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1 Introduction

Today’s Goal: investigation of non-core dative arguments, (1) vs. (2), in Turkish with a focus on their status.

(1) caused experiencer
a. Adam-lar ban-a sinir-i-ne 4 defa torba-ya koy-muş-lar
   man-PL I-DAT anger-POSS-DAT put-PERF-PL
designation-1poss-DAT
   kargo-m-u.
   package-1POS ACC
`The men wrapped my package four times in a bag to my anger.'

b. O-na gıcıklıği-ı-na, yani surf o-nu gıcık et-mek
   he-DAT irritation-POSS-DAT that.is just he-ACC irritation do-INF
   uğru-na en iyi arkadaş-ı-yla öp-üş-tü-m.
   for-DAT most good friend-3POSS-COM kiss-REC-PST-1SG
`To his irritation, just to irritate him, I kissed his best friend.'

(2) (benefactive) applicative

Başbakan-imiz-ı-a dans et-mek isti-yor-um.
prime minister-1POSS-PL-DAT dance do-INF want-PROG-1SG
`I’d like to dance for our Prime Minister.' (Tonyalı 2015:22)

• As the paraphrase in (1b) makes clear, a salient reading is that the woman performs an event, i.e. ‘kissing the best friend’, with the intention of causing another event/state, i.e. ‘the irritation of her boyfriend’.

• The dative argument in (1) is contained in a nominal structure of the form “NP-DAT experiencing eventuality-POSS-DAT”.

• This structure expresses an experiencing eventuality via various roots, such as inat ‘spite’, hınç ‘resentment’, haset ‘jealousy’, sinir ‘anger’, gıcıklık ‘irritation’ or uyuzluk ‘annoyance’.

• I use the label affected experiencer (AffEx) following Bosse et al. (2012) (cf. caused experiencer (CEx) from Ingason 2016).

Results Previewed

• Dative-marked arguments in (1) and (2) have different status, and occupy distinct syntactic positions in the structure.
  – Whereas the former is a caused experiencer, the latter is a simple applicative.

• The AffEx in Turkish are introduced by the syntactic head Aff(ect) of (Bosse and Bruening 2011; Bosse et al. 2012), whereas benefactives are introduced by the Applicative head (Pykkänen, 2008).

• AffEx occurs in a nominal construction (cf. Ingason 2016 for Icelandic, Berro and Fernández 2018 for Basque).
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2 Syntax of non-core datives

2.1 Applicatives

A non-core dative argument can be added to the stative verb tut- ‘hold’:

(3) Kemal Hasan için / Hasan-a şemsiye-yi tut-tu.
    Kemal Hasan for / Hasan-DAT umbrella-ACC hold-PST
    ‘Kemal held the umbrella for Hasan.’

It can combine with unergatives.

(4) O-na çalı-iyor-um
    s/he-DAT work-PROG-1SG
    ‘I am working for his/her benefit.’

It can also combine with dynamic or stative unaccusatives, as in (5), but not
inchoatives, e.g. break, die, fall, (6).

(5) a. benefactive
    Öğrenci-ye büyük ikramiye çık-tı.
    student-DAT big prize emerge/appear/come out-PST
    ‘A student won/got the biggest lottery prize.’ (Tonyalı 2015:38)

b. malefactive
    İş yine ban-a kal-dı.
    work again I-DAT remain-PST
    ‘The work remains for me (to do) again.’

    Ayş-DAT vase break-PASS-PST
    Intended: ‘The vase broke on Ayşe accidentally.’ (Tonyalı 2015:102)

    soldier country-3POSS for /*country-3POSS-DAT die-PST.3SG
    ‘The soldier died for his country.’

- Only the former can combine with these two verb types in addition to
  transitives (Pylkkänen 2008).
- In order to incorporate non-core arguments into the syntax, Pylkkänen
  (2002, 2008) proposed that cross-linguistically languages exhibit two types
  of applicative constructions: (i) high applicative, and (ii) low applicative.

