

# On subject properties of datives in psych predicates

## A comparative approach

**Ángel L. Jiménez-Fernández**

University of Seville  
ajimfer@us.es

**Bożena Rozwadowska**

University of Wrocław  
brozwad@uni.wroc.pl

**Abstract:** In this work, we show that in Spanish and Polish, the distribution of dative Experiencers in the sentence is influenced by factors pertaining to argument structure as well as to information structure. From an argument-structure point of view, they are claimed to be generated in VP, in a position higher than the nominative subject, and hence it is the closest candidate to move to spec-TP and satisfy the EPP under T. From an information-structure perspective, dative Experiencers occur first only in two situations, namely when they are part of the broad focus that the whole sentence performs or when they function as topic. However, different tests will tear Spanish and Polish DEs apart with respect to their “subject” properties, which will ultimately be derived from the syntactic position they target when they are used in all-focus sentences.

**Keywords:** all-focus sentences; dative experiencers; subject properties; monadic and dyadic psych predicates

## 1. Introduction

Among the controversial and intriguing problems in contemporary linguistic theories is the non-canonical marking of core arguments of verbs (Aikhenvald et al. 2001) and their behavioral properties with respect to the Subject (Agent) vs. Object distinction. It is widely recognized that the most interesting semantic class of predicates showing non-canonical marking patterns is the class of Experiencer predicates (see Haspelmath 2001 for experiential verbs in typological perspective). There is rich linguistic literature on the behavioral peculiarities of experiential/Experiencer predicates in various languages (for an exhaustive overview see Landau 2010). Among them Dative Experiencers (DEs) are especially controversial, because they co-occur with the nominative Stimulus, nominative being a

typical subject-marking property in what Haspelmath classifies as Standard Average European (SAE) languages.

Following Croft (1991, 212) and Lazard (1994, 41), Haspelmath claims that non-canonical marking in experiential predicates is due to their special meaning compared to prototypical causative action predicates.<sup>1</sup> Verbs with other meanings which do not fit the prototype of transitive verbs have to be assimilated in some way or other to the prototypical verbs. On the basis of the rich literature on Experiencer predicates Haspelmath divides them into three important types: the agent-like Experiencer, the dative Experiencer, and the patient-like Experiencer, respectively. Of special interest are dative Experiencer constructions, because, as Haspelmath notes, it is not obvious which of the arguments is non-canonical here. This depends on how one analyzes a sentence such as German *Mir gefällt das Buch* and Italian *Mi piace il libro* 'I like the book'.

Haspelmath notes that one possibility is that the dative Experiencer is S/A (Subject/Agent-like) and the nominative Stimulus is O (Object). On this analysis, SAE languages would show non-canonical marking of both S/A (which normally is not in the dative case) and O (which normally is not in the nominative case nor does it control verb agreement). Another possibility is that dative Experiencer constructions are not analyzed as transitive clauses, but as extended intransitive clauses. Since dative Experiencers in psychological predicates co-occur with the nominative Stimulus, and both arguments are obligatory, we adhere to the former position and intend to explore the behavioral subject properties<sup>2</sup> of core arguments of dative experiential constructions in Spanish and Polish. It is also important to recall the well-known division into: (i) Case-marking languages (German, Polish, etc.) and (ii) Configurational languages (English, French, Spanish, etc.). Haspelmath summarizes the essence of this division as in (1) below:

<sup>1</sup> See also numerous two-dimensional approaches to the linking problem of psych verbs such as Dowty (1991); Grimshaw (1990); Reinhart (2002); Rozwadowska (1989), among others.

<sup>2</sup> As rightly pointed out by an anonymous reviewer and convincingly demonstrated in Barðdal & Eythorsson (2016), there are various subjecthood tests used in the literature to determine the subject status of a particular argument, but there is no independent definition of the subject agreed upon. In our paper we investigate the behavioral properties of DEs, being aware of this situation. Barðdal and Eythorsson (2016) define subject as the first argument of the argument structure. We leave for future research the evaluation of this proposal. On the other hand, our discussion supports the views that dispense with the necessity to have an independent definition of the subject.

