INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

**Bell & Howell Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
800-521-0600**

UMI[®]

**Extended Predicate Constructions in German:
The *Pertinenzdativ* as a Study in Relevance-based Pragmatic Theory**

by

Robert Arthur Christian Johnson, B.A.

**A thesis submitted to
the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfilment of
the requirements for the degree of**

Master of Arts

School of Languages, Literatures and Comparative Literary Studies

Carleton University

Ottawa, Ontario

August 20, 1999

© copyright

1999, Robert Arthur Christian Johnson

**National Library
of Canada**

**Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services**

**395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada**

**Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada**

**Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques**

**395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada**

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-48394-0

Canada

The undersigned recommend to
the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
acceptance of the thesis

**"EXTENDED PREDICATE CONSTRUCTIONS IN GERMAN:
THE *PERTINENZDATIV* AS A STUDY
IN RELEVANCE-BASED PRAGMATIC THEORY"**

Submitted by Robert Arthur Christian Johnson, B.A.
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Master of Arts

M.-O. Junker, Thesis Supervisor

R. Jeffreys, Director, School of Languages,
Literatures and Comparative Literary Studies

CARLETON UNIVERSITY
September 14, 1999

ABSTRACT

This study focuses on extended predicate constructions traditionally classified as *Pertinenzdativ* in German. These predicate constructions can be extended with a dative encoded NP, although this complement is not foreseen by the lexical entry or valence of the verb. Traditionally, these extended predicate constructions have been classified as different dative types: *Pertinenzdativ*, *Dativ Commodi* and *Dativ Incommodi*, on the basis of a number of perceived differences of semantic features or semantic relations. Recent studies in case theory have attempted to reduce these dative types to a limited number of (abstracted) semantic roles. This thesis argues for a unified analysis of these ‘dative types’ within a relevance-based pragmatic approach which is applied to a limited sample of extended predicate constructions usually classified as *Pertinenzdativ*.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Special thanks to Professor Jutta Goheen whose counsel was instrumental for the development of chapters two and three. I am particularly grateful for the valuable guidance and support provided by Professor Marie-Odile Junker for the duration of this thesis, as well as for the much needed encouragement during its final stages. My final acknowledgement and gratitude is to Laurie, who shares her enthusiasm for life and science with me and who is always a patient listener to my half-worked out ideas.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction
2. Literature review
 - 2.1 Isaçenko (1965)
 - 2.2 Von Polenz (1969)
 - 2.3 Krohn (1980) and Helbig (1981)
 - 2.4 Wegener (1985)
 - 2.4.1 *Enge Haben-relationen*
 - 2.4.2 *Bloße Haben-relationen*
 - 2.4.3 Physical contact
 - 2.4.4 Affectedness
 - 2.4.5 Inanimates and Participation
3. *Duden-Grammatik* (1998): A Test Case
 - 3.1 Semantic criteria
 - 3.2 Syntactic criteria
 - 3.3 Sentence patterns
 - 3.4 Testing the tests
4. Final remarks on the background literature
5. A relevance-based pragmatic approach to extended predicate constructions traditionally classified as PD
 - 5.1 General reasons for a pragmatic approach
 - 5.2 Ambiguity, assignment of referents and context

5.3 Explicatures, implicatures and relevance

5.4 A sample of extended predicate constructions

5.4.1 Body parts

5.4.2 Clothing

5.4.3 Cars

5.4.4 Houses

5.5 Conclusion

1. Introduction

As is so often the case in research, the present object of study has a long tradition of systematic study, dating back to at least the beginning of the 20th century.¹ It may then seem a fairly discouraging enterprise, if not a completely redundant exercise, if it were not for the fact that the *Pertinenzdativ* (henceforth: PD) remains to date a challenging construction to study for linguists.² Moreover, it has also proven a difficult task to define, describe and explain the PD and much time and effort have been spent by linguists and grammarians on distinguishing the PD from other non-prepositional, non-lexical dative types such as the *Dativ Commodi* (DC) and *Dativ Incommodi* (DI), as the discussion of the background literature in chapters two and three will try to make clear.

The following examples represent two basic types of constructions with a Dat-NP usually classified as PD:

(1) PD + V + NP

f. ex.: Mir blutet die Hand.

(2) NP + V + PD + NP

f. ex.: Er kämmt dem Kind die Haare.

¹ See Havers (1911) for a diachronic and typological study of all Indo-European languages, König and Haspelmath (1997) for a review.

² In particular for research on inalienable possession, see: Neumann (1996), Delbecque and Lamiroy (1998).

Although it may seem that (1) and (2) are two and three-place-predicates respectively, the verbs that appear in these constructions do not usually require a PD. This is clear in (3) and (4):

(3) Die Wunde blutet.

(4) Er kämmt das Kind.

Syntactically, such constructions with a PD have been accounted for in a variety of ways by previous authors. In a strictly valence-dependent view, Engel (1994: 158-159) classifies the PD as an attribute, dependent on the valence of another NP. On the other hand, Wegener (1989, 1991) argues that the PD (and the DC/DI) is an argument (with subcategorisation) of V, on the basis of a number of syntactic tests and within the theoretical model of Government and Binding. Moreover, she argues that the PD, DC/DI are structurally assigned by the verb. Between these extremes of attribute versus argument status, the *Duden-Grammatik* has held an intermediary position since 1973 up to and including its latest, sixth, edition of 1998: the PD is directly dependent on another NP, indirectly on V. *Duden* calls this a syntactic *Zweitabhängigkeit* (see 3.2). A fourth alternative has been to assign the PD (and DC/DI) adjunct status (Helbig and Schenkel, 1975). Finally, Rosengren (1986: 286) argues that so-called ‘free’ datives (determined either by S or another NP), such as the PD, fall outside the predicating function of the verb and are introduced into the sentence via a general rule. This makes the PD extrapositional, but distinguishes it from other adjuncts, such as adverbials.

In recent years, it appears generally accepted that the PD and DC/DI have argument status, explained either on the basis of valence extension (Wegener 1985;

Schöfer 1992; König and Haspelmath 1997) or on the basis of structural case assignment (Wegener 1991; Abraham 1995). I will use the term ‘extended predicate construction,’ reflecting the basic notion that the predicate has been extended with an extra place (here: a Dat-NP).³

The difference between an extended predicate construction with a PD, DC or DI interpretation is semantically motivated. Consider the Dat-NP in the following examples, which is usually classified as PD in (5), DC in (6) and DI in (7).

- (5) Er bricht ihm das Bein.
- (6) Er trägt ihr den Koffer.
- (7) Sie zerbricht ihm das Glas.

It is usually argued that the Dat-NP in (5) is considered a ‘Possessor,’ on the basis of a possessive or part-whole relation with the NP *das Bein*. In (6), the Dat-NP would yield a benefactive type reading, whereas in (7) it is considered a malefactive. One may ask, of course, if the PD in (5) is not also to be considered in terms of a malefactive type reading. Alternately, one may also ask if in (6) and (7), a possessive relation cannot also be assumed between the person encoded with the dative and the suitcase in (6) and the glass in (7). The review of the background literature, which presents in a chronological order past research on the PD conducted over the last thirty-five years, will explore these questions and the answers that have been proposed.

The goal of Chapter Two and Three, then, is two-fold: on the one hand, they aim to provide a comprehensive overview of the semantic criteria employed for the so-called

³ This excludes the other non-lexical, non-prepositional dative ‘types’ from this study which do not have

PD, including those that allow for a distinction with the DC and DI. On the other hand, they also aim at showing the limitations of the criteria employed. This will be extensively argued in Chapter Three, where the most recent descriptions and explanations of the PD to date (1998) are reviewed and tested on the examples provided. A summary of the review is given in chapter four.

In Chapter Five, I present the proposal that a unified analysis of the PD, DC and DI is possible, based on the premise that when a hearer encounters a Dat-NP in an extended predicate construction designating a human being, a number of semantic inferences (explicatures) are triggered on the basis of both the linguistic information encoded in the utterance and some non-linguistic information provided by the context. In other words, I will attempt to explain cases of extended predicate constructions with a PD, DC or DI interpretation on the basis of a pragmatic approach, one that is approximatively based on Grice's communicative principle of relevance and Sperber and Wilson's Relevance Theory (1995).

This principle predicts that all intentional communication is treated as a number of assumptions by a hearer constrained by relevance: a hearer will focus on those aspects that appear the most relevant to him. This basic principle is asserted by Sperber and Wilson: *To communicate is to claim an individual's attention: hence to communicate is to imply that the information communicated is relevant* (1995: vii). Sections 5.1 and 5.2 in this study present arguments for a pragmatic approach for extended predicate constructions traditionally classified as PD, while 5.3 provides an outline of the methods employed and an initial application to two examples of extended predicate constructions.

argument status: *Dativ Ethicus* (DE) and *Dativ Iudicantis* (Diu). The following are examples of a DE (a) and Diu (b) respectively: a) Daß du *mir* nicht ins Wasser fällst!, b) Dieser Mantel ist *mir* zu groß.

In 5.4, I will test my proposal on a number of examples taken from the background literature that are normally considered extended predicate constructions with a PD interpretation (body parts), as well as those constructions with either PD, DC or DI interpretation (clothing, houses, cars) depending on the criteria employed. In all cases, the context provided is artificial, but has been verified with native speakers as a *possible* occurrence. The results are discussed in section 5.5.

Chapter 2. Literature review.

Isačenko (1965)

Isačenko researches a number of syntactic constructions with body parts in his article “Das syntaktische Verhältnis der Beziehungen von Körperteilen im Deutschen” (1965). He remarks that in German, as in many languages, a ‘Possessor’ obligatorily appears with a NP designating a body part in non-elliptic sentences. Rejecting the general (possessive) semantic relation ‘X has Y’, Isačenko advances a relation ‘X is a body part of Y’ termed *Pertinenzrelation*. Within the framework of early GTG, he then postulates that a dative in a sentence as *Dem Mann schmerzt der Rücken* is a surface structure construction out of a deep structure transformation from *Der Rücken des Mannes schmerzt*, a transformation he calls the dative-transformation. The possessive transformation *Sein Rücken schmerzt* is considered to be a paraphrase of the dative and to originate from the same genitive construction in the deep structure.

The *Pertinenzrelation* is decisive for a dative-transformation from a genitive, which excludes other dative types from this transformation. For example, Isačenko rejects the dative-transformation for sentences *Mir starb eine Tante* and *Mir ist Peters Schlüssel ins Wasser gefallen* and classifies them as DI (malefactive), since the *Pertinenzrelation* is for him strictly limited to body parts. Finally, Isačenko observes that with the class of transitive verbs, semantic restrictions apply as well: only those indicating that the body part is *affected* allow a dative-transformation. This excludes verbs such as *bewundern*, *entdecken*, *loben*, *betrachten*, *sehen*, *bemerken* (22).

2.1 Von Polenz (1969)

Von Polenz coined the term *Pertinenzdativ* in his article “Der Pertinenzdativ und seine Satzbaupläne”. The article presents a critical and comprehensive overview of traditional grammar, word content grammar and generative grammar, while at the same time advancing a valence-dependent view of the PD to establish a number of *Satzbaupläne* for this particular dative type. This article is of particular interest, because it not only presents a number of syntactic and semantic aspects for the PD, but also incorporates discourse-pragmatic factors.

Von Polenz applies initially a basic syntactic test of elimination to the following examples, observing that neither the dative NP nor the PP (body part) can be left out:

- (8) Er klopfte seinem Freund auf die Schulter.
- (9) Die Sonne scheint dem Mädchen ins Gesicht.
- (10) Der Hund sprang dem Hirsch in die Flanke. (151)

He compares this to the construction *Freunde verhelfen Fritz zu einer Reise*, where the dative and the PP are obligatory as well, indicating the same syntactic dependence on the verb. However, substituting the PP (body part) with another PP (object) in (11) – (13), he notes that the dative does not (and cannot) appear:

- (10) Er klopfte auf den Tisch.
- (11) Die Sonne schien auf das Dach.
- (12) Der Hund sprang in die Grube. (152)

This leads him to the conclusion that the verb *verhelfen* is a three-place-predicate, i.e. has a valence of three arguments, whereas the verbs *klopfen*, *scheinen*, *springen* are two-place-predicates. Although the dative NP, when it appears with these verbs, is syntactically subordinated to the verb (test of elimination), its formal realisation is not dependent on the valence of the verb but on the semantic characteristics of another argument. The fact that the dative can be transformed into a possessive or a genitive attribute supports this view. Like Isačenko, von Polenz sees a deep structure transformation for the dative out of a another sentence pattern: the genitive attribute, for example, *Er klopfte auf die Schulter des Freundes* → *Er klopfte dem Freund auf die Schulter* (155).

The question is then: which semantic criteria (of subcategorisation) or (selection) rules endorse a genitive deep structure transformation into a surface structure dative? First, this dative is restricted to animate beings. Inanimate objects do not allow the dative-transformation, but have to be encoded with the genitive: *Er schlug auf den Deckel der Tonne/ *Er schlug der Tonne auf den Deckel* (von Polenz 155). Sentences that violate this semantic rule are examples of metaphoric transfer and personification, according to von Polenz, who quotes Weisgerber's (1962) example *Die Lokomotive fuhr dem Schnellzug in die Flanke* (von Polenz 155).

