only after habitual events of losing the travel card took place. For instance if it leads the affectee to become broke; or an effect can be perceived after each individual instantiating episode; namely the dative participant is habitually affected after each travel-card losing episode. For instance, if

she has to come pick up a kid that can no longer use public transportation. Crucially in (31), the dative core participant can only be associated with the individual instantiating episodes and cannot be interpreted as a recipient or goal of a sum or series of habitual event of giving.

In the case of the AD then, the added participant is not directly related to the underlying eventuality as is a core event participant.

7 Conclusion

In this paper we have proposed a novel organization of the landscape of non-core datives in Modern Hebrew. We have suggested that non-core datives are of two types: truth-conditional and non-truth conditional. Focusing on the former, we defined the added participant as one that is introduced in a separate, contextually available eventuality that is causally related to the eventuality described by the clause. As such it is an affected participant. We have stressed that the effect can be either material or psychological, showing that this distinction is irrelevant to the issue of contribution to truth conditions. This analysis, additionally, enabled us to clearly tease apart core datives from non-core datives in negated and habitual clauses. If on the right track, the proposed analysis can set the basis for a cross-linguistic comparison of non-core datives.

References

- Al-Zahre, Nisrine. 2003. *La Structure du Groupe Verbal en Arabe*. PhD dissertation, Université Paris VIII.
- Al-Zahre, Nisrine and Boneh, Nora. 2010. Coreferential dative constructions in Syrian Arabic and Modern Hebrew. *Brill's Annual of Afroasiatic Languages and Linguistics* 2:248-282.
- Ariel, Mira, Elitzur Dattner, John W. Du Bois, and Tal Linzen. 2015. Pronominal datives: The royal road to argument status. *Studies in Language* 39: 257-321.
- Bar-Asher Siegal, Elitzur A. and Nora Boneh. 2014. Modern Hebrew non-core dative in their context. *Ləšonénu* 74:461-495.
- Bar-Asher Siegal, Elitzur A. and Nora Boneh. 2015. On discursive datives in Modern Hebrew. In *Catalonia-Israel Symposium on Lexical Semantics and Grammatical Structure in Event Conceptualization*. The Linguistics department at The Hebrew University.
- Beebe, Helen 2004. Causing and nothingness. In *Causation and Counterfactuals*, edited by L. A. Paul, E. J. Hall and J. Collins, 291-308. Cambridge MA: The MIT Press.
- Berman, Ruth A. 1982. Dative marking of the affectee role: Data from Modern Hebrew. *Hebrew Annual Review* 6:35-59.
- Boneh, Nora, and Lea Nash. 2011. When the benefit is on the fringe. In *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory XX*, ed. Janine Berns, Haïke Jacobs and Tobias Scheer, 19-38. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Borer, Hagit and Yosef Grodzinsky. 1986. Syntactic cliticization and lexical cliticization: The case of Hebrew dative clitics. In *Syntax and Semantics*, ed. Hagit Borer. New York: Academic Press.
- Bosse, Solveig, Bruening, Benjamin and Yamada, Masahiro. 2012. Affected experiencers. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 30:1185–1230.

- Copley, Bridget, and Phillip Wolff. 2014. Theories of causation should inform linguistic theory and vice versa. In *Causation in Grammatical Structures*, ed. Bridget Copley and Fabienne Martin. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cuervo, Maria Cristina. 2003. *Datives at large*. PhD dissertation, MIT.
- . 2010. Against ditransitivity. *Probus* 22:151-180.
- Dattner, Elitzur. 2014. *Mapping Hebrew Dative Constructions*. PhD dissertation, Tel-Aviv University.
- Davidson, Donald. 1967a. The logical form of action sentences. In *The Logic of Decision and Action*, ed. Nicholas Rescher, 81-95. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- . 1967b. Causal Relations. *Journal of Philosophy* 64:691-703.
- Franco, Jon, and Susana Huidobro. 2008. Ethical datives, clitic doubling and the theory of pro. In *Selected Proceedings of the 10th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium*, ed. Joyce Bruhn de Garavito and Elena Valenzuela, 215-224. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
- Gutzmann, Daniel. 2007. Eine Implikatur konventioneller Art: der Dativus Ethicus. *Linguistische Berichte* 211:277-308.
- Herslund, Michael. 1988. *Le datif en français*. Louvain: Peeters.
- Hole, Daniel. 2005. Reconciling ‘possessor’ datives and ‘beneficiary’ datives – Towards a unified voice account of dative binding in German. In *Event Arguments in Syntax, Semantics, and Discourse*, ed. Claudia Maienborn and Angelika Wöllstein-Leisten, 213-242. Tübingen.
- . 2006. Extra Argumentality – Affectees, Landmarks, and Voice. *Linguistics* 44:383-424.
- Horn, Laurence R. 2008. I love me some him: The landscape of non-argument datives. In *Empirical issues in syntax and semantics (vol 7)*, ed. Olivier Bonami and Patricia Cabredo Hofherr.
- Johnston, Michael. 1994. *The Syntax and Semantics of Adverbial Adjuncts*. PhD dissertation, University of California, Santa Cruz.
- Lagnado, David A, Michael R. Waldmann, York Hagmaye and Steven A. Sloman. 2007. Beyond covariation: Cues to causal structure. In *Causal learning: Psychology, philosophy, and computation*, ed. Alison Gopnik and Laura Schulz, 86-100. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lambert, Silke. 2010. *Beyond recipients: Towards a typology of dative uses*. PhD dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo.
- Lamiroy, Béatrice, and Nicole Delbecque. 1998. The possessive dative in Romance and Germanic. In *The Dative*, ed. William Van Belle & Willy Van Langendonck, 29-74. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Landau, Idan. 1999. Possessor raising and the structure of VP. *Lingua* 107:1-37.
- Linzen, Tal. 2014. Parallels between cross-linguistic and language-internal variation in Hebrew possessive constructions. *Linguistics* 52:759-792.
- Michelioudakis, Dimitris, and Eleni Kapogianni. 2013. Ethical datives: A puzzle for syntax, semantics, pragmatics, and their interfaces. In *Syntax and its Limits: Oxford Studies in Theoretical Linguistics*, ed. Raffaella R. Folli, Christina Sevdali and Robert Truswell. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- O’Connor, M. C. 2007. External possession and utterance interpretation: A crosslinguistic exploration. *Linguistics* 45:577-613.

- Payne, Doris L., and Immanuel Barshi. 1999. *External possession* (Typological studies in language 39). John Benjamins.
- Pylkkänen, Liina. 2008. *Introducing arguments* (Linguistic Inquiry Monographs 49). Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Rákosi, György. 2008. Some remarks on Hungarian ethical datives. In *When grammar minds language and literature. Festschrift for Prof. Béla Korponay on the occasion of his 80th birthday*, ed. Béla Hollósy, József Andor, Tibor Laczkó, and Péter Pelyvás, 413-422. Debrecen: Institute of English and American Studies, University of Debrecen.
- Roberge, Yves and Michelle Troberg. 2009. The high applicative syntax of the dativus commodi/incommodi in Romance. *Probus* 21:249–289.
- Rooth, Mats. 1985. *Association with Focus*. UMass. Amherst, Graduate Linguistics Students Association.
- . 1992. A Theory of Focus Interpretation. *Natural Language Semantics* 1:75–116.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi. 1994. An integrational approach to possessor raising, ethical datives, and adversative passives. In *Proceedings of the 20th Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 461-486. Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society.
- Zúñiga, Fernando, and Seppo Kittilä. 2010. *Benefactives and Malefactives*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