- (1) a. In Case marking languages the subject is in the nominative case and triggers verb agreement, the object is in the accusative case.  
 b. In configurational languages the subject precedes the verb and triggers verb agreement, the object follows the verb.<sup>3</sup> Pronominal objects and pronominal subjects do show case distinctions, however, and in the Romance and Balkan languages weak object pronouns typically precede the verb. (Haspelmath 2001, 56)

Spanish belongs to configurational languages with certain admissible variations in word order, whereas Polish is a Case-marking language, so we expect some differences in the behavioral properties of the core-arguments of DE verbs.

Haspelmath's division corresponds to the classic classification of Belletti and Rizzi's (1988) into three types of verbs: SE (Subject Experiencer), OE (Object Experiencer) and DE (Dative Experiencer) verbs, which inspired research into psych predicates in the generative tradition, which we are following in this paper. We discuss the so-called subject properties of dative Experiencers which have been detected in the relevant literature on languages like Spanish and Polish for verbs such as *gustar* 'like', *interesar* 'interest', *sorprender* 'surprise', etc. We carry out a systematic comparison between DE psych verbs in Spanish and their Polish equivalents. We focus on the neutral word order that psychological predicates which select a DE exhibit in the two languages when used in all-focus sentences, because the word order in such sentences has been taken as indicative of the basic argument structure (i.e., S/O) distinction.

As Jiménez-Fernández & Rozwadowska (2016) have shown from an experimental perspective, DE verbs in Spanish display a clear preference for the pattern OVS when used as a reply to an open question such as *What's up?* (cf. Fábregas et al. forthcoming). This is illustrated in (2):

- (2) a. A Luis le interesa                      la sintaxis.  
       to Luis CL interest-PRES-3SG the syntax  
 b. #La sintaxis le interesa a Luis.  
       'Luis is interested in syntax.'

<sup>3</sup> Haspelmath's classification is too restricted since in configurational languages we find examples which clearly follow a syntactic word order different from the canonical SVO. Spanish is such language which displays patterns such as OVS, VSO, VOS, etc. (cf. Jiménez-Fernández 2010). So, we take Haspelmath's typology as referring to canonical word order.

The fact that datives most naturally occur in the initial part of the corresponding sentence has been taken as an indication that they are subjects (albeit quirky subjects), as in Fernández-Soriano (1999a;b).

In this work, we show that, in Spanish and Polish, DEs' distribution in the sentence is influenced by factors pertaining to argument structure as well as to information structure (IS). From an argument-structure point of view, they are claimed to be generated in the VP in a position higher than the nominative subject, and hence it is the closest candidate to move to spec-TP and satisfy the EPP under T. From an information-structure perspective, DEs occur first only in two situations, namely when they are part of the broad focus that the whole sentence performs, as in (1a), or when they function as topic.

To the best of our knowledge, IS-based factors influencing the distribution of DEs have been largely ignored. Some exceptions can be found, though. Masullo (1992) makes a contrast between Spanish preverbal datives and true Clitic Left Dislocated topics and concludes that dative Experiencers are subjects. One of the tests Masullo uses is the co-occurrence with adverbs such as *solamente* 'only', which are compatible with subjects but not with CLLD-ed topics:

- (3) A Marco solamente pueden            gustarle            las óperas de Verdi.  
       to Mark   only            can-PRES-3PL to.like.him-DAT the operas of Verdi  
       'Mark alone can like Verdi's operas.' (Masullo's ex. (16))
- (4) \*A Marco solamente, su novia    le            regalará            una grabación  
       to Mark   only            his girlfriend him-DAT give-FUT-3SG a    recording  
       de Verdi.  
       of Verdi  
       'To Mark alone, his girlfriend will give him a recording of Verdi.' (Masullo's ex. (17))

From IS, this test is intended to show that the constituent modified by this adverb has some focus flavor, and hence it is not a subjecthood test.

Fernández-Soriano (1999a) establishes a parallelism between dative Experiencers and true nominative subjects and draws the conclusion that DEs are subjects. One of the DE subject properties that Fernández-Soriano highlights is that as opposed to other types of datives (Indirect objects), DEs are used preverbally in out-of-the-blue sentences:<sup>4</sup>

<sup>4</sup> The example in (6) contains a non-selected affected dative (which can be argued to be an Experiencer). Although this type of Experiencer is not a psych verb argument, it is still different from an indirect object. DEs arguments in psych verbs are a subset

- We agree with the data, but our interpretation is different: DEs are preverbal not because they are subjects but because they move to spec-TP, as we will show below.