(7) a. High-applicative (Pylkkänen, 2008, (13))

    VoiceP
    NP
    Voice
    ApplP
    NP
    Appl
    VP

b. \(|\text{Appl}] = \lambda P_{vt}.\lambda x.\lambda e. P(e) \& \text{Appl.}(x)(e)\)

    - a relation between an individual and an event, being introduced
      above the VP
    - e.g. dative experiencers/benefactives/malefactives

→ Let us turn to distributional and interpretational diagnostics, which
  demonstrate that affected experiencers are of a different category than
  applied arguments.

2.2 Distributional Differences

The two dative arguments differ in their distributional properties.

- the host structure
  - The applicative argument simply has the form of a dative-case
    marked DP.
  - The experiencer, however, is expressed in a more articulated
    structured which contains an experience predicate in addition to the
    experiencer argument itself.

- predicate-types
  - Applicatives can’t occur with change of state (inchoative) predicates.

    Kemal Hasan-DAT die-PST
    ‘Kemal died for Hasan.’
   apple tree-ABL as if woman-DAT fall-PST
   ‘The apple fell from the tree as if for the woman.’

   – Experiencers can;

(9) a. Kemal ban-a inad-i-na öl-dü.
   Kemal I-DAT spite-POSS-DAT die-PST
   ‘Kemal died to spite me.’

b. Şimşek sanki ban-a geceğ-i-na çarp-tı.
   lightning as if I-DAT irritation-POSS-DAT strike-PST
   ‘The lightning struck as if to my irritation.’

• possibility of co-occurrence

    I-DAT irritation-POSS-DAT Hasan-DAT umbrella-ACC hold-PST
    ‘S/he held the umbrella for Hasan to my irritation.’

b. Kemal ban-a sinir-i-ne Hasan-a dans et-ti.
   Kemal I-DAT anger-POSS-DAT Hasan-DAT dance do-PST
   ‘Kemal danced for Hasan to my anger.’

• no coordination of the two arguments

(11) [Ban-a ve Hasan-a] şemsiye-yi tut-tu.
    I-DAT and Hasan-DAT umbrella-ACC hold-PST
    ‘S/he held the umbrella to me and Hasan.’

(12) [Ban-a geceğ-i-na ve Hasan-a inad-i-na]
    I-DAT irritation-POSS-DAT and Hasan-DAT spite-POSS-DAT
    şemsiye-yi tut-tu.
    umbrella-ACC hold-PST
    ‘S/he held the umbrella to my irritation and to Hasan’s spite.

    I-DAT irritation-POSS-DAT and Hasan-DAT umbrella-ACC hold-PST
    ‘S/he held the umbrella for Hasan and to my irritation.’

2.3 The syntax of AffectP

• Bosse et al. (2012); Bosse and Bruening (2011) deal with similar considerations for mainly German, Hebrew and Japanese.

• They propose that experiencers are introduced by a syntactic head Aff(ect).

• Aff can merge with VP, (14a), or VoiceP, (14b).

• This head introduces an experiencing event and an experiencer.

(14) a. low attachment
   VoiceP
       NP<sub>subj</sub>
       Voice
       Aff<sup>P</sup>
       NP
       Aff
       VoiceP
   – predicts the agent is irrelevant = German (15)

b. high attachment
   AffP
   NP
   Aff
   VoiceP
   NP<sub>subj</sub>
   Voice
   VP
   – predicts the agent is relevant = Japanese (16)

(15) Alex zerbrach Chris Bens Vase.
    Alex broke Chris.DAT Ben GEN vase.ACC
    ‘Alex broke Ben’s vase and...
    1. ... it matters to Chris because it was Ben’s vase.’
    2. ... #it matters to Chris because Alex did it.’ (Bosse et al., 2012, (65))

(16) Sachi-wa Masa-ni Aiko-no kabin-o kowas-are-ta.
    Sachi TOP Masa DAT Aiko GEN vace GEN break-AFF-PST
    ‘Sachi had Masa break Aiko’s vase on him and ...
    1. ... it matters to Sachi because it was Aiko’s vase.’
    2. ... it matters to Sachi because Masa did it.’ (Bosse et al., 2012, (66))

• Bosse et al. (2012): the judgments are subtle, and actual contexts can make the agent more or less relevant.

