

MODERN GREEK DITRANSITIVES IN LMT

Valia Kordoni

Dept. of Computational Linguistics, Saarland University,
P.O. BOX 15 11 50, D-66041 Saarbrücken, GERMANY
kordoni@coli.uni-sb.de

Proceedings of the LFG04 Conference

University of Canterbury

Miriam Butt and Tracy Holloway King (Editors)

2004

CSLI Publications

<http://csli-publications.stanford.edu/>

ABSTRACT: Modern Greek distinguishes two types of ditransitive constructions, the genitive ditransitive construction and the double accusative ditransitive construction.

1. In Modern Greek the goal in most ditransitives surfaces as a PP (see example (1)), or as an NP with morphological genitive case (see example (2)):

(1) O Petros estile to paketo s-tin mitera
 the Peter.Nom send.3SG.PAST the packet.Acc to-the mother.Acc
 tu polu profata.
 his.Cl.Gen very recently
 “Peter sent the packet to his mother very recently”.

(2) O Petros estile tis miteras tu to
 the Peter.Nom send.3SG.PAST the mother.Gen his.Cl.Gen the
 paketo polu profata.
 packet.Acc very recently
 “Peter sent his mother the packet very recently”.

2. With a limited set of verbs both the indirect object and the direct object may surface with morphological *accusative* case used without a preposition. These verbs include the predicates *didasko* (teach), *serviro* (serve), *plirono* (pay):

(3) O kathigitis didakse tus fitites tin
 the professor.Nom teach.3SG.PAST the student.Acc.PL the
 ili ton mathimatikon profata.
 course-material.Acc the maths.Gen.PL recently
 “The professor taught the students the course material for the maths recently”.

(4) O kathigitis didakse tin ili ton
 the professor.Nom teach.3SG.PAST the course-material.Acc the
 mathimatikon s-tus fitites profata.
 maths.Gen.PL to-the student.Acc.PL recently
 “The professor taught the course material for the maths to the students recently”.

Adjectival passives with goal externalization are not possible with the verbs forming the genitive ditransitive construction (the following example reads in relation to examples (1) and (2)):

- (5) Ena profata stalmeno paketo. /* Mia profata stalmeni mitera.
 a recently sent packet /* a recently sent mother
 “A recently sent packet”. /* “A recently sent mother”.

In contrast, adjectival passives with goal externalization are possible with the verbs forming the double accusative ditransitive construction (the following example reads in relation to examples (3) and (4)):

- (6) I profata didagmeni ili ton mathimatikon./I profata
 the recently taught course-material the maths.Gen.PL/the recently
 didagmeni fitites.
 taught students
 “The recently taught course material for the maths”./ “The recently taught
 students”.

Moreover, in Modern Greek the two verb classes differ with respect to nominalization. Nominalizations where the goal surfaces as the non-prepositional complement of the noun are not possible with the verbal predicates participating in the genitive ditransitive construction (examples (7)-(9)), while they are possible with the verbal predicates participating in the double accusative ditransitive construction (example (10) in relation to examples (3) and (4)):

- (7) O Petros nikiase to spiti s-ton fititi.
 the Peter.Nom rent.3SG.PAST the house.Acc to-the student.Acc
 “Peter rent the house to the student”.
- (8) O Petros nikiase tu fititi to spiti.
 the Peter.Nom rent.3SG.PAST the student.Gen the house.Acc
 “Peter rent the student the house”.
- (9) To nikiasma tu spitii. /* To nikiasma tu fititi.
 the rental the house.Gen /* the rental the student.Gen
 “The rental of the house”. /* “The rental of the student”.
- (10) I didaskalia tis ilis ton mathimatikon. / I
 the teaching the course-material.Gen.SG the maths.Gen.PL / the
 didaskalia ton fititon.
 teaching the students.Gen.PL
 “The teaching of the course material for the maths”. / “The teaching of the
 students”.