Second, von Polenz adopts Isačenko's *Pertinenzrelation*, but extends it from body parts to include clothing and certain lexicalized expressions:

- (13) Der Regen tropft mir auf den Hut.
- (14) Das Wasser läuft mir in die Schuhe.
- (15) Eine Katze lief mir über den Weg. (lex.) (157)

Von Polenz notes that clothing items are not 'parts' in a strict sense, but that a pragmatic condition is added, whether or not they will be considered as such: they have to be worn as in (14) and (15). Nevertheless, he holds to a general semantic relation-of-belonging [*Zugehörigkeitsbeziehung*] between the dative and the 'other' NP, which encompasses both 'parts' and 'possessed items': *Die Relation zwischen B [Acc-NP or PP] und C [PD] unseres Satzbauplanes kann weder auf 'Teil von' noch auf 'Besitz von' festgelegt werden; sie umfaßt beides; Es ist ein 'Zugehören', sei es als 'Teil', sei es als 'Besitz' (von Polenz 162).* A justification is to be found in a comparison of the PD with the adnominal dative, which is restricted to animate beings and which can be combined both with lexemes designating body parts or 'possessed' items: *dem Mann seine Schulter, dem Mann sein Hut, dem Mann sein Leben, dem Mann sein Haus, dem Hund sein Fressen, usw. (von Polenz 163).*

Von Polenz rejects the semantic criterion physical affectedness, which Isačenko observed for transitive verbs. This rejection is based on the fact that transitive verbs of vision *blicken*, *schauen*, and *sehen* do allow a dative, as in *Ich blicke ihr ins Gesicht*. Instead, the third and most important semantic criterion for the realisation of a dative is *participation*. Von Polenz argues that this criterion also incorporates a pragmatic principle: the perspective of the speaker. If the speaker considers the person as having a part in the event or action, then the person will be coded with the dative. If not, the possessive or genitive will be used. This allows von Polenz to secure the difference in meaning between a dative and the seemingly similar possessive and genitive construction. He gives a number of examples, which he interprets intuitively (*nach dem eigenen Sprachgefühl*):

- (16) Ich blicke ihm über die Schulter/über seine Schulter. (dative/possessive)
 (17) Ich gieße der Katze Milch in den Napf/Milch in den Napf der Katze.
 (dative/genitive)

Von Polenz would use the dative in (17) if he were secretly trying to look over someone's shoulder to read a letter the person is holding. The possessive construction would be used when looking over someone's shoulder, to read a sign, for example. In this case, the participation of the person happens to be accidental and no real involvement is then considered by the speaker, hence the possessive. In (18), the sentence would be uttered to indicate that the cat is ensured its milk, or when the cat is physically present. The genitive construction is uttered when the cat is not present, or even when the cat is dead or might never return. Absence or presence of the animate being seems to figure prominently in this pragmatic-semantic criterion. Von Polenz argues that this dative should actually be called "Partizipationsdativ".⁴ Unlike the semantic *Pertinenzrelation* which is a relation between two sentence constituents, the semantic-pragmatic criterion *participation* applies to the meaning of the sentence as a whole. This last criterion is decisive whether or not a dative-transformation actually takes place. In other words, communicative factors influence the choice to use a dative or another construction (genitive-possessive).

These semantic and syntactic criteria – animacy, *Pertinenzrelation*, participation and transformation from an attribute into an argument – provide the justification for a separate classification from the dative object, the last being part of the valence for a number of verbs. Thus, as von Polenz concludes: *Wir müssen also die Pertinenzdativ-*

⁴ This term was initially proposed by Bally (1926) who coined the term *le datif de participation* for these types of constructions.

*Transformation bei der Aufstellung der deutschen Satzmuster und Satzbaupläne
gesondert berücksichtigen (166).⁵*

2.2 Krohn (1980) and Helbig (1981)

Krohn presents an in-depth study on the *Pertinenzrelation* between the dative and the class of lexemes (body parts and clothing) that can enter into the position of the 'other' NP, while basing himself on the previous work of Isaçenko and von Polenz. He separates the two classes of lexemes to denote two separate semantic relations with the dative: a PARS-relation for the class of body parts (like Isaçenko) and a TRÄGER-relation for the class of clothing (von Polenz). Corresponding to these relations are a *dativus possessivus* (with body parts=PD in the sense of Isaçenko) and a *Trägerdativ* (clothing). The justification is essentially syntactic (Krohn 8-9, 118, 189): whereas the dative cannot be eliminated with an NP(body part), it can be left out with an NP(clothing), as shown in (19) to (22).

- (18) Ich trete ihm auf den Fuß/*Ich trete auf den Fuß.
- (19) Ich schlage ihm ins Gesicht/*Ich schlage ins Gesicht.
- (20) Ich trete ihm auf den Schuh/Ich trete auf den Schuh.
- (21) Ich schlage ihm auf den Hut/Ich schlage auf den Hut. (8)

The semantic(-pragmatic) justification for a *Trägerdativ* is that its realisation always presupposes that the person encoded with the dative wears the clothing item in question:
z.B. ist in "Er greift Karin unter den Rock" (=S1) stillschweigend vorausgesetzt, dass

⁵ With the incorporation of more recent research, these sentence patterns are discussed in section 3.3.

Karin im Augenblick der Verbhandlung Trägerin des Rockes ist (Krohn 25). Furthermore, the semantic difference between a PARS-relation and a TRÄGER-relation is *wohl letztlich aussersprachlich bedingt* (Krohn 90). He means by this that parts of the body are always contiguous with the possessor (*unveräusserliches Besitz*), whether in a dative construction or transformed in a genitive construction. This is not the case with items of clothing, where a Träger-relation and/or a Possession-relation can be realised.

These two semantic relations – PARS-relation and TRÄGER-relation – which are restricted to the lexical classes of ‘body parts’ and ‘clothing’, allow Krohn to make a clear distinction between the *dativus possessivus* and *Trägerdativ* on the one hand, and the DC/DI on the other:

Eine Dativkonstituente kann dann niemals ein possessiver Dativ bzw Trägerdativ sein, wenn keinem der Lexeme in Subjekt- oder Objektposition ein Merkmal (Körperteil) und/oder (Kleidungsstück) inhärent ist. Das Fehlen von ‘Körperteillexemen’ und ‘Kleidungsstücklexemen’ als Beziehungswörter für eine Dativkonstituente weisen die entsprechende Dativkonstituente als *dativus commodi/incommodi* aus, was insbesondere für Lexeme gilt, die ein Merkmal (Besitz) oder (Zubehör des Menschen) besitzen. (189)

This characteristic of possession [Besitz] or personal belongings [Zubehör] exemplifies a general *Haben-oder Pertinenzrelation* (see Krohn 26-27). This would be applicable to sentences like *Er ist mir ins Auto gefahren*, where a general semantic relation of possession or disposition links the car to the person coded with the dative.

The distinction of the PD into two separate datives has received strong criticism, especially from Wegener (1985), who voices two important objections. The first one is that body parts are by no means always contiguous with the person coded in the dative: *jede Organtransplantation stellt einem Besitzwechsel von Körperteilen dar, der sprachlich durch eine Dativkonstruktion wiedergegeben wird: (139a) er setzt, pflanzt ihr das Herz des Verunglückten ein [:] er entnimmt ihm Blut* (104-105). Secondly, Wegener notes that: *der Trägerdativ kann allenfalls als eine Variante des Pertinenzdativs gelten, aber dann müßte man auch einen "Fahrerdativ" postulieren für denjenigen, 'dem das Kind ins Auto lief', einen "Bewohnerdativ", für den, 'dem es ins Zelt regnet' ...*(105). One of the problems lies undoubtedly in the difficulty of determining the semantic relations in a given sentence. This is especially evident in Schöfer's (1992) criticism (see below) of Helbig's semantic relations.

Helbig (1981) incorporates Krohn's two datives in his article "Die freien Dative im Deutschen." The semantic criteria Helbig includes for a classification of the 'free' datives (non-argument status: either adverbial-like or attribute-like complements) are four semantic HAVE-relations that can be formulated as (logical) predicates: 1) a *Possessivrelation* (POSS-REL) 'A has (possesses) B'; 2) a *Zugehörigkeitsbeziehung* (HABERE REL) – 'A disposes over B'; 3) a *Teil von-Relation* (PARS-REL) – 'A is part of B'; and 4) a *Trägerrelation* (TR-REL) – 'A wears B'. The following examples (23) and (24) represent a PD and a *Trägerdativ* respectively, where the test of transformation into a possessive shows the difference between the two semantic relations:

- (22) Ich wasche mir die Hände/Ich wasche meine Hände. (324)
 possessiver dativ (=PD) – PARS-REL/PARS-REL

- (23) Ich ziehe mir den Mantel an/Ich ziehe meinen Mantel an. (325)
Trägerdativ – TR-REL/POSS-REL

Following Krohn, the transformation into a possessive (or genitive) shows that the TR-REL changes into a POSS-REL, whereas this is not the case with a PARS-REL.

Schöfer questions the TR-REL in Helbig's example (41) *Er streicht ihr den Rock glatt*, asking whether it is not also possible that the sentence can be understood in such a way, *daß der Rock irgendwo liegt (...) und dort glattgestrichen wird* (Schöfer 37). In this case, the sentence would have the function of a DC (ZUGUNSTEN-REL). This perspective of the hearer leads Schöfer to make several important distinctions. First, he argues that a TR-REL is obligatory with verbs that *ausdrücklich ein Anhaben (inklusive des Beginns oder des Endes des Anhaben) thematisieren* (wie z.B. *anziehen, ausziehen, aufsetzen, [...]*) (Schöfer 37). The TR-REL is with these verbs an implication (entailment), as it is part of the semantic content of the verb. Furthermore, a TR-REL can be realised with other verbs, but it is dependent on the semantic inferences on the part of the hearer: *Die Typikalität* [of the following examples] *bezieht sich auf die semantischen Inferenzen, die der Hörer aus dem grammatischen Angewiesenen ziehen kann* (Schöfer 37). He quotes some of Helbig's examples, noting that a TR-REL becomes less and less likely from the first to the last one:⁶

- (24) Er greift seiner Freundin unter den Rock.
(25) Er öffnet ihr die Bluse.
(26) Das Wasser läuft mir in die Schuhe.
(27) Ich trete ihm auf den Schuh.
(28) Sie streicht sich den Rock glatt. (37)

⁶ The native speakers that I consulted judged the persons encoded with the dative intuitively as 'wearers' of the clothing item in question in all sentences.

What Helbig (and Krohn) in many cases regarded as semantic (HABEN) relations, that allows a classification into different dative types, are according to Schöfer only semantic inferences. Therefore, Schöfer doubts that the limited number of verbs implicating a TR-REL would justify a separate dative type.

Furthermore, Schöfer notes the practical problems of recognizing the specific HABEN-relation that leads to the interpretation of the right dative type. He asks whether the dative in (30) is *Trägerdativ* or DI.

(29) Er reißt ihr ein Loch in den Rock.

If both interpretations are possible, then the distinction of different HABEN-relations cannot be upheld. He asks: *Liegt hier eine TR-REL (sie hat den Rock am Leib) oder eine HABERE-REL (sie verfügt über den Rock) oder eine POSS-REL (sie besitzt ihren Rock) vor?* Finalising his argument that HABEN-relations are inadequate to determine the various dative types, he leaves open the question whether a HABEN-relation is in fact relevant for the description of any dative (type):

Man wird davon ausgehen müssen, daß es sprachlich eine allgemeine Haben-relation gibt, die unterschiedliche natürliche (außersprachliche) Gegebenheiten subsumiert. Die von Krohn und Helbig beschriebenen Dative (mit den speziellen Relationen) sind Spezialfälle eines Dativs, dessen Referent sich in einer speziellen Haben-relation befindet. Genausowenig wie der unterschiedliche Status des REC einer geben-Handlung und einer schenken-Handlung unterschiedliche Typen des

DO (einmal allgemeine HABERE-REL), einmal speziellere POSS-REL) begründet, ist u.E. die Subklassifizierung der fD [freie Dative] unter diesem Aspekt berechtigt. (40)

The distinction between semantic inferences versus implications leads Schöfer to the conclusion that the *Trägerdativ* does not constitute an independent dative type, which is also Wegener's conclusion. This also leads them to reject the various HABEN-relations proposed by Helbig to account for the 'free' datives. The problem remains to define 1) the PD with regard to the semantic relation established between the PD and the 'other' NP, 2) the class of lexemes that establish this relation, and 3) the distinctions between the PD and the DC/DI.

2.3 Wegener (1985)

Wegener's monograph *Der Dativ im heutigen Deutsch* is generally regarded as one of the most comprehensive studies published to-date on the dative by advocates (Abraham 1995; Draye 1996) and opponents (Helbig 1989; Johansen 1988) alike. Her main thesis is that an adequate characterisation of the dative case in German can only be based on a semantic description.

2.3.1 Obligatory versus facultative status

Wegener rejects the long-standing distinction of obligatory versus facultative dative on the basis that the verbs (and therefore the datives) are far too similar (semantically and syntactically) to allow for such a distinction:

Besitzwechsel:	Er gibt ihr das Buch – Er schickt (ihr) Blumen
Beschaffen:	Er verhilft ihr zu dem Buch – Er besorgt (ihr) das Buch
Schaffen:	Er macht ihr Angst, Freude – Er macht (ihr) eine Suppe
Veränderung:	Er wäscht ihr die Haare – Er wäscht (ihr) die Socken
	Mir kommt eine Idee – Das Kind läuft (mir) weg
	Ihm bricht der Arm, das Herz – Der Zweig zerbricht (ihm)
	(86)

Since Wegener establishes argument status for the PD, DC/DI and the DO (with the exclusion of the DE and Diu),⁷ the above observation applies to all of these dative types. Thus, the distinction of the functions between the DO, PD, DC/DI is based on a semantic description.