• In Turkish, judgments seem to vary

3Out of 5 speakers, 3 speakers (Mehmet Köse, Aslı Gökbel, and myself) pattern like German in that the identity of the agent is not crucial, whereas 2 (Bülent Akkuş, Hasan Yıldırım) more like Japanese (as such what matters is the existence of an event that leads to an experiencing event.)
• For the sake of exposition, I will adopt a low attachment site for AffP (with the caveat that I will assume adjunction of AffP).

3 The semantics of non-core datives

3.1 Interpretational properties

Several meaning-related diagnostics demonstrate that experiencers and applicatives differ (diagnostics from Potts 2005 and Bosse et al. 2012).

Benefactives do not require that the non-selected argument be sentient and aware, as in (18).

(18) Kemal merhum baba-sı-na çiçek topla-di.
Kemal dead father-3POSS-DAT flower pick-PST
‘Kemal picked some flowers for his late father.’ (father can be dead at the time of picking)

Affected experiencers require the argument to be sentient and aware.

(19) a. #Kemal merhum baba-sı-na çiçek topla-di.
Kemal dead father-3POSS-DAT flower pick-PST
‘Kemal picked some flowers for his late father.’ (father can be dead at the time of picking)

b. #Adam kapı-ya inad-i-na kapı kol-u-nu
man door-DAT spite-POSS-DAT door handle-CM-ACC
değiştir-me-di
replace-NEG-PST
‘The man didn’t replace the door handle to the spite of the door.’

(19a) is infelicitous because the father is dead, and (19b) because the office is non-sentient.

(20) Context: Kemal died first.

a. Sonra anne-si öl-dü.
   then mother-3POSS die-PST
   ‘Then his mother died, too.’

b. #Sonra anne-si Kemal-e hınc-ı-na öl-dü.
   then mother-3POSS Kemal-DAT resentment-POSS-DAT die-PST
   ‘Then his mother died to Kemal’s resentment, too.’

(20a) is another example of sentience.

(21) Kemal Hasan-a şemsiye-yi tut-ma-dı.
Kemal Hasan-DAT umbrella-ACC hold-NEG-PST
‘Kemal didn’t hold the umbrella for Hasan.’
(Kemal held the umbrella, but not for Hasan)

(22) Kemal Hasan-a inad-i-na öl-me-di.
Kemal Hasan-DAT spite-POSS-DAT die-NEG-PST
‘Kemal didn’t die on Hasan.’
i. Kemal didn’t die, but if he had it would have angered/mattered to Hasan.
ii. *Kemal died, but it didn’t anger/matter to Hasan.

In order to negate the affected experiencer, we need to add değil ‘not’.

(23) Kemal Hasan-a inad-i-na değil, Murat-a inad-i-na
Kemal Hasan-DAT spite-POSS-DAT die-NEG-PST
not Murat-DAT spite-POSS-DAT die-NEG-PST
‘Kemal didn’t die, not to the spite of Hasan, but of Murat.’
The meaning of experiencers projects beyond a yes-no question, while that of applied arguments does not.

Thus, experiencers contribute not-at-issue meaning while benefactives do not.

Interestingly, similar to benefactives, experiencers can also contribute some at-issue meaning, as such can be questioned as \( \text{wh} \)-phrases, (24), (Bosse and Bruening 2011:73).

(24) Leyla, kim-e gıcıklık-na araba-yı satın al-di?
Leyla who-DAT irritation-POSS-DAT car-ACC purchase take-PST
‘To whose irritation did Leyla buy the car?’

Expectedly, benefactives can also be questioned.