For Modern Greek genitive ditransitive constructions I argue for an account which shares with the “dative shift” approaches the idea that there is a single verb

meaning involved, and with the “dative alternation” approaches the idea that variants are nonderivationally related (see Butt, Dalrymple, and Frank (1997), Wechsler (1995), among others, for similar approaches in LFG and HPSG, respectively, to English ditransitives). The starting point of the analysis for predicates heading Modern Greek genitive ditransitive constructions is that they are not polysemous and, more generally, the genitive ditransitive alternation does not involve two distinct meanings for each individual ditransitive predicate. In the spirit of Levin and Rappaport Hovav (2001), I propose that the key idea is that the genitive ditransitive alternation in Modern Greek is not about alternate objects, like for instance, the locative alternation in Modern Greek, but about alternate expressions of recipients (i.e., animate goals). That is, recipients in Modern Greek genitive ditransitive constructions may be realized in two ways as they are open to two semantic characterizations (see also Goldsmith (1980) for English): (i) a type of possessor, (ii) a type of goal, as the Localist Hypothesis predicts (cf., also Gruber (1965), Jackendoff (1972)). The consequence of the availability of two semantic characterizations for recipients in the case of Modern Greek genitive ditransitive constructions (i.e., possessors and goals) is that recipients have also two potential modes of syntactic instantiation: (i) a genitive case-marked NP (see example (2)), (ii) a PP (*s-tin* (to)-phrase in example (1)). For Modern Greek double accusative ditransitive constructions I propose an analysis which shares with the “dative alternation” approaches the idea that variants are nonderivationally related. I also propose, though, that unlike the genitive ditransitive constructions in Modern Greek the double accusative ditransitive construction is about alternate objects, like for instance, the locative alternation in Modern Greek. This proposal is strongly supported by the evidence from adjectival passives and nominalizations presented above in relation to Modern Greek double accusative ditransitive constructions, which shows that with predicates heading double accusative ditransitives either the *theme* or the *recipient* argument exhibits “object” properties, depending on which is (the primary) object. Such an analysis tends to be accompanied by different lexical semantic entailments in relation to the two variants:

- (11) From Arad (1998)
- a. *to*-VARIANT: x cause [y to come to be at (possession) z]
 - b. DOUBLE OBJECT VARIANT: x cause [z to come to be in STATE (of possession)] by means of [x cause [y to come to be at (poss) z]]
- (12) O Petros estile to paketo s-tin mitera
the Peter.Nom send.3SG.PAST the packet.Acc to-the mother.Acc
tu.
his.Cl.Gen

“Peter sent the packet to his mother”.
stelno < agent recipient=goal theme >
 -o ($\hat{\theta}$ -arg) -o -r
 SUBJ OBL $_{\theta}$ OBJ

- (13) O Petros estile tis miteras tu to paketo.
 the Peter.Nom send.3SG.PAST the mother.Gen his.Cl.Gen the packet.Acc

“Peter sent his mother the packet”.
stelno < agent recipient=possessor theme >
 -o ($\hat{\theta}$ -arg) +r -r
 SUBJ OBJ $_{\theta}$ (genitive) OBJ

- (14) O kathigitis didakse tus fitites tin
 the professor.Nom teach.3SG.PAST the student.Acc.PL the
 ili ton mathimatikon profata.
 course-material.Acc the maths.Gen.PL recently

“The professor taught the students the course material for the maths re-
 cently”.

didasko < agent recipient theme >
 -o ($\hat{\theta}$ -arg) -r +o
 SUBJ OBJ OBJ $_{\theta}$ (second accusative)

- (15) O kathigitis didakse tin ili ton
 the professor.Nom teach.3SG.PAST the course-material.Acc the
 mathimatikon s-tus fitites profata.
 maths.Gen.PL to-the student.Acc.PL recently

“The professor taught the course material for the maths to the students
 recently”.

didasko < agent recipient theme >
 -o ($\hat{\theta}$ -arg) -o -r
 SUBJ OBL $_{\theta}$ OBJ

References

- Arad, M. (1998). *VP-Structure and the Syntax-Lexicon Interface*. Ph. D. thesis, University College London, London, UK.
- Butt, M., M. Dalrymple, and A. Frank (1997). An architecture for linking theory in LFG. In M. Butt and T. H. King (Eds.), *Proceedings of the LFG97 Conference*, University of California, San Diego. CSLI Publications.

- Goldsmith, J. (1980). Meaning and Mechanism in Grammar. In S. Kuno (Ed.), *Harvard Studies in Syntax and Semantics*, pp. 423–449.
- Gruber, J. S. (1965). *Studies in Lexical Relations*. Ph. D. thesis, MIT.
- Jackendoff, R. S. (1972). *Semantic Interpretation in Generative Grammar*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Levin, B. and M. Rappaport Hovav (2001). What Alternates in the Dative Alternation? Colloquium Series, Department of Linguistics and Philosophy, MIT, Cambridge, MA, November 9, 2001.
- Wechsler, S. (1995). *The Semantic Basis of Argument Structure*. Stanford: CSLI Publications. Series: *Dissertations in Linguistics*, Joan Bresnan, Sharon Inkelas, William J. Poser, and Peter Sells (eds.).