2.3.2 *Pertinenzrelation* between the PD and the 'other' NP

Wegener notes that in only two extensive areas is the adverbial dative-NP obligatory: *im Bereich der Verben und Verbkomplexe, die psychische Vorgänge, und solche, die Vorgänge am Körper und ähnlich eng zugeordnete [Pertinenz]Elemente beschreiben* (86).

Unlike von Polenz, Krohn and Helbig, however, she rejects the relevance of a class of *Pertinenzelementen* to determine the semantic relation between the PD and the NP(part): *Entscheidend ist nicht die Natur dieser NP, sondern die Natur dieser Relation, die zwischen dem Referenten der 'anderen' NP und dem der Dat-NP auf der*

Sachverhaltsebene besteht (87). In a majority of cases, the nature of this relation is a variation of a *Haben-relation* that is either *vor der Handlung vorausgesetzt* (87) or *durch die Handlung etabliert oder annulliert* (87). She examines these semantic relations and distinguishes between *enge Haben-relationen* or *Pertinenzrelationen* and *bloße Haben-relationen*. She establishes the following *Pertinenzrelationen*:

1. Teil-Ganzes:

- a. konkrete Körperteile: der Magen dreht sich mir um, er pflanzt mir eine Niere ein, er spuckt mir ins Gesicht.
- b. Abstrakte Körperteile: er verdirbt mir die Laune, die Handschrift, die Stimme, mir kommt eine Idee, mir vergeht die Lust, die Angst.
With general restrictions: f. ex. das hebt eure/*euch die Stimmung, das hat seine/*ihm die Aufmerksamkeit erregt.
- c. Krankheiten u.a. Eigenschaften: er hat ihm die Gruppe kuriert (veraltetes Verb), man sieht ihr die Krankheit an, man hört ihm den Professor an
With general restrictions: *er heilt ihr die Krankheit, *er sieht ihr das Gesicht an.

2. Soziale Relation: Verwandte, Freunde, Abhängige

Die Großmutter verwöhnt ihr das Kind, das Kind ist ihr krank geworden, sie machen uns den Schülern aufsässig, in Sarajewo hat man uns den Erzherzog erschossen, er macht ihr ein Kind, tötet ihr das Kind, er setzt ihr einen Embryo ein.

With general restrictions: *er schlägt ihr das Kind, *das Kind ist ihr gesund geworden.

(88-89)

These relations pertain to so-called inalienables, i.e. body parts and family are in many languages considered part of and inseparable from a person. When the inalienable NP is considered separated from the 'possessor', the *enge Haben-relation* ceases to exist and a dative is no longer possible:

⁷ Appendix to Wegener (113-130) where argument status is determined on the basis of syntactic criteria such as *Erfragbarkeit*, *Anaphorisierbarkeit*, *Passivierbarkeit*, *Subjektivierbarkeit*.

- (30) *Er verbrennt ihr die (abgeschnittenen) Haare. (89)⁸

The many exceptions of 1b-c and 2 make such a sub-classification of various (inalienable) *Pertinenzrelationen* questionable. The only semantic relation without any exceptions is the part-whole relation with body parts in 1a.

A second sub-classification of the *Pertinenzrelation* are those that *in einer vergleichbar engen Weise dem Possessor zugeordnet werden kann wie Körperteil dem Körperteil 'besitzer': es handelt sich jeweils um dieselbe – sprachlich, nicht biologisch gesehen – Relation des physischen Kontakts zwischen Possessor und Possessum: diese Relation nenne ich mit Isačenko (1965) Pertinenzrelation (89)*. This second sub-classification of the *Pertinenzrelation* comprises:

3. Kleidungsstücke und Prothesen, sofern sie getragen werden:
Der Regen tropft mir auf den Hut, ihm verruscht die Krawatte, die Brille, das Gebiß, er bespritzt mir den Mantel, er öffnet, zerreißt ihr die Bluse, die Hose ist mir zerrissen, dreckig geworden.
4. Fahrzeuge, sofern sie gefahren werden:
Das Kind ist mir ins Auto gelaufen, er ist ihm gegen das Fahrrad gerannt.
5. Behausungen, sofern sie bewohnt werden:
Man ist uns ins Haus eingebrochen, es regnet uns ins Zelt, er schaut mir direkt ins Zimmer.
6. Wege, sofern sie begangen werden:
Er lief mir über den Weg (lexikalisiert), *er lief mir über die Straße.
(89-90)

⁸ Contested by Johansen (1988: 17-18), who disputes the ungrammaticality of (31). She argues that the Dat-NP in (31) can be a DC, providing the hypothetical situation where a husband, upon the request of his wife, disposes of the hairs.

Wegener concludes as follows: *Jeder Versuch, den Pertinenzdativ nach der semantischen Klasse der Pertinenzelemente zu bestimmen (Krohn 1980, Helbig 1981), ist zum Scheitern verurteilt: Nicht die Natur des Possessums ist entscheidend, sondern die Art der Haben-relation, in dem dieses zum 'Possessor', dem von der Handlung Betroffenen, nicht unbedingt dem Besitzer, steht (90).*

Unfortunately, a *Pertinenzrelation* is not a conclusive criterion for the PD. Some verbs do not allow a PD, despite *enger Haben-relation*: **er lag ihm vor dem Auto, *der Mantel hängt ihm über dem Arm, *er bewundert ihr die Haare (90)*. Therefore, the PD depends on the semantics of the verb and on the nature of the relation that denotes physical contact between the PD and the other NP.

2.3.3 *Bloße Haben-relationen*

Opposed to a *enge Haben-relation* is a *bloße Haben-relation*, similar to Helbig's and Krohn's POSS-REL, which comprises in general *allgemeine Konkreta* and the lexemes of categories 3-6, insofar as they do not express a *Pertinenzrelation*. Wegener explains the difference in *Haben-relation* according to a syntactic test: *Die dann auftretenden Dativ-NPs sind aber anderer Art, was sich syntaktisch daran zeigt, daß sie fakultativ und durch eine 'für'-Phrase ersetzbar sind, sofern die Handlung positiv bewertet ist. Diese Möglichkeit besteht für keinen der unter a-f [1-6] aufgeführten Pertinenzdative (90)*. Leaving aside doubts about the applicability of syntactic criteria to explain semantic relations, I will focus on these two criteria. The first criterion is invalid, because all of the datives in the examples of categories 2 – 6 are also facultative.

Moreover, this contradicts Wegener's general claim that the facultative and obligatory status is irrelevant for the dative, due to the syntactic and semantic similarity of the various verbs. In fact, it does seem to be relevant for the type of *Haben-relation*.

Elsewhere she states: *je enger der physische Kontakt, desto obligatorischer der PD* (93).

The second criterion, the substitution of the PD with a prepositional *für*-phrase, can also be questioned. First, it is always applicable to a DC and never to a DI, since it is precisely *the* test to distinguish the two:

(31) er hat mir das Auto repariert, kaputt gefahren. (91)

Both constructions contain a *bloße Haben-relation* according to Wegener and yet only the first one can be replaced by a *für*-PP: *er hat für mich das Auto repariert/*er hat für mich das Auto kaputtgefahren*. Second, all of the examples of 2-6, in which the Dat-NP expresses a DI, a substitution is not possible. Moreover, contrary to what the author claims, at least one of the examples in 1-6 does allow a substitution with a *für*-PP:

(32) Er öffnet ihr die Bluse (category 4) → Er öffnet für sie die Bluse.

(33) Er zerreißt ihr die Bluse → Er zerreißt für sie die Bluse.

Whether or not the Dat-NP in (33) and (34) can be substituted by a *für*-PP depends on the type of dative: DC or DI. This is a question Wegener herself poses for the DC and DI and then argues that: *eine positive oder negative Bewertung des Geschehens hängt nicht vom Dativ und kaum vom Verb ab, sondern oft von außersprachliche Faktoren ab* (100). This allows her to give up the distinction between a DC and a DI. She

takes them together (see also Schöfer 30). This leaves the Dat-NP in (34) open to a reading of PD or DC/DI. The author's intention to use *den Terminus DC für alle Dat-NPs trans. Verben der Veränderung [...], die nicht PD sind* (100) is not a solution, because a verb like *öffnen*, which is a *Verb der Veränderung*, can alternately be interpreted as a PD (she is wearing the blouse – *enge Haben-relation*) or as a DC (she is not wearing the blouse → no physical contact – *bloße Haben-relation*). In Schöfer's terms, the variable factor as to whether or not the clothing item is worn or not, depends on the inference drawn by the hearer based on the semantics of the verb.

This is only partly true, at least for the PD. Semantic inferences are not only based on the semantics of the verb, but also on the 'other' NP that is linked to the Dat-NP. A simple substitution of the Acc-NP *Bluse* with *Tür* makes this clear: in *er öffnet ihr die Tür*, the interpretation can only be DC and never PD. This indicates that the nature of the 'other' NP is in fact relevant for the interpretation of the PD. This is conceded by Wegener herself at another point:

Die Interpretation des Dativs als Pertinenzdativ, [...], tritt dann auf, wenn C [OBJ-NP] einen Körperteil (am Körper), ein getragenes Kleidungsstück, ein gefahrenes Fahrzeug oder eine bewohnte Behausung bezeichnet, sie ist also abhängig von der Semantik der OBJ-NP C und der zwischen C und B [Dat-NP] bestehenden Haben-relation (Pertinenzrelation=Haben-Relation i.S. des physischen Kontakts [...]). (274)

In summary, this section leads to the conclusion that the syntactic criteria (facultative status and substitution with a *für*-PP) proposed by Wegener do not establish a clear distinction between a *enge Haben-relation* and a *bloße Haben-relation*. The first

criterion is too general, the second is only applicable to a DC. Thus, a distinction between a PD and a DI cannot be made. Finally, this problem is further complicated by the fact that not only the semantics of the verb and the ‘other’ NP are crucial for a distinction between PD and DC/DI, but that this distinction proposed appears dependent on extra-linguistic factors. This becomes increasingly clear in the next section, where the semantic criterion “physical contact” is considered.

2.3.4 Physical contact

In an another section, Wegener shows an important difference between the PD and the genitive or possessive, which is based on the importance of a *Pertinenzrelation*. The genitive and possessive are *für jede Art der Zugehörigkeit verwendbar* (124), the PD is not. She provides the following examples showing that the PD can only be used if the person is in the car at the time of the event. The PD is excluded in (36).

- (34) Ich sah im letzten Augenblick, wie er mir vors Auto lief, und konnte gerade noch bremsen.
- (35) Ich sah vom Fenster aus, wie er vor mein Auto lief und sich dort versteckte. (124)

She concludes as follows: *Wenn jemand vor mein (geparktes Auto) läuft, impliziert das aber nicht, schließt sogar aus, daß er ‘mir vors Auto’ läuft, da dies voraussetzt, daß ich im Auto sitze, sogar: daß ich das Auto fahre. Hier muß zwischen Auto und mir Pertinenzrelation, physischer Kontakt, bestehen, die bewirkt, daß ich durch den sich vor dem Auto abspielenden Vorfall betroffen werde* (124). This statement supports

Wegener's definition of the PD and does indeed show a decisive difference with a possessive and/or genitive attributive construction. However, "physical contact", perceived or real, is not an all-inclusive criterion to distinguish the PD from the DC/DI.

This can be shown with the following counter-examples.

- (36) Die Gauner haben dem Mann gestern abend das Auto zerbeult.
- (37) Man ist uns ins Haus eingebrochen, als wir in Majorca waren.
- (38) Dem Mann ist das Haus abgebrannt, während er in Majorca war.

As a reading of (37), it is possible that the 'Possessor' was in the car at the time of the event, although not necessarily. If the man was in the car, the Dat-NP would be interpreted as PD, if not, it would yield a reading of DC/DI, if one follows Wegener's argumentation. The question is then: does 'physical presence' (in the car) change the function of the Dat-NP, since the *Haben-relation* has changed? Or, will a hearer infer a different *Haben-relation* based on the knowledge of presence or presumed presence, knowledge that is extra-linguistic (37), i.e. is not present in the utterance itself.

In (38), of which the first part *man ist uns ins Haus eingebrochen* is classified by Wegener (category 5) as a *Pertinenzrelation*, the *Pertinenzrelation* should suddenly change into a *bloße Haben-relation*, because the persons were not living in the house at the time of the burglary. It seems doubtful that the interpretation of the Dat-NP should change, depending on whether the house was being lived in or not at the time of the event (as 39), so that a different type of *Haben-relation* needs to or would be established by a hearer. This is not to say that in (37), (38) and (39), a *Haben-relation* is not inferred or even presupposed, but whether one owns, rents, looks after, versus wears, drives in or

lives in the object in question is of doubtful value to the interpretation of a PD versus a DC/DI. The difference between an *enge* and *bloße Haben-relation* – the terms are vague and ambiguous – cannot be the basis for this distinction. There are – naturally – situations, expressed in language, that lend themselves more easily to an interpretation of the Dat-NP as being inside the house or a car (35), as in (40) but not in (41):

- (39) Es regnete ihm ins Haus gestern abend.
 (40) Das Haus brannte ihm gestern abend ab.

On the other hand, Wegener is able to show that the difference between a possessive/genitive and a Dat-NP is the criterion *affectedness*. As a semantic characteristic, however, it too is equally valid for an interpretation of DC/DI and PD.