(25) Leyla, program-ı kim-e kur-du?
Leyla program-ACC who-DAT install-PST Q
‘Who did Leyla install the program for?’

Interim summary

- The affected experiencers and applied arguments are of different nature.
- They differ in various interpretational and distributional properties.
  - Experiencers contribute not-at-issue meaning, applicatives don’t.
  - This warrants identifying them in two distinct projections.

3.2 The semantics of AffP

- Aff also takes the event property denoted by its sister constituent to be the source of the affected experiencer’s experience via a conventional implicature.
- In order to capture these components, the denotation in (43a) is provided for Aff, with Source defined in (43b).

(26) a. \(|\text{Aff}| = \lambda p\cdot \lambda x.p(e) & \exists e'(\text{exper}(e) & \text{Exp}(x)(e')): \forall e''(p(e'') & \text{Source}(e'')(e')) \in D_{<,vt,et>}\)

b. Source \(\rightarrow \lambda e.\lambda e'. e \text{ is the source of } e'\) (Bosse et al., 2012, (63))

- Source is a function that holds true iff the first event argument is the source of the second event argument.
- Bosse et al. (2012) captures the conventional implicature part after the colon.

- The observation, that part of the meaning of an affected experiencer construction is at-issue while part of it is an implicature as illustrated in this section, is captured by this split in the meaning:
- The source information is on the not-at-issue tier, while the affected experiencer is projected on the at-issue tier.

4 Experiencer in the noun phrase

The dative experiencer is introduced in a nominal structure, independently of a verbal property.

4.1 The category-defining head closest to root is \( n \)

- The category-defining head closest to the root is a nominalizing \( n \), as in (27a) and not verbalizing \( v \), which would yield a construction similar to English gerund type (glossing over Voice etc), as in (27b).

(27) a. \( n\sqrt{\text{root}} n\) 

b. \( n\sqrt{\text{root}} v n\)

- The external status of gıcıklık ‘irritation’ or uyuzluk ‘annoyance’ as a noun is uncontroversial.
  - It bears the overt nominalizing morphology -lık,
  - as well as the possessive morpheme, which in these instances has lost its possessive function (Göksel and Kerslake, 2005, 70; Ash Göksel, p.c.) and dative case.
  - I leave open the status of dative on the experiencer predicate, as a DP or PP.
  - Also, most of the caused experiencers surface as root nominals, e.g. inat ‘spite’, hınç ‘resentment’, haset ‘jealousy’ or sinir ‘anger’

(28) a. \( n\sqrt{\text{INAT}} n\) 

b. \( n\sqrt{\text{GİÇİK}} n\) -lık
• A light-verb construction is needed to use these nominals in a verbal context.

(29) a. Son gelişme-ler ben-i gıcık et-ti.
last development-PL I-ACC irritation do-PST
‘The recent developments irritated me.’
b. *Son gelişme-ler ben-i gıcık-tı.
last development-PL I-ACC irritation-pst
‘The recent developments made me resentful.’

• Not all eventualities have a verbal counterpart.

Kemal Hasan-DAT resentment-POSS-DAT die-NEG-PST
‘Kemal didn’t die to Hasan’s resentment.’
b. *Son gelişme-ler ben-i hınç et-ti.
last development-PL I-ACC resentment do-PST
‘The recent developments irritated me.’

• case-matching
– If the mechanism that introduces thematic datives crucially depends on composition with a verb, the expectation is that verbs that correspond to caused experiencer predicates to also take dative arguments.
– We find that sometimes they do, but not always.

(31) a. pro ban-a I hased-i-ne yeni bir araba al-müş.
I-DAT jealousy-POSS-DAT new a car buy-PST
‘S/he apparently bought a new car to my jealousy.’
b. Hazret-i Âdem’in evlát-lar-ı-ndan Kânil, Hâbil-e haset
prophet Adam-GEN son-PL-POSS-ABL Cain Abel-DAT jealousy
et-ti do-PST
‘Of Adam’s sons, Cain was jealous of Abel.’