2.3.5 Affectedness [BETR]

[BETR] is a semantic criterion Wegener claims for every (non-prepositional) dative. First, Wegener re-classifies the dative types (dative object, PD, DC/DI, DE, DIu) into several semantic functions or roles with two-place and three-place predicate verbs that allow or require a dative: REC(ipient), EXP(eriencer), BEN(efactive), COR(respondence), CAUSE, Co-AG(ens). These roles in turn are sub-functions or sub-roles of a *Grundfunktion* or *Hyper-rolle*: *den von einer Handlung an C [OBJ] (bei Intransitiva: einer Veränderung oder einem Zustand von C) Betroffenen zu bezeichnen* (275). This allows Wegener to present a semantically unified conception or function of

the dative⁹, *der Betroffene* who is *eine belebte Größe*, *die in das vom Verb beschriebenen Geschehen nur indirekt involviert ist, von ihm nicht verändert wird und den anderen Handlungsbeteiligten selbständig gegenübersteht* (321). Its semantic characteristics, then, are *belebt, weniger involviert (als der OBJ), weniger agentisch (als der AG)* (321). The OBJ is not simply to be seen as the Acc-NP, this semantic role can equally be coded as a PP, or a Nom-NP:

- (41) Er streicht mir über die Hand.
 Er streichelt mir die Hand.
 Mir schwillt die Hand. (294)

This criterion *Betroffenheit* appears relevant for the PD in light of the examples thus far provided, as in (42). There are two sub-functions related to the [BETR] which are assigned to the PD, that of BEN or REC, *je nachdem ob das Verb eine bloße Veränderung des Pertinenzelements oder einen 'Besitzwechsel' zwischen Possessor und Possessum beschreibt*:

- (42) REC: er reißt ihm ein Haar aus, setzt ihm einen Zahn ein.
 (43) BEN: er wäscht ihr die Haare, rennt ihm ins Auto. (274)

In all these cases, Wegener observes, is the PD not just *objektiv vom Geschehen betroffen*, sondern *fühlt sich subjektiv von ihm betroffen* (274).

⁹ Compare with Fillmore's definition (1968: 24) of the following case role: *Dative (D)*, *the case of the animate being affected by the state or action identified by the verb*.

2.3.6 Inanimates and Participation

Wegener notes a distinct preference in German to denote the Dat-NP with animate beings, as in the following examples:

- (44) Die Wohnung gehört meiner Mutter/*dem Haus.
 Der Pullover paßt dem Kind/*dem Rock.
 Er überweist dem Freund das Geld/*dem Konto. (286)

As she points out, this is a general rule, whose exceptions can be seen as *Übertragung* (conceptual transfer). This is particularly evident with vehicles, where the ability to move makes them “human-like”. The following example denotes the Dat-NP as [BETR]:

- (45) die Lokomotive fährt dem Zug in die Seite. (291)

The next examples are provided by Wegener in an attempt to reject von Polenz’s semantic characteristic [PART] (participation), but they are also prone to a rejection of the characteristic [BETR]:

- (46) er faltet dem Toten die Hände.
 (47) sie merkte nicht, daß ihr der Mann ins Gesicht starrte.

Wegener only remarks that the participation of the *Betroffene* is excluded with these examples, but fails to include von Polenz’s discourse factor: the speaker chooses a Dat-NP instead of a possessive or genitive attribute to indicate that in his or her perspective

the person is considered a participant in the event. Wegener's argument that the no-longer-living can equally be coded with a Dat-NP, as long as *die Toten wie Lebende in sozialen Beziehungen zu ihrer Umwelt stehend gedacht werden* (290), is similar to that of von Polenz: the perspective of the speaker dictates the use of the Dat-NP and therefore as a *Betroffene* (as opposed to a genitive or possessive).

This seems supported in (48), although there is no question of 'real' participation or affectedness on the part of the Dat-NP. Nevertheless, it is clear that the Dat-NP is an unaware participant to the event (the man is looking at her face) and that she is likely to be affected (surprised, upset, etc.) if she noticed what was happening. This, however, is not a semantic characteristic of the Dat-NP itself in (48). It is an inference on the part of the hearer based on her or his knowledge of the world, in which people will react in certain ways when other people stare at them. As it is knowledge shared between speaker and hearer alike, it is possible to attribute this semantic characteristic to the Dat-NP.

Von Polenz's observation of the PD as a participant is not so much inaccurate, as it is redundant. All of the non-prepositional datives are (animate) participants in the constructions of the following examples:

- (48) Ich gebe dem Mann das Buch. (D[ativ]O[bjekt] – REC/BEN)
- (49) Ihm brennt das Haus ab. (DI – BEN)
- (50) Ich öffne ihm die Tür. (DC – BEN)
- (51) Mir schwillt die Hand (PD – EXP)
- (52) Er legt mir die Hand auf die Schulter (PD – BEN)
- (53) Er reißt ihm ein Haar aus (PD – REC)
- (54) Daß du mir nicht ins Wasser fällst! (DE – REF[erent])
- (55) Dieser Hut ist mir zu groß. (DIu – COR[respondent])

Therefore, this semantic characteristic [PART] cannot be used to distinguish between a PD and other dative types.

3. *Duden-Grammatik* (1998): A Test Case.

The *Duden-Grammatik* is included in this review of the PD, because it provides the most recent description and explanation of the PD available. Although a standard grammar, *Duden* is somewhat of an oddity among grammars. It is both prescriptive and descriptive, incorporating both valence theory and traditional grammar, which at times leads to inconsistencies.¹⁰ On the other hand, to include *Duden* also allows for a verification of what has been accepted from the relevant literature on the PD and what has been left out. To take *Duden* as the endpoint of this review, it is possible to test the criteria proposed by *Duden* in more detail on the examples that are provided in the grammar.

3.1 Semantic criteria

Duden cautiously provides a semantic description or definition for the cases, providing the phrase *es kann z.B. bezeichnen* for every definition. The *Dativobjekt* is characterised as a person or thing, *dem sich eine Tätigkeit oder Handlung eher mittelbar zuwendet* (657). Conspicuously absent is the semantic criterion /affected/ for the dative, presumably since it defines the *Akkusativobjekt*: it designates *eine Person (Lebewesen) oder eine Sache, die von einer Tätigkeit betroffen ist* (656). Indeed, Wegener's semantic role for the dative appears to have found little acceptance, a view that can be summed up with Schöfer:

Das Problem [...] ist, daß diese Grundfunktion [des Dativs] mit dem Merkmal /+aff/ sehr wenig Aussagekraft hat. Ein Merkmal /+aff/ aktualisieren immerhin auch andere Kasusfunktionen, wobei es am typischsten wohl bei AkkE aktualisiert ist. (103)

The definition *Duden* provides for the PD is based on a part-whole relation (following Isačenko): *es [der Dativ] kann z.B. bezeichnen: [...] 4. Eine Person (ein Lebewesen) oder Sache, auf die – als Ganzheit – ein Teil bezogen wird* (658). *Duden* calls this dative a *Pertinenzdativ* or *Zugehörigkeitsdativ*. This makes it clear that *Duden* incorporates not only lexemes that are in a strict part-whole relation to the PD, such as body parts, but also those that belong (*zugehören*) to the person. This is evident in the examples provided:

- (56) *Mir* schmerzt der Kopf.
- (57) Ich putze *mir* die Schuhe.
- (58) Er fuhr *dem* Lastwagen in die Seite. (658)

Following von Polenz, however, *Duden* provides a syntactico-semantic criterion for the PD: *Der Pertinenzdativ steht immer dann, wenn in der Ergänzung, auf die sich der Dativ bezieht, ein Körperteil genannt wird, oder wenn bei dem, was in der Ergänzung genannt wird, ein "Zugehörigkeitsverhältnis im weiteren Sinne besteht* (680). Surprisingly, this leaves out (58), because the 'other' NP is neither a body part, nor a lexeme where a *Zugehörigkeitsverhältnis* "im weiteren Sinne" is expressed. Thus, the aforementioned quote (680) contradicts *Duden*'s definition, in which the PD can be animate or inanimate.

¹⁰ In keeping with valence theory, *Duden* describes the verb as the nucleus of the sentence, on which the arguments – including the subject – are dependent. The phrase structures provided with *Duden*'s sentence patterns show a traditional division between subject and predicate, with S(entence) as the highest node.

Taking the semantic part-whole relation expressed in the definition, extended by *Zugehörigkeitsbeziehung* “im weiteren Sinne”, *Duden* holds two semantic relations valid between the PD and the ‘other’ NP.¹¹ I will call these semantic relations a PART-WHOLE relation and a BELONGING-TO relation (*Zugehörigkeitsbeziehung*).

As for the DC/DI, *Duden* defines it as a person, *an deren Stelle und für die bzw. zu deren Vorteil oder Nachteil etwas geschieht*, and provides the following examples:

- (59) Er trägt ihr den Koffer.
- (60) Sie hat mir den Teller zerbrochen.
- (61) Er hat ihr (=für sie) einen Apfel gestohlen. (657)

3.2 Syntactic criteria

In accordance with valence theory, *Duden* classifies the dative in obligatory arguments, facultative arguments and adjuncts (*Angaben*). The dative object is an obligatory argument of the verb (as with *geben*), the PD is a facultative argument and the DC (and DE) is considered an adjunct (678). The adjunctial status of the DC is justified by the test of substitution with a *für*-PP (as in (60)). *Duden* does not mention a syntactic status for the DI, presumably because the two are taken together as indicated by the semantic definition. As argued by Wegener, extra-linguistic factors may dictate a DC or DI reading. This is equally valid for (61), usually regarded as DI. A substitution with a *für*-PP is possible (*Er hat für mich den Teller zerbrochen*) and renders the Dat-NP into a DC.

¹¹ From now on, I will refer to the ‘other’ NP either as NP(part) when it expresses a PART-WHOLE relation, or as NP(belong) when it expresses a BELONGING-TO relation.

According to *Duden's* definition for the PD, the NP(part) or NP(belong) is semantically related to the PD. Syntactically, however, the PD is related to or dependent on the NP(part) or NP (belong). According to *Duden*, this argument has itself a valence, i.e. is capable of opening up a 'place' for an additional argument (the PD). This leads to a *Zweitabhängigkeit*: the second argument is directly dependent on the first argument and indirectly dependent on the verb. *Duden* calls them *Ergänzungen zweiten Grades* (679). The PD is a special type of an *Ergänzung des zweiten Grades*, since it can be transformed into a genitive attribute or possessive: *Ich klopfe meinem Freund auf die Schulter* → *Ich klopfe auf die Schulter meines Freundes* → *Ich klopfe auf seine Schulter* (680). This *Zweitabhängigkeit* justifies the existence of a separate *Satzbauplan* for the PD, as opposed to that of the dative object which is directly dependent on V. A tree structure is here reproduced from *Duden* (680) for a two-place-predicate:

I.

The diagram does not do the notion of (valencial) *Zweitabhängigkeit* justice. The PD is not dependent on the NP(part) in this diagram, but an independent argument. Moreover, Homberger's claim (1993: 81) that *Duden's* *Prädikatsverband* is purely *ad hoc*, can be

applicable to the notion of an *Ergänzungsverband* as well. In any case, this last notion contradicts valence theory¹², to which *Duden* claims to adhere for its sentence patterns.

3.3 Sentence patterns (*Nebenpläne*)

Duden explains the notion of a *Satzbauplan* in the following way: *Man kann hinter der grundsätzlich unendlich großen Zahl konkreter deutscher Sätze eine endliche und überschaubare Anzahl von abstrakten Plänen sehen, Satzbaupläne* (676). These abstract sentence patterns are based on the notion of valence and *Duden* includes both obligatory and facultative arguments for its *Satzbaupläne*. As already seen, the justification for a separate sentence pattern for the PD lies in a syntactic *Zweitabhängigkeit*, which is not the case for the dative object, as it is directly dependent on the verb.

Duden identifies the following 5 sentence patterns (708).

1. **S + Prädikat + PD**
Die Hand blutet dem Kind.
2. **S + Prädikat + PD + AO**
Er streichelt ihr die Wangen.
3. **S + Prädikat + PD + AO + Artergänzung**
Der Friseur färbt der Kundin die Haare blond.
4. **S + Prädikat + PD + Raumergänzung**
Ich klopfe ihm auf die Schulter.
5. **S + Prädikat + PD + AO + Raumergänzung**
Er legt ihm die Hand auf die Schulter. (708)

¹² An element can only be dependent on one other element (Wegener 1985: 108)

In the above sentence patterns, the PD is dependent either on an AO (2 and 3) or a PP functioning as a *Raumergänzung* (4 and 5). In sentence pattern 1, syntactic *Zweitabhängigkeit* cannot be discerned. The PD is attached directly to the predicate in this pattern, as the tree structure reproduced below shows (II). Recourse must then be made to semantic criteria (a PART-WHOLE relation or a BELONGING TO- relation) or to the test of transformation into a genitive or possessive to distinguish this pattern from the dative object (S + Prädikat + DO).

II.

3.4 Testing the tests

This last section considers the syntactic tests and semantic criteria *Duden* has proposed to distinguish the PD from the DC/DI, based on the examples provided with the definitions (657-658) and the sentence patterns (680, 698-700). It also summarises the problem of using syntactic tests to differentiate the PD from the DC/DI.

1. The substitution with a *für*-PP: This test shows adjunct status for the DC and therefore differentiates it from the PD. However, this test is equally valid for the PD in many cases:

- (62) Sein Freund wäscht ihm/für ihn den Wagen. (sentence pattern 2)
- (63) Er putzt ihr/für sie die Schuhe. (2)
- (64) Der Friseur färbt der Kundin/für die Kundin die Haare blond. (3)
- (65) Er [der Arzt] schaut ihr/für sie in die Augen. (4)
- (66) Der Gärtner pflänzt uns/für uns Blumen in den Garten (5)

In some cases, a specific context has to be specified, as in (66) by naming a suitable referent *der Arzt*. On the other hand, the test cannot be applied, when the Nom-NP is a PATIENT and not an AGENT. To do something for someone else implies intention and volition. This explains why (68) and (69) cannot be replaced by a *für*-PP, whereas a substitution is possible in (63) – (67). In other words, one-place-predicates with the PD exclude a substitution:

- (67) Die Hand blutet dem Kind/*für das Kind. (1)
- (68) Dem Bauern/*Für den Bauern verendet das Vieh. (1)

A hand is not conceived of as an entity that voluntarily does something for someone else. Cows cannot be conceived of as dying of their own free will on behalf of the farmer. Whether or not a dative can be substituted with a *für*-PP depends in many cases on background knowledge and the ability of the hearer to imagine a situation where this may apply. Given the semantic content of the substitution ('*für eine Person*'), its use as a *syntactic* test is questionable. Finally, the reason why a substitution of a PD with a *für*-PP is many cases (esp. with body parts) not possible or awkward, results from the impression that the person is incapable of doing something him/herself (as in (70) and (71)), or from a fixed lexicalisation process of the expression (72), or from extension to idiomatic use (73) and (74):

- (69) Er streichelt ihr/??für sie die Wangen.
- (70) Er legt ihm/??für ihn die Hand auf die Schulter.
- (71) Die Zahnärztin zog ihm/??für ihn einen Zahn.
- (72) Seine Freunde gingen ihm/*für ihn aus dem Weg.
- (73) Der Chef steht ihm/*für ihn zur Seite.

It is for all of these reasons that the *für*-PP substitution is inadequate as a syntactic test. A final argument against this test is that some verbs with dative objects also allow a *für*-PP substitution, as for example *holen*: *Ich hole ihm/für ihn das Brot* (Schöfer, 33).

2. Transformation of PD into a genitive attribute/possessive: This test is decisive in showing direct syntactic dependency on the NP(part) or NP(belong). It also provides an additional argument to include an NP(belong) for the PD. However, the test can also be applied to examples of DC/DI:

- (74) a. Ich trage ihr den Koffer.
- b. Ich trage den Koffer der Frau.
- c. Ich trage ihren Koffer.
- (75) a. Sie hat mir den Teller zerbrochen.
- b. Sie hat meinen Teller zerbrochen.

The above examples, classified by *Duden* as DC/DI, should then be reclassified as PD.

However, there are DC/DI-constructions that only allow this test with a change of meaning:

- (76) a. Er hat ihr einen Apfel gestohlen.
- b. Er hat ihren Apfel gestohlen.
- (77) a. Er hat ihr die Tür geöffnet.
- b. Er hat ihre Tür geöffnet.

The ambiguity in (77) depends on the reading of the Dat-NP as DC or DI. If the reading is DI, then the possessive construction in b. is equivalent to a. If the reading is that of DC, then b. is not semantically equivalent. In (78), however, regardless of a reading of DC or DI, the transformation of the Dat-NP into a possessive in construction b. is not and cannot be equivalent to a.

It is even more complicated, when the verb allows a reflexive use, as in the following examples with a NP(belong):

- (78) a. Ich ziehe mir den Mantel an. (Schöfer 39)
- b. Ich ziehe meinen Mantel an.
- (79) a. Ich ziehe ihr den Mantel an. (Schöfer 39)
- b. Ich ziehe ihren Mantel an.

Krohn used a number of syntactic tests to determine the *Trägerdativ*, including the one above, concluding that they led to inconclusive results. However, the results of such examples as in (79) and (80) did lead Krohn to distinguish between a non-reflexive TD and a reflexive TD. Then again, the following examples with *putzen* show semantically equivalent constructions between a and b, both with reflexive use in (81) and non-reflexive use in (82):

- (80) a. Ich putze mir die Schuhe.
- b. Ich putze meine Schuhe.
- (81) a. Ich putze ihr die Schuhe.
- b. Ich putze ihre Schuhe.

A transformation into a possessive cannot be applied to a reflexive PD with a NP(part), leading to ungrammaticality:

- (82) a. Ich putze mir die Zähne.
 b. *Ich putze meine Zähne.
 (83) a. Ich wasche mir die Hände.
 b. *Ich wasche meine Hände.¹³

In summary, the validity of the test of transformation is inconclusive, specifically the transformation of a Dat-NP into a possessive. At the same time, however, it can be shown that the test puts the status of certain Dat-NPs usually classified as DC/DI in doubt (75) and (76). In other words, this syntactic test does not always provide a clear distinction between PD and DC/DI either. Secondly, reflexive use of the PD shows a sharp distinction between those with a NP(belong) versus those with a NP(part): the former allows a transformation into a possessive, the latter does not.

3. PART-WHOLE relation and BELONGING TO- relation: one of these two semantic relations is established, when either a NP(part) or a NP(belong) is linked to a Dat-NP. Of these two relations, the PART-WHOLE relation does not pose a problem for a distinction with a DC/DI. On the other hand, it is difficult to distinguish between a PD and a DC/DI in two-place-predicates (85 – 89) and one-place predicates in (90) and (91), as in the following examples from *Duden*:

¹³ Regional differences may change the ungrammaticality of the examples in b. One native speaker from Münster area (close to the Dutch border) indicated a preference to use the constructions in b, as opposed to those in a.

- (84) Sein Freund wäscht ihm den Wagen. (PD)
- (85) Er putzt ihr die Schuhe. (PD)
- (86) Der Regen tropft mir auf den Hut. (PD)
- (87) Ich trage ihr den Koffer. (DC/DI)
- (88) Er hat mir den Teller zerbrochen. (DC/DI)
- (89) Ihm brannte das Haus ab. (PD)
- (90) Mir zerbrach den Teller. (DC/DI)

The examples in (85), (86) and (88) contain a benefactive reading (unless the situation makes the hearer infer a malefactive). The Dat-NPs in (87), (89) - (91) are usually considered malefactives. However, all of the examples above also strongly imply a BELONGING TO- relation. If someone breaks 'to me the plate', then it is likely to be my plate. If I carry the suitcase for someone else, then it is likely to be that person's suitcase. If there is a distinction between a DC/DI and a PD with NP(belong) in the above examples, it is very difficult to discern. There need not be physical contact between the Dat-NP and the object in question either. Physical contact becomes more likely in descending order from (85) to (87). In (88), it is excluded. In (89) and (91), it is possible.

If the distinction between DC/DI and PD with NP(belong) is that difficult, one may as well ask, whether it should not be given up. The following examples, however, do not contain a BELONGING TO- relation:

- (91) Er baut ihm ein Haus.
- (92) Er backt ihr einen Kuchen.
- (93) Er öffnet ihr die Tür.
- (94) Sie leistet ihm Hilfe.

The examples range from a Dat-NP with an effected object [*effiziertes Objekt*] in (92) and (93), to that with a highly idiomatised expression in (94), and finally to a Dat-NP with an

abstract object in (95). The difference between an affected object [*affiziertes Objekt*] and an effected object is that the first one *unabhängig von der Tätigkeit oder Handlung, die im Prädikat genannt wird, existiert* (656). All of the objects in (85) – (91) are *affizierte Objekte*. On the other hand, the *effiziertes Objekt* designates an object in process, as in (92) and (93). It has no independent existence of its own, which is emphasised by the indeterminate function of the indefinite article. Similarly, the absence of an article with the abstract object in (95) indicates that a BELONGING TO- relation is absent. Moreover, abstracta do not stand in a BELONGING TO-relation to a Dat-NP. Finally, similar to (92) and (93), the emphasis is on a process itself in (95), not on a result.

The only exception is (94), where the Acc-NP is preceded by a definite article. In this case, it is necessary to exclude the Dat-NP in highly idiomatic constructions that have their basis in social conventions. The construction in (94) falls in this category and so does the following example in (96) versus that of (97):

- (95) Er gibt dem Mann die Hand.
- (96) Er gibt dem Mann ein/das Buch.

In (96), there is no indication of a real transaction as indicated by the three-place-predicate *geben*, whereas this is the case in (97). Rather, (96) expresses a culturally based convention of a greeting. The Dat-NP has more in common with the beneficiary of the action of (94), than the recipient coded dative object in (97). From a semantic point of view, they could be taken together and classified as DC.

This discussion of a BELONGING TO- relation suggests that those Dat-NP classified by *Duden* as DC/DI could be equally classified as PD. However, I have provided other examples (92) – (95) where a BELONGING TO- relation is (at least intuitively) not present and where, with the exception of (94), the distinction between an *effizientes Objekt* versus a *affizientes Objekt* and the corresponding indefinite or null-article for the former may provide an indicator of a DC/DI versus a PD, if one wished to uphold a division of these dative types. Finally, *effiziente Objekte* appear with verbs whose semantic content emphasise a process, not a result.

4. Final Remarks on the Background Literature

The preceding selected overview of the PD from Isačenko (1965) to the latest edition of *Duden* (1998) has focused on the semantics of this dative type, in particular the semantic relation that would exist between the PD and the ‘other’ NP. At this point, it is worthwhile to finalise the main points of the preceding review proposal outlined in the introduction.

First, several points can be made with regard to the function and nature of the PD. Only two of the authors discussed above point to a difference in use between the PD and the genitive or possessive. According to von Polenz, the PD introduces an (animate) participant to the event expressed by the verb, dependent on the speaker’s perspective whether or not the person (or animal) is felt to be involved in the event. This function of participation or involvement distinguishes the PD from an adnominal genitive or a possessive determiner. For Wegener, the PD designates an animate entity who is indirectly involved (as opposed to the accusative case), but who is nonetheless seen by the speaker as physically and/or emotionally affected by the event. This does not, however, guarantee a clear distinction between the PD and DC/DI, the latter can equally be seen as (affected – according to Wegener) a participant in the event.

Given the relevance of the criteria involvement and affectedness, it is not a surprise that the animacy restriction for the PD figures prominently for both authors, who see exceptions as examples of (conceptual) transfer. Only *Duden* contests the animacy restriction in its definition for the PD, but provides only one example of an inanimate PD while contradicting itself as it adopts von Polenz’s description for the type of lexemes that

can characterise the 'other' NP. On the other hand, the descriptions and data provided by all authors indicate that the nature of the 'other' NP confirms the animacy restriction for the PD: the lexemes range from body parts and other human characteristics (thoughts, feelings, qualities, etc.) to more general items associated with human beings, such as clothing, cars, roads, and houses. However, as animacy is a (strict) semantic criterion of the DC/DI as well, it cannot form the basis for a distinction with the PD.

Moreover, I have noted one author's (Wegener) attempt to dissolve the traditional dative types into an abstracted semantic or thematic role, *der Betroffene*, including a number of subordinate semantic roles. This is further developed by Schöfer (1992), whose work appears to be the latest major work¹⁴ on the functions of the German dative to date, postulating only three semantic roles or functions for the non-prepositional dative: recipient (REC), beneficiary (BEN) and experiencer (EXP), of which the first one is a prototypical function (based on three-place-predicates, such as *geben*). Combining prototype semantics and semantic feature analysis within an operational valence grammar model (Welke and Meinhard 1980; Welke 1988), Schöfer argues that a deviation from the prototypical function REC to BEN or further to EXP is based on a semantic inference, when the semantic feature /rec/ is absent. The appearance of so-called 'free' datives with two-predicate-verbs indicates an extension of the base valence (*Grundvalenz*) of the verb, whereby a hearer will derive the function of this Dat-NP based on his knowledge from the above functions with dative verbs; either they correspond to the prototypical function REC or an interpretation of BEN or EXP is derived through semantic inference, dependent on the weaker or stronger realisation of variant semantic features of the verb,

¹⁴ Other (recent) major studies on the functions of the German dative are Johansen (1988) and Schmid (1988).

such as /+ben/, /+aff/, /+exp/ etc. Traditional dative types are abandoned in this model: the DC/DI functions either as REC or BEN, the PD as BEN, whereas the DE functions as EXP. Schöfer's semantic functions are here included for completeness sake.

The 'other' NP, which forms the nexus to the PD in terms of definition and delimitation from other dative types, can also be said to provide a crucial point for the type of semantic relation proposed by most of the authors, even if the semantics of the verb are also to be said relevant (Isačenko, Wegener). On the one hand, some authors have argued for specific classes of relational nouns to determine the type of semantic relation involved: the lexical class of 'body parts' for a *Pertinenzrelation* [X ist Teil von Y] in the case of Isačenko, 'body parts' and 'clothing' for a PARS-relation and a TR-relation respectively by Krohn and Helbig. Any other lexical class (generally: possessed items) in the position of the 'other' NP would yield a DC/DI, since another type of semantic relation (HABEN- or HABERE-relation) would be present.

On the other hand, authors like von Polenz and Wegener do not restrict the 'other' NP to specific lexical classes; a variety of lexemes ranging from body parts and clothing, to lexicalised expressions with actions and roads (von Polenz) and to kin, friends, thoughts, emotions and other characteristics associated with human beings (for example, *Handschrift, Stimme*), as well as generally possessed items, such as bicycles, cars and lived-in accommodations (Wegener). According to Wegener, it is the nature of the semantic relation that determines a reading of PD or DC/DI, not the nature of the lexeme itself: if 'physical contact' between the Dat-NP and the 'other' NP is asserted by the speaker with one of the lexemes from categories 1-6, then a *Pertinenzrelation* will lead to a reading of PD. If not, only a *bloße Haben-relation* exists between the Dat-NP and the 'other' NP,

resulting in a reading of DC/DI. I have argued that ‘physical contact’ need not be necessary with some possessed lexemes, such as houses.