Kemal I-DAT irritation-POSS-DAT loud sound-COM music
listen-PST
‘Kemal listened to loud music to my irritation.’
b. Kemal’in davranış-lar-ı *ban-a / ben-i gıcık et-ti.
Kemal-GEN behavior-PL-POSS I-DAT / I-ACC irritation do-PST
‘Kemal’s behavior irritated me.’

4.2 The type of nouns allowed

• Since the DP in a AffEx construction refers to the causing event, not all nouns are appropriate in this position. Contrast (33a) with (33b).5

(33) a. Dans ban-a gıcık-ı-na-ydı.
dance I-DAT irritation-POSS-DAT-pst
‘The dance was to my irritation.’
b. #Kemal ban-a gıcık-ı-na-ydı.
Kemal I-DAT irritation-POSS-DAT-pst
‘Kemal was to my irritation.’

same restriction for Icelandic, as shown in (34), (Ingason 2016).

(34) a. Dansinn var stelpunum góð skemmtun.
dance.the.NOM was girls.the.DAT good entertainment.NOM
‘The dance entertained the girls well.’ (Ingason, 2016, 89)
b. #Jón var stelpunum góð skemmtun.
John.NOM was girls.the.DAT good entertainment.NOM
‘John entertained the girls well.’ (Ingason, 2016, 92)

No such restriction is observed when the AffEx is used in a verbal context, (35), where the mere existence of the individual Kemal might lead to the feeling of irritation, without necessarily him doing anything.

dance / Kemal I-ACC irritation do-PST
‘Dance/Kemal irritates me.’


5 It is possible to pragmatically coerce it in (33b) to make it acceptable (in Icelandic as well). However, in that case Kemal refers to ‘something that Kemal did’ or ‘some event that featured or involved Kemal’ rather than the individual Kemal himself.
4.3 The dative is part of the AffectP/noun phrase

⇝ the whole AffEx construction behaves as a constituent, based on topicalization (36) and replacement by a wh-word (37).

    I-DAT irritation-POSS-DAT they  dance do-PST-PL
    ‘To my irritation, they danced.’

       irritation-POSS-DAT they  I-DAT dance do-PST-PL
       Intended: ‘To my irritation, they danced.’

(37) Niçin dans et-ti-ler? [Ban-a gıcıklığ-ı-na],
    ‘Why did they dance? [to my irritation = so that I’d get irritated].’

Aside: despite the presence of a possessive morpheme on the caused predicate, it is not possible for the experiencer argument to surface with genitive, (38).

(38) *Kemal Hasan-ın gıcıklığ-ı-na bütün gece dans et-ti.
    Kemal Hasan-GEN irritation-POSS-DAT whole night dance do-PST
    ‘Kemal danced the whole night to Hasan’s irritation.’

Thus, this construction is not possessor raising (e.g. Adger and Ramchand 2007).

• We can assume the following structure:

(39) AffP
    DPexp  Aff  nP
    n  \sqrt{ROOT}

5 Implementation

5.1 ApplP

(40) Kemal Leyla-ya şemsiye-yi tut-tu.
    Kemal Leyla-DAT umbrella-ACC hold-PST
    ‘Kemal held the umbrella for Leyla.’

(41) VoiceP
    Kemal
    Voice
    ApplP
    Leyla’ya for Leyla ApplBen
    şemsiyeyi tuttu
    held the umbrella

(42) a. [VP] = λe.hold(e) & Theme(e, the umbrella)
    b. [ApplP] = λe.Benef(e, Leyla) & hold(e) & Theme(e, the umbrella)
    c. [VoiceP] = λe.Agent(e, Kemal) & Benef(e, Leyla) & hold(e) & Theme(e, the umbrella)

5.2 AffP

Recall that Bosse et al. (2012) provide the denotation for Aff.

(43) a. ||Aff|| = λPvt.λx.λe.P(e) & ∃e’(exper(e) & Exp(x)(e’)) ∀e”(P(e”)
    → Source(e”)(e’) ∈ D_{<vt,et>}
    b. Source → λe.λe’. e is the source of e’  (Bosse et al., 2012, (63))

In Turkish, the eventuality is overt, thus we need to slightly modify the original denotation, and feed Aff a second argument of type <s,t>, Q below:

(44) ||Aff|| = λPst.λx.λQst.λe.Q(e) & ∃e’(exper(e) & Exp(x)(e’)) ∀e”[Q(e”)
    → Source(e”)(e’) ∈ D_{<st,et>}][6]

---

*Bosse et al. (2012) use the denotation v for eventuality, here I use s.
(45) Hasan-a gıcık-h-ı-na
Hasan-DAT irritation-POSS-DAT
‘to Hasan’s irritation’

(46) a. AffP_{st,st} <e,<st,st> >

D_{<st,st>}
<e,<st,st> >

Hasan

Aff_{<st, <e,<st,st> > , >}

nP_{<s,t>}

n_{<st,st>}

-gıcık
irritation

b. [[√gıcık]] = λe.√gıcık(e)

c. [[nP]] = λL_{<st,st>}, f

d. [[Aff]]( [[nP]]) = λx.λQ.λe.√gıcık(e) & Exp(e', x) : ∀e"[Q(e") → Source(e"')(e'')) ] ∈ D_{<st,et>}

e. [[Aff]]( [[nP]]) = λx.λQ.λe.√gıcık(e) & Exp(e', x) : ∀e"[Q(e") → Source(e"')(e'')) ] ∈ D_{<st,et>}

f. [[AffP]] = λQ.λe.∃e'.√gıcık(e') & Exp(e', Hasan) : ∀e"[Q(e") → Source(e"')(e'')) ] ∈ D_{<st,et>}

The tree in (47) illustrates the structure until the point where AffP adjoins to ApplP, and the denotations of them are provided in (48).

(47) ApplP2_{<s,t>}

AffP_{<st,st>}
Hasan-a
Affexp
nP

n_{<st,st>}

-gıcık
irritation

Appl1_{<s,t>}

Leyla’ya
for Leyla

VP

ğensiği tuttu
held the umbrella

(48) a. [[ApplP1]] = λe.Benef(e, Leyla) & hold(e) & Theme(e, the umbrella)

b. [[AffP]] = λQ.λe.∃e'.√gıcık(e') & Exp(e', Hasan) : ∀e"[Q(e") → Source(e"')(e'')) ] ∈ D_{<st,et>}

AffP and ApplP combine by Functional Application; that is, we simply conjoin the terms of each predicate.

(49) [[ApplP2]] = λe.hold(e) & Benef(e, Leyla) & Theme(e, the umbrella) & ∃e'.√gıcık(e') & Exp(e', Hasan): ∀e"[hold(e") & Benef(e", Leyla) & Theme(e", the umbrella) → Source(e"')(e'')) ]

- ApplP2 combines with Voice, and the agent is introduced via Event Identification (Kratzer, 1996).
- The assertion and conventional implicature is illustrated in (51).

(50) VoiceP
Kemal

Voice_{<e,<s,t> > , >}

ApplP_{<s,t>}

(51) • Assertion: ∃e.(e is an event of Kemal holding the umbrella for Leyla) and ∃e'.(e' is an event of Hasan having a psychological experience of irritation).

• Implicature: Any event e" that is holding umbrella (for Leyla) would be the source of Hasan’s experiencing e'.

6 Conclusions

• Two dative-case marked arguments in Turkish belong to distinct categories: (i) affected experiencer, and (ii) applicative argument.

• They differ in several distributional and interpretational properties.
  – The experiencers are introduced by the Affect head of Bosse and Bruening (2011); Bosse et al. (2012),
  – internally to a nominal structure (Ingason 2016; Berro and Fernández 2018).

• The simple applicative argument introduced in Spec,ApplP.
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