Third, most of the authors resort to (syntactic) tests to establish the PD and DC. I have considered those tests on the basis of *Duden*. One of the tests taken up by Isačenko, von Polenz and *Duden* is the possible transformation of the PD into an adnominal genitive or possessive construction. The validity of the test is doubtful, since a) not all PDs allow such a transformation and b) some PDs only allow the test with a connotative change of meaning and c) the test can be also applied to other dative types. The above objections also apply to Isačenko and von Polenz’s proposal of a dative transformation. Moreover, as Heine points out, although the reduction of two structures to one is certainly economic (and elegant), it is inadequate for a satisfactory explanation of language structure in general, nor is it supported by diachronic evidence (1997: 29). The second test is of similarly doubtful value as the first one. The replacement of the Dat-NP with a *für*-PP supposedly identifies the DC. It has been shown, however, that objection c) is also valid for this test. This is particularly relevant with regard to Wegener, who identifies a *bloße Haben-relation* on the basis of facultativity of the Dat-NP and the *für*-PP test. Neither criterion can be considered convincing. In conclusion, the tests proposed do not yield the taxonomies they are supposed to yield.

Fourth, several of the authors have noted the relevance of discourse-pragmatic factors. Most convincingly, this applies to the difference in use between a PD and a genitive or a possessive determiner. But discourse-pragmatic factors also apply to the use of the PD with certain classes of lexemes, in particular ‘clothing’ (von Polenz, Krohn): the PD can only be present when the clothing item in question is worn. In fact, Krohn

carefully stipulates in the introduction that his study is to be understood as a *forschungspragmatischer Ansatz* (Krohn, 9). As has been seen, it is not always evident whether the item in question needs to be worn, driven or lived in, etc., which appears to depend on extra-linguistic factors in a number of cases. I have for many of the examples provided by the various authors suggested that they may be better explained by means of a pragmatic approach. This will be argued for in the next chapter.

Finally, the various semantic relations proposed by the individual authors are characterised in the following schema. Since the term *Pertinenzrelation* has been used differently by some of the authors, I have used alternative terms to avoid confusion.

Author	PD (relation)	DC/DI
Isačenko	Part-whole (body parts)	-
Von Polenz	<i>Zugehörigkeitsbeziehung</i> (<i>Teil und Besitz</i>)	-
Krohn (and Helbig)	Part-whole (body parts) <i>Trägerrelation</i> (clothing)	HABEN-relation HABERE-relation
Wegener	<i>Enge Haben-relation</i> (perceived physical contact)	<i>Bloße Haben-relation</i>
<i>Duden</i>	Part-whole (Belonging to-)	-

5. A Relevance-based Pragmatic Approach to Extended Predicate Constructions Traditionally Classified as PD.

5.1 General reasons for a pragmatic approach

There are a number of general reasons that can be advanced for a pragmatic approach to extended predicate constructions traditionally classified as PD:

- 1) Generally, this construction is considered as a phenomenon of spoken language.
- 2) Related to 1), the Dat-NP is often represented in pronominal form or with the definite article, which may reflect the speaker's estimation that the hearer can easily identify the entity encoded with the Dat-NP. Lamiroy and Delbecque (1998) argue that the pronominal form makes sentences more 'natural.'
- 3) The Dat-NP is highly topical, at least in extended one-place-predicates, as for example in *Ihm brannte das Haus ab*, where the pronominal Dat-NP in first position represents the unmarked order (as opposed to the Nom-NP *Das Haus* which would be stressed if in first position).
- 4) Similarly, the 'other' NP is normally encoded with the definite article, which again may indicate that the information is either to be treated as given or easily identifiable in the information structure or the context.
- 5) A number of authors (Krohn 1980; Wegener 1985; in particular Johansen 1988) have argued that the interpretation of a PD and/or DC/DI appear dependent on extra-linguistic factors.

It is generally known that the code model, i.e. a model that does not incorporate a pragmatic component, has difficulty explaining how hearers disambiguate sentences, establish a context and assign referents. This is relevant for the extended predicate construction traditionally classified as PD, because their frequent use with a Dat-NP in pronominal form and the ambiguity of the definite article with the 'other' NP allow various interpretations, as the following section will argue.

5.2 Ambiguity, assignment of referents and context.

Traditionally, from the earliest studies onwards concerning the so-called PD, authors have considered the class of 'body parts' as the main domain for extended predicate constructions with a PD interpretation. This view can already be found in Havers (1911): *Der Verbalbegriff bezieht sich auf den Leib des Menschen oder auf einen seiner Teile; hier hat der symp. Dativ [PD] sein Hauptgeltungsgebiet, weil eben hier die vitalsten Interessen einer Person beruehrt werden* (Havers, 3). What is usually not considered in previous literature, is that expressions involving body parts allow for multiple interpretations.¹⁵

Consider the extended predicate construction with a PD interpretation in (1). Conventionally, (1) is represented as (2), made explicit with co-indexisation, where A puts his hand onto the shoulder of B. This is not the only possibility, however. In (3), A puts B's hand onto B's shoulder. In (4), the hand is neither co-referent with A or B.

1. Er legt ihm die Hand auf die Schulter. (Er=A; ihm=B)

¹⁵ Exceptions are Isačenko (1965), Rosengren (1986)

2. E_{ri} legt ihm_j die Hand_i auf die Schulter_j.
3. E_{ri} legt ihm_j die Hand_j auf die Schulter_j.
4. E_{ri} legt ihm_j die Hand_k auf die Schulter_j.

Which situations or contexts are possible interpretations in (2) to (4)? As a conventional interpretation of (2), support, sympathy and reassurance is expressed to the person encoded with the Dat-NP, as for example at a funeral. In this case, the person encoded with the Dat-NP may be perceived as a type of 'benefactive', who might welcome the support expressed to him. However, (2) may be also be interpreted as an indication to a person not to get up. The interpretation of (3) may involve a situation where a first aider puts a person's hand onto his injured shoulder to stabilize the shoulder. In (4), the Acc-NP may refer deictically to an artificial hand put on another person's shoulder as a prank.

Hearers usually have little trouble disambiguating utterances such as (1), assigning referents to the Nom-NP and Dat-NP, because they have access to information associated to the linguistic forms in the utterance and a range of other non-linguistic information which allow to establish a context: information is accessed from encyclopaedic knowledge (a type of common or background knowledge) and discourse knowledge (information from previous utterances), as well as information from the physical environment (situational knowledge) incorporated. For example, the utterance interpretation (3) may be assigned within a context of the speaker's story about a car accident she witnessed on the highway.

Therefore, hearers do not simply decode (assign syntactic and semantic meaning to forms) an utterance, but need to make a number of inferences on the basis of linguistic information and other types of information to assign an interpretation to an utterance. In

the next section, I will be following Sperber and Wilson's proposal that inferences are based on and restricted by a general communicative principle: relevance.

5.3 Explicatures, implicatures and relevance

If one abandons the notion of the various dative types, as is my proposal for the PD, DC/DI, it is possible to simply ask what is communicated when a predicate is extended with a non-lexical Dat-NP designating a human being. For example, taking up the following example from *Duden*, which assumptions may be triggered in a hearer when someone utters (5) to her?

5. A to B: Ihm brannte das Haus ab.¹⁶
(Ihm=C)

Scanning the relevant literature for possibilities, the following propositions come to mind:

- (a) C is the possessor of the house. (*Zugehörigkeitsrelation*=PD)
- (b) C disposes over the house. (*HABERE-relation*=DC/DI)
- (c) C was in the house as the house burnt. ("*Physischer Kontakt*"=PD)
- (d) C was not in the house when it burnt down. (*bloße Haben-relation*=DI)
- (e) C was responsible for the event. (*Verantwortlichkeit*¹⁷=DI)
- (f) C is affected by the event. (*Betroffene*=PD or DI)
- (g) C had no control over the event.

¹⁶ All examples, unless explicitly indicated otherwise, are to be taken here as assertions.

¹⁷ In Eisenberg (1993: 301)

Arguably, all of these assumptions in (a) – (g) and others communicated through (5) are possible utterance interpretations, based on the combination of the lexical meanings in the utterance and the assumptions or hypotheses drawn from them through inference.¹⁸ These assumptions may be strong or they may be weak. They may also be cancelled. For example, if B has background knowledge that C owns a house in the Grünewald Straße, then B will infer (a) and also (b). She may even assume (a) and (b) to be factual, since she has visited C's house a number of times. Moreover, if she has no knowledge of C owning any other houses, then she will infer that it is the house in the Grünewald Straße that burnt down. This further assumption will become part of the context and may be validated or cancelled in the discourse following A's utterance, or, if B is confident that it 'must be' the house she visited, she may not ask for further information concerning C's house.

Following Sperber and Wilson (176, 182), I will distinguish between two types of assumptions:

- 1) Explicature: an assumption that is derived through inference from the utterance itself.
- 2) Implicature: an assumption that is not a development of the logical forms encoded by the utterance (i.e. assumptions inferred *exclusively* from non-linguistic information)

For example, an explicature of (5) would be (6), whereas (7) would be an implicature.

6. The speaker asserts that C is affected by the event.
7. The speaker wants me to provide lodgings for C.

¹⁸ Sperber and Wilson (68): "Inference is the process by which an assumption is accepted as true or probably true on the strength of the truth or probable truth of other assumptions."

All of the assumptions in (a) to (g) are, of course, explicatures that may be triggered by the utterance.

It was Grice (1975) who first formulated a number of conversational principles based on the Co-operative Principle (CP) of communication, i.e. the implicit agreement speakers and hearers make to follow a number conversational principles or maxims when they participate in communication. These maxims or norms are mere guidelines, speakers may intentionally violate them (for example, by lying) or flout them (irony, etc.). Grice established the following maxims:

- I. Quantity: be as informative as required.
- II. Quality: do not say what you believe to be false or for which you have no evidence.
- III. Relation: be relevant.
- IV. Manner: make your contribution in a brief, coherent manner, while avoiding ambiguities and obscurities of expression. (45-46)

A great deal of discussion has ensued to establish the right number and type of conversational principles. I follow Sperber and Wilson's proposal that the principle of relevance is sufficient to explain all intentional communication.

There are several premises put in place with this principle. First, the hearer will assume that the speaker's utterance is the one that is the most relevant he could have uttered (compare Grice's maxim III), i.e. conveys accurately the information the speaker intended to convey. Any utterance interpretation will be based on this premise. For example, suppose that A asserted (8) instead of (5). The assumptions triggered will be of a different kind: that C burnt down the house with intention and volition. Or A could

have uttered (9), triggering (a) but without specifying whether the event happened to C or was caused by C.¹⁹

8. A: Er brannte das Haus ab.

9. A: Sein Haus brannte ab.

Comparing (8) with (5), it is clear that in (5) – contrary to (8) – C had no control over the event happening. Thus, (g) is triggered. Furthermore, the event may also be measured in the impact it has on C – in accordance with the anthropocentric view expressed in this utterance – as it is an event that happened to him. This allows (f) affectedness to be triggered. The background knowledge that B has of such events will make her infer further assumptions as to C's loss of the house, possessions, as well as well as further consequences.

Explicatures such as (a) possession, (b) disposition are, unless there is specific knowledge of B about C, dependent on the encyclopaedic knowledge associated with the concept itself. If the phonological representation of the NP *Haus* is linked to the concept, encyclopaedic information leading to the explicature of possession could be triggered (people own houses), but is probably not as strong as (b) disposition (people live in houses). Of course, explicatures such as (a) or (b) may strengthen (f), but they are not necessary. What this implies is that there may more and less relevant explicatures triggered through the utterance.

¹⁹ Although, based on her knowledge of the world and without other contextual assumptions concerning the referent C, the hearer may create a stronger assumption that the event happened to C than that it was caused by C. Moreover, the hearer would expect the speaker to state (8) instead of (9) in accordance with the principle of relevance.

Second, the principle of relevance constrains the number of assumptions possible by relating them to a context. Hearers draw conclusions seemingly automatically in utterance interpretation. If the number of explicatures (assumptions made explicit by linguistic information) and implicatures (assumptions exclusively based on extra-linguistic information) were not constrained, the inferences would be made *ad infinitum*. Adopting Sperber's and Wilson's (132) definition, the hearer's context contains a set of assumptions in which the new assumptions are compared and processed. The context, as discussed in the previous section, contains assumptions based on information from previous utterances (discourse knowledge), encyclopaedic knowledge and the physical environment. For example, suppose that B told A that C was house-sitting last night, upon which A utters (5). This information will trigger the explicatures (e) responsibility,²⁰ (g) lack of control and (d) 'physical contact' (C was in the house), but not (a) possession. Moreover, (f) affectedness (C feels guilty, is upset, ...) is likely to be triggered as well. Within the artificial context of the house-sitter provided in the preceding example, (e) may be triggered as the most relevant implicature, but also (f) and (g).

Up till now, the explicatures (c) 'physical contact' and (d) 'no physical contact' have not been discussed. Suppose that the Dat-NP in the extended predicate construction in (5) is used deictically. A notices C across the street and utters (5) to B, while nodding in C's direction. B looks over and notices that C's face and arms are bandaged. At this point, B will assign referent status to C, inferring not only (f), but also (c) 'physical contact' (and physical affectedness) on the basis of the physical evidence presented. In

²⁰ For ease of exposition and to avoid redundancy, the explicatures are not represented each time in propositional form.

this case, the Dat-NP in the extended predicate construction has a traditional PD interpretation.

Of course, A may have meant another pedestrian on the other sidewalk, in which case B will have made an erroneous inference of (c), due to the wrong assignment of the referent. Communication can and does fail (occasionally). Quite often, however, the hearer will request more information if she is unsure of the utterance. In the situation provided, B may ask (10) to establish the referent:

10. Meinst du den da, mit den...

The explicature (c) may be inferred through discourse knowledge, as in the conversation between B and A in (12) and (13):

11. B: Wo ist Johann?

(Johann=C)

12. A: Im Krankenhaus. Ihm brannte das Haus ab.

Note that (c) is not explicitly expressed in (12). B will infer (f) and (c), however, by inferring a causal relationship between the two utterances: the burning down of the house and the reason why Johann is in the hospital. Johann may be in the hospital for other reasons than the one inferred in (12), but if this were the case, B would have expected A to have used other means to express this linguistically. However, if A continues (12) with (13), B will cancel explicature (c) and infer that Johann is in the hospital for the friend who looked after the house. This information will cancel (c) and trigger (d) instead.

13. Ein Freund kümmerte sich um das Haus, während er in Majorca war.

A DC type interpretation may be unlikely, but is not impossible. Suppose that A utters (5) to B, while raising his eyebrows and in such a way that B perceives it as a sarcastic remark about C. (14) is an explicature of (5), as is (15):

14. A house associated to C burnt down.

15. C is affected by the event.

Unlike the explicature in (15), B replaces it with the implicature in (17) on the basis of other contextual information (raised eyebrow, intonation of the voice, ...). Moreover, the non-linguistic information provided by A about his attitude towards C indicates to B that A's communicative intention in uttering (5) really conveys (16) and (17):

16. The speaker implies that C is not affected by the event.

17. The speaker implies that a house associated to C did not burn down by itself.

There is an obvious contradiction between what is explicated in (14) and (15) and what is implicated in (16) and (17). Suppose that at this point, B remembers a conversation with A in which A mentioned that C had a large amount of debt. This information allows B to solve the contradiction by means of a large number of inferences, leading to the implicature in (21):

18. The speaker implies that C had something to do with the burning down of the house.
19. C may own the house.
20. If the house burnt down and C had insurance, then the insurance may pay.
21. If the insurance pays, C is the beneficiary of the insurance payment. (DC)

If B comes to this heavily context dependent conclusion of (21), then B may assign a benefactive type reading (DC) in the extended predicate construction in (8). Moreover, the explicatures (f) affectedness and (g) lack of control are cancelled. It appears, on the other hand, that a weaker assumption of 'control' is inferred.

Summarizing example (5), I suggest that the two explicatures (f) and (g) are in all contexts triggered as relevant in the utterance interpretation. Moreover, they correspond more or less to a DI interpretation. If a PD interpretation is to be inferred, then information needs to be accessible in the context to give rise to explicature (c). A DC interpretation is possible in certain (rare) cases, but is severely dependent on a large number of implicatures. A hearer may refuse to go through the time and effort to establish all of these inferences and instead simply ask what the speaker is implying.

Other explicatures, such as (a) possession and (b) disposition may be triggered by specific background information about the referent, but are less prominent explicatures for the utterance interpretation in (5). Compare the last observation with the extended one-place-predicate in (22) where possession of a glass might be an explicature in a specific context (the person broke it in her own home, for example), but is not likely to be triggered by the information contained in the encyclopaedic entry (people own glasses(?) versus people use glasses to drink out of). It is not a relevant explicature.

22. Ihm zerbrach das Glas.

Which relevant explicatures are triggered by (22)? What is explicated in (22) is that the person accidentally broke the glass. Physical contact may or may not have happened: the person may have broken it by accidentally dropping it or by bumping into a table causing the glass to fall; this information is accessible from the physical environment. If the event was not accidental, the person uttering (22) would have used a Nom-NP instead of a Dat-NP, as in (23):

23. Er zerbrach das Glas.

In (23), the use of the Nom-NP triggers the explicatures intention and volition. Both are absent with the Dat-NP in (22). Thus, a speaker who wanted to convey that the event was intentionally caused would use (23).

Suppose that A hears the shattering of glass in another room of the house. Upon entering the other room, he utters (24) whereupon B answers (25).

24. A: Was ist hier passiert?

25. B: Ihm zerbrach das Glas.

If A interprets B's answer, the explicature 'lack of control' on the part of C figures prominently: B indicates that it was an accident. However if, as B utters (25), A notices blood on C's hand, this explicature will strengthen the relevance of the explicature 'affectedness' for the utterance interpretation based on new information provided from

the physical environment: A infers that B indicates C's affectedness by the event. This is a context dependent conclusion, but one that is still motivated linguistically. If this is the case, then A has inferred a traditional PD interpretation.

Comparing (5) with (22), one may say that the same explicatures are triggered: (f) affectedness and (g) lack of control. However, the explicatures triggered in both utterances are not equally relevant. Intuitively, a person whose house burnt down is considered more affected than a person who dropped a glass. Although certain explicatures (such as evidence of physical contact-affectedness) may increase or decrease the degree and thereby the relevance of the explicature, the person who lost her house is still considered as more affected by the event than the person who received a few cuts due to broken glass. Thus, in (5), the explicature 'affectedness' is inferred to be more prominent in the utterance interpretation than the explicature 'lack of control' (C was unable to stop the fire), whereas in (22) the explicature 'lack of control' is triggered (C was unable to prevent the glass from falling), unless contextual assumptions lead the hearer to infer otherwise: it happened to be the glass that Marie-Antoinette drank from the night before her execution. Are there degrees of 'lack of control'? Presumably not. Either one is capable of preventing something from happening or one is not. The verbs in both examples are resultatives. The Dat-NP is possible in (5) when the verb is resultative, but not when the verb is durative, as in (29):

26. *Ihm brennt das Haus.²¹

Thus far, I have tried to apply the principle of relevance and the derivation of explicatures and implicatures on the basis of two examples, showing how they may alternately yield traditional DI, PD or DC interpretations. The first example is traditionally classified either as DI or PD, dependent on the criteria employed in the classification. The second example is usually classified as DI. Moreover, the previous two examples examined seem to indicate that the explicatures (g) lack of control and (f) affectedness are triggered in all contexts, except when a traditional DC interpretation is yielded due to a number of context dependent implicatures. This may allow for a careful hypothesis that the difference between a DC type interpretation versus a DI type interpretation is precisely the absence of these two explicatures. Within the scope of this study, these explicatures in particular will be studied in section 5.4 on a sample of extended predicate constructions usually classified as PD.

5.4 A sample of extended predicate constructions with a PD interpretation

5.4.1 Body parts

Suppose that the following conversation takes place between A and B in (27) and (28):

27. A: Sollen wir in die Stadt gehen?
 28. B: Mir schmerzt der Bauch.

²¹ Compare Wegener (1985), section /RES[ultativität]/, (69-74), as well as her example: *Dem Bauern reift das Korn/*dem Bauern wächst das Korn* (71). Contrary to (28), examples with a body part are grammatical: *Ihm brennt die Haut*.

In (27), B does not give a direct answer to A's question, as in a 'yes' or a 'no'. Moreover, there is no social convention that would predict that (28) is either 'yes' or 'no'. However, the principle of relevance predicts that A will treat the response as pertinent to her question and lead her to a number of assumptions from which she will deduce an utterance interpretation. Given the encyclopaedic information of the NP *Bauch* which will be anaphorically related to the referent (in this case the speaker), the explicature (c) physical contact will be triggered, as it will be assumed in all further examples involving body parts. Furthermore, since the semantics of the verb trigger the prominent explicatures (f) affectedness (pain) and (g) lack of control (of the pain), A will conclude that B cannot go to the city at this point, even if he wished to go.

Consider an enrichment of the situation in (29) and (30). A finds B still reading the newspaper at the kitchen table, when he has normally long left for work. Surprised to find A still there, she utters (29). B's smile appears to contradict his response.

29. A (surprised): Gehst du heute nicht zur Arbeit?
 30. B (smiling): Mir schmerzt der Bauch.

A may consider B to be lying or joking. She may also infer that B's stomach really does hurt, but that this provides a convenient justification to call in sick and stay home. This would be an implicature of (30). If this is so, this final implicature dependent conclusion of (30) would override the explicatures (f) affectedness and (g) lack of control, whereby the proposition expressed in the utterance is instead inferred to be of benefit to B. Thus, this would lead to a traditional DC interpretation.

The example is, again, a rare one and also dependent on the degree of affectedness denoted by the verb. Not all of the following extended one-place-predicate constructions which trigger the explicatures (a) and (b) may apply in this situation:

- 31. Mir tut die Hand/der Fuß/der Arm weh.
- 32. Mir brennt der Rücken/das Gesicht.
- 33. Mir juckt die Haut.

On the other hand, a response like (34) would seem comical, whereas (35) is nonsensical or indicative of a lie:

- 34. Mir fallen die Haare aus.
- 35. Mir klappern die Zähne.

However, all of the examples trigger (f) affectedness and (g) lack of control. A DC type interpretation is in most cases very unlikely and highly dependent on contextual information provided for an implicature dependent conclusion.

Extended two-place-predicates are common in German, as can be deduced from examples presented in previous chapters. Unlike the verbs in one-place-predicates, in two-place-predicates verbs with an Acc-NP may be neutral with regard to explicatures of (f) affectedness and (g) lack of control.

Consider the conversation in (36) and (37). The verb *waschen* is neutral with regards to (f) and (g).

- 36. A: Was machst du heute nachmittag?
- 37. B: Ich wasche Johann die Haare.

If A knows that B is referring to his six-year-old son, the explicatures (f) affectedness and (g) lack of control can be triggered. For one, he infers that the child requires help because of its age. He may also infer that the child does not like to have his hair washed, since soap may enter and sting his eyes. The explicature (f) affectedness may be strengthened by information of a similar childhood experience from A's own Long Term Memory (LTM).

However, whereas in one-place-predicates the type of referent is not relevant to trigger the two explicatures, this is the case in (37). For, suppose that B answers with (38) and the NP 'Maria' refers to B's wife.

38. B: Ich wasche Maria die Haare.

How is A to interpret this answer, if A assumes that Maria is quite capable of washing her own hair and that adults in general do so without the help of others. One possible interpretation is that A assigns a 'benefactive' type reading to Maria, on the weaker assumption that Maria has asked B to wash her hair. In this case, B infers a DC type interpretation on the absence of the explicatures (f) and (g). Unlike the DC type interpretation in one-place-predicates, however, this one is not an implicature dependent conclusion, but one triggered through the information associated to the referent denoted by the Dat-NP. This would suggest that a relevant explicature of 'control' is triggered.

However, suppose that B has a factual assumption that Maria was in a recent car accident and had broken both hands. It would appear that (g) lack of control would be

triggered, but not (f) affectedness. B may still infer that A is doing this for Maria's benefit, and likely on her request: Maria may wish to wash her own hair, but is incapable of doing so. Thus, (g) lack of control may be triggered for a DC interpretation as well. It appears that when the verb semantics is neutral with regard to the explicatures (f) and (g), information from the referents and other contextual assumptions are accessed to assign a DC interpretation to the referent. Thus, the hypothesis that (g) is not triggered when a traditional DC interpretation is inferred is not a valid one in all cases. The question, however, is whether the explicature is a relevant one or, on the contrary, the benefit inferred to the person is decisive to allow a DC interpretation.

This appears to be the case in (39), where (g) lack of control is evident.

39. Und die Ärztin pflanzte ihm die Niere ein.

However, the patient is here interpreted as a benefactive on the basis of the importance of the event itself, triggering background knowledge that such operations may save a person's life. The necessity of having the operation allows for a DC interpretation to take place. The link to a mental script of 'operations' and the benefits that are inferred from them, will establish a DC type interpretation.

This is not to say that 'control' may not be inferred as well, triggered by a person's background knowledge. Suppose one reads (40) and (41) in a historical novel.

40. Ein Sklave kam und wusch dem König die Füße.

41. Der Ritter küßte der Jungfrau die Hand.

Here, the hierarchical relationship expressed in (40) between the two persons involved, indicates that the person encoded with the dative is in fact in control over the event expressed by the verb. It is also unlikely that certain daily actions, routines, are inferred as affecting the person particularly. Verb semantics are again indicative whether or not (f) affectedness is triggered. Similarly, certain social norms of respect and deference as expressed in (41) may be considered as 'normal' or ritualized for the period without inferring any particular change of (negative) emotional state for the Dat-NP involved.

The last part of this section will consider extended two-place-predicates with a PP. Verb semantics are in most cases indicative of the degree of affectedness involved, compare such verbs as *klopfen*, *schlagen*, *stechen*.

Consider also the utterances in (42) and (43) where the explicature 'lack of control' is the same, but 'affectedness' is inferred to a different degree due to the ellipsed 'instrument'. 'Physical contact' is in both cases a relevant explicature which strengthens the explicature (f). It is difficult to envisage a DC type interpretation for any of these types of utterances.

42. Eine Biene hat mir in den Finger gestochen!

43. Witness: Ein junger, etwa zwanzig-jähriger Mann mit kurzen, schwarzen Haaren hat ihm in den Bauch gestochen.

In (45), B's response to A's question is given, when A returns from a concert B had wanted to go to, but for which the tickets were sold out. Naturally, A's intention is to find out about the concert.

44. A: Und? Wie war's?

45. B: Der Mann neben mir trat mir ständig auf den Fuß.

B's response is unlikely to be the one A expected, since B does not refer to the concert itself. However, A will infer that B expresses an event that was an inconvenience to her enjoying the concert, something she was affected by and could not do much about. Thus, A may infer the following assumptions within the context provided, still reflecting A's original communicative intention.

- 46. a. B would have enjoyed the concert, if it hadn't been for (45)
- b. B is not sure that the concert was good, because of (45)
- c. The concert was probably good, except for (45)

Thus, the Dat-NP, referring back to the speaker, triggers the explicatures (f) and (g).

Moreover, A will infer that (f) affectedness is not only physical (the stepping on her foot), but a change of state emotionally (annoyance, anger, etc.), which is why the event is relevant enough to be expressed in response to the question in (45), even if the communicator was likely more interested in hearing about the concert he had wanted to go to, then the nuisance caused by another concertgoer.

The extended two-place-predicates with a PP discussed do not appear to allow a DC interpretation. Again, this is due to the semantics of the verbs involved which pattern predominantly with causative verbs. However, when the semantics of the verb portrays the event as 'neutral' (47) or as 'positive' (48) with regards to the person encoded with the Dat-NP, a DC interpretation is inferred, since the action brings a positive contribution to the well-being of the person. Consider (47) and (48).

47. Er legte dem weinenden Mann die Hand auf die Schulter.
 48. Sie streichelte ihm über den Handrücken.

Thus, the semantics of the verb is in most cases decisive whether or not the two explicatures are triggered for the utterance interpretation, leading to either a DI type interpretation or a DC interpretation.

Finally, although stative verbs are rare²² with extended predicate constructions they may be considered ‘neutral’ with regard to the explicatures (f) and (g). Consider the following utterance in (49) with the stative verb *hängen*, in response to A’s question in (50). Suppose that the context is B’s return from a visit to their son who moved away to go to university recently.

49. A: Wie geht es ihm?
 50. B: Gut, aber die Haare hängen ihm bis auf die Schulter.

A may well assume that B’s response indicates a disapproval of the son’s long hair. Moreover, A may also assume that if the son did not wish to have his hair that length, he would have it cut. A further assumption may be that the son likes his hair that way. In that case, the explicatures (f) and (g) lack of control will not be triggered in this context.

5.4.2 Clothing

Suppose that A holds up a pair of torn jeans and asks B (51). From B’s

²² Wegener, 1985: 68

answer in either (52), A will infer that B was wearing the pair of jeans at the time and that B could not do anything to prevent it. The difference between the Dat-NP in (52) versus the possessive in (53), is that in (53) B is inferred to have ripped the jeans intentionally and that he was not wearing them at the time. Thus, in (52), the explicatures (g) lack of control and (f) affectedness (to a lesser degree) will be triggered.

- 51. A: Was ist denn hier passiert?
- 52. B: Mir ist die Hose zerrissen.
- 53. B: Ich habe meine Hose zerrissen.

Consider the possibility that A asked the question, because she was aware that B really disliked this particular pair of pants. B's answer will be processed within this contextual assumption and his answer indicates that the ripping of the pants occurred incidentally, an event over which he had no control, but A may still conclude that it is of benefit to him: B is happy to be rid of the pants. If this is the case, A may then assign a DC type interpretation to the Dat-NP that refers back to the speaker. At that point, however, (g) lack of control is still a relevant explicature, but (f) affectedness is cancelled on the basis of previous contextual assumptions, thus yielding an implicature dependent conclusion of a DC interpretation.

In the following situation A is driving a car and suddenly utters (54) to B, triggering (f) affectedness and (g) lack of control. B may, on the basis of these explicatures, make further inferences as to why A uttered (54). What A is implicating is that she cannot see, because of (54) and would like B to reach over to take off her glasses. This example is unlikely to yield a DC type reading.

54. A: Mir beschlägt die Brille.

Consider the situation where A and B are planning to go to the park with their four-year-old daughter. A calls up to B and asks (55), to which B responds with (56).

55. A: Seid ihr fertig?

56. B: Ich putze ihr gerade die Schuhe.

From B's response, A will infer that the four-year-old daughter is with B and that B is brushing her shoes while she is wearing them. As in (38), although (g) lack of control may be triggered on the part of the person encoded with the dative, it is unlikely that (f) affectedness is triggered. The semantics of the verb is considered 'neutral' and a DC type interpretation is inferred.

When considering extended two-place-predicates with a PP designating an item of clothing, a similar interpretation may be triggered as with body parts. Suppose that A uttered (57) instead of (45), then B may still make the same assumptions, on the basis of a simple abductive inference (58).

57. Der Mann neben mir trat mir ständig auf den Schuh.

58. If the man stepped on her shoe, then he stepped on her foot. Thus, A is upset.

As in (45), the relevant explicatures (f) and (g) are triggered.

5.4.3 Cars

Interestingly, there are not any extended one-place-predicates mentioned with cars in the previous literature on the PD. Extended two-place-predicates, on the other hand, are common. Suppose that A and B's car broke down and had to be towed to a garage. The next day, they receive a phone call from the garage, after which the following conversation takes place between A and B.

59. B: Und?

60. A: Sie haben uns das Auto repariert. Es war nichts Schlimmes.

In this case, the Dat-NP triggers a 'benefactive type' reading, i.e. that the repair was done for them and that it was done successfully. The verb semantics is again indicative of the absence of (f). It is unlikely that (g) will be triggered, as well. Again, such events are represented as necessary actions and part of background knowledge: when the car breaks down, you have it taken to a garage where it is repaired, after which you pay, etc.

Suppose, however, that their car had been stolen. In this case, the phone call is from the police to tell them their car has been found. To B's (59), A responds with (61), implicating that it may have been a joy-ride. Similarly, B may infer that conclusion if A utters (62). In this case, (f) and (g) are triggered and a traditional DI interpretation inferred.

61. Sie haben uns das Auto kaputtgefahren.

62. Sie haben uns den BMW zerbeult.

Consider the following extended two-place-predicate with a PP. Suppose that A is late for a meeting with B. Upon arrival, she utters (63) to B.

63. Entschuldige die Verspätung, aber jemand fuhr mir ins Auto.

B will infer that A's late arrival is due to (63). Moreover, it is clear that this event was beyond A's control and affected her, in particular if B infers that the accident happened on the way to the meeting. This would be a traditional PD interpretation. However, A continues with (64) and B revises his assumptions accordingly, canceling the explicature 'physical contact'. Thus, a DI interpretation is yielded. In both cases, however, (f) and (g) are triggered.

64. Es passierte gerade, als ich das Haus abschließen wollte.

5.4.4 Accomodations

In (5), a detailed analysis was conducted to determine the various explicatures triggered within a number of contexts. It was found that (f) and (g) were prominent explicatures in all contexts. Similarly, in the following example, A will infer that B did not have a good time, because of the explicatures (f) and (g).

65. A: Habt ihr Spaß gehabt beim Campen?

66. B: Es regnete uns ins Zelt. Johann hatte vergessen, es zu reparieren bevor

wir abführen.

5.5 Conclusion

In this final chapter, an attempt was made to apply a relevance-based pragmatic approach to a number of extended predicate constructions, in order to show how this could lead to a unified analysis of the dative types traditionally classified as PD, DC and DI. An initial application in 5.3 showed that the explicatures ‘physical contact’ and ‘possession’ (PD type interpretation) appeared less relevant for the utterance interpretation involved, whereas ‘lack of control’ and ‘affectedness’ were found to be relevant in all contexts considered (DI and PD type interpretation). Moreover, when a context dependent implicature conclusion was provided, it appeared that these two explicatures were ‘cancelled’ (non-relevant for the final interpretation), which led to a DC type interpretation. This in turn provided the basis for the hypothesis that the difference between a DI type interpretation and a DC type interpretation revolved around the relevance or non-relevance of these two explicatures. This hypothesis was subsequently tested on a sample of extended predicate constructions usually classified as PD.

The one-place-predicates considered in this sample verified the hypothesis: the explicatures ‘lack of control’ and ‘affectedness’ were relevant explicatures, but not when a context dependent implicature conclusion led to a DC type interpretation. Verb semantics were in all cases indicative of the two explicatures triggered. However, two-place-predicates did not verify the hypothesis. It became clear that a DC type interpretation could be inferred, even if the explicature ‘lack of control’ was triggered (as

in (39). Instead, it appeared that a DC or DI type interpretation was dependent on the absence or presence of the explicature ‘affectedness’, which in most cases was directly dependent on the semantics of the verb involved. The type of referent (such as (40) and (41) was relevant in some cases for a DC type interpretation.

Further research, in particular working with a much larger sample and ideally with empirical data, should be conducted to verify the findings of this thesis.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abraham, W. 1995. "Struktureller und lexikalischer Kasus: Dativ gegenüber Akkusativ," in W. Abraham (ed.) *Deutsche Syntax im Sprachenvergleich*. Tübingen, G. Narr Verlag. 161-239.
- Bally, Ch. 1926. "L'expression des idées de sphère personnelle et de solidarité dans les langues indo-européennes", in *Festschrift Louis Gauchat*. Aarau : H.R. Sauerlander. 68-78.
- Duden. 1998. *Grammatik der deutschen Gegenwartssprache*. Mannheim, Bibliographisches Institut.
- Draye, L. 1996. "The German dative," in W. Van Belle and W. van Langendonck (eds.) *The Dative*. Volume I. Amsterdam, John Benjamins. 155-215.
- Eisenberg, P. 1994. *Grundriss der deutschen Grammatik*. 3rd edition. Stuttgart and Weimar, Verlag J.B. Metzler.
- Engel, U. 1993. *Syntax der deutschen Gegenwartssprache*. 3rd edition. Berlin, Erich Schmidt Verlag.
- Fillmore, C.J. 1968. "The Case for Case," in E. Bach and R.T. Harms (eds.) *Universals in Linguistic Theory*. New York, Rinehart. 1-88.
- Grice, H.P. 1975. "Logic and Conversation," in P. Cole and J. Morgan (eds.) *Syntax and Semantics. Volume 3: Speech Acts*. New York, Academic Press. 43-58.
- Havers, W. 1911. *Untersuchungen zur Kasussyntax der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Strasbourg.

- Heine, B. 1997. *Possession*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Helbig, G. 1981. "Die freien Dative im Deutschen," in *Deutsch als Fremdsprache* 18. 321-332.
- Helbig, G. 1989. "[Review] Josef Schmid: Untersuchungen zum sogenannten freien Dative in der Gegenwartssprache und auf Vorstufen des heutigen Deutsch," in *Deutsch als Fremdsprache*, 2. 120-121.
- Helbig, G. and Schenkel, W. 1975. *Wörterbuch zur Valenz und Distribution deutscher Verben*. 3rd edition. Leipzig, Bibliographisches Institut.
- Homberger, D. 1993. *Das Prädikat im Deutschen*. Opladen, Westdeutscher Verlag.
- Isačenko, A. 1965. "Das syntaktische Verhältnis der Beziehungen von Körperteilen im Deutschen," in *Studia Grammatica*, 5. 7-27.
- Johansen, I. 1988. *Der heterogene deutsche Dativ 1988*. Heidelberg, Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- König, E. and Haspelmath, M. 1997. "Les constructions à possesseur externe dans les langues d'Europe," in J. Feuillet (ed.) *Actance et valence dans les langues de l'Europe*. Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter. 525-606.
- Krohn, D. 1980. *Dativ und Pertinenzrelation*. Goteburger Germanistische Forschungen 20. Göteborg, Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis.
- Lamiroy, B and Delbecque, N. 1998. "The possessive dative in Romance and Germanic Languages," in W. Van Belle and W. van Langendonck (eds.) *The Dative*. Volume II. Amsterdam, John Benjamins Publishing Company. 29-74.
- Neumann, D. 1996. "The dative and the grammar of body parts in German," in H.

- Chappell and W. McGregor (eds.) *The Grammar of Inalienability : A typological Perspective on Body ParTerms and the Part-Whole Relation*. Berlin/New-York, 745-779.
- Von Polenz, P. 1969. "Der Pertinenzdativ und seine Satzbaupläne," in *Festschrift für Hugo Moser*. Düsseldorf. 146-171.
- Rosengren, I. 1986. "Gibt es den freien Dativ?," in *Deutsch als Fremdsprache*, 5. 274-287.
- Schmidt, J. 1988. *Untersuchungen zum sogenannten freien Dativ in der Gegenwartssprache und auf Vorstufen des heutigen Deutsch*. Frankfurt, Peter Lang Verlag.
- Schöfer, G. 1992. *Semantische Funktionen des deutschen Dativs*. Münster, Norkus Publikationen.
- Sperber, D. and Wilson, D. 1995. *Relevance*. 2nd edition. Oxford, Blackwell Publishers.
- Wegener, H. 1985. *Der Dativ im heutigen Deutsch*. Tübingen, G. Narr Verlag.
- Wegener, H. 1989. "Komplemente in der Dependenzgrammatik und in der Rektions- und Bindungstheorie. Die Verwendung der Kasus im Deutschen," in *Zeitschrift für Germanistische Linguistik* 18. 150-184.
- Wegener, H. 1991. "Der Dativ – ein struktureller Kasus?," in G. Fanselow and S. Felix (eds.). *Strukturen und Merkmalen syntaktischer Kategorien*. Tübingen, G. Narr Verlag. 70-103.
- Weisgerber, L. 1962. *Die ganzheitliche Behandlung eines Satzbauplanes: Er klopfte seinem Freunde auf die Schulter*. Düsseldorf, Pädagogischer Verlag Schwann.
- Welke, K. 1988. *Einführung in die Valenz- und Kasustheorie*. Leipzig,

Bibliographisches Institut.

Welke, K. and Meinhard, H.-J. 1980. "Prinzipien einer operativen Valenzgrammatik."

Zeitschrift für Germanistik, 1, 2. 146-156.