As for Polish, Wiland (2013) suggests that objects in OVS sentences move to the left periphery, but this is not applied to DEs. In a different vein, Żychliński (2013) re-assesses Bondaruk and Szymanek's (2007) claims for the subject status of dative Experiencers in Polish, and concludes that they are not subjects.

The different discourse interpretations that DEs display in Spanish and Polish have been discussed by Jiménez-Fernández and Rozwadowska (2016). In initial position DE can be topic or contrastive focus. Here we concentrate on IS situations where the DE is part of the all-focus sentence. We examine different subjecthood tests and derive the DE's subject prop-

Acta Linguistica Academica 64, 2017

erties from the argumental position (spec-TP) that they occupy, rather than from the function of subject *per se*.

As we mentioned earlier, we argue that originally these DEs are generated in a position higher than the stimulus argument of this type of psych verbs (in line with Harley 1995, Fernández-Soriano 1999a;b and Fábregas et al. forthcoming). However, DEs can move to a higher position (spec-TP or spec-CP) for different reasons: (i) to simply value the EPP feature in T or (ii) to further value some discourse feature in T or C, depending on the language (Miyagawa 2010; Jiménez-Fernández 2010; Jiménez-Fernández & Spyropoulos 2013). The ‘subject’ properties of DEs will ultimately follow from their movement to spec-TP.

The paper is organized as follows. In section 2 we discuss the subject properties of DEs in Spanish, and derive them from moving the dative to spec-TP. In section 3 we argue that datives are of two types in Polish, depending on whether the relevant verb is monadic or dyadic. The behavior of the two types of datives will be shown to be different with respect to their subject properties. In section 4 we present our analysis of datives in the two languages; we claim that DEs in Spanish and in Polish monadic predicates move to spec-TP, whereas they move to spec-CP in Polish dyadic predicates. Finally, section 5 shows our conclusions.

## 2. Evidence that DEs move to TP in Spanish

In this section, we derive the subject properties of DEs in Spanish from their A-properties, whereas in section 3 we show that such A-properties are missing in Polish DEs. This will support our analysis of Spanish DE as targeting the TP area, and of Polish DEs as undergoing movement to the CP system. It should be made clear that in both Spanish and Polish the verb agrees with the nominative Stimulus. Therefore, we take the subject properties of DEs to mean that their behavior is similar to subjects in that they move to Spec-TP in languages such as Spanish in neutral (all-focus) sentences. On the other hand, in Polish, they have no subject properties as we show below, which we take to indicate that they are rather moved to the CP-system.

### 2.1. Raising

A piece of evidence in support of our analysis of DEs as moving to spec-TP comes from Raising, as illustrated in (8).

- (8) a. A *Ángela* parecen gustarle las patatas fritas.  
           to Angela-DAT seem-PRES.3PL to.like.her-DAT the potatoes fried  
       b. #Las patatas fritas parecen gustarle a *Ángela*.  
           ‘Angela seems to like crisps.’

Sentence (8a) can perfectly be used as an all-focus sentence, contrary to (8b) – hence its pragmatic oddness –, so it is not a case of topic preposing. Though the raising verb agrees with the nominative argument, the dative moves to spec-TP. Raising is movement to spec-TP, an A-position. In all-focus sentences the only possibility with DE psych verbs is for the DE to raise to the matrix subject position. This can only be explained if in our sentence *a Ángela* has undergone movement to spec-TP. A topic reading is not available here. Again this points to the fact that the subject properties of DE in Spanish are in fact A(argumental)-properties. DEs are not quirky subjects as in Icelandic, but DEs which move to an A-position.

Icelandic prototypically represents a language with quirky subjects. This means that in this language a dative argument can occupy a subject position and show the same properties as nominative subjects, as illustrated in (9).

- (9) a. *Hún* virdist [*t* hafa séð myndina]  
           She-NOM seems have seen picture  
           ‘She seems to have seen the picture.’  
       b. *Henni* virdist [*t* hafa leidd bókin]  
           she-DAT seems have bored book  
           ‘She seems to have found the book boring.’ (Boeckx 2000, 356 (1d), (2d))

However, in Spanish this is not possible (which has been shown independently by Tubino 2009, as opposed to what Fernández-Soriano 1999a claims).

- (10) a. ?*La comida* parece habérsele quemado a *Juan*.  
           the food-NOM seem-PRES-3SG to.have.him-DAT burnt to John-DAT  
       b. *A Juan* parece habérsele quemado la comida.  
           ‘John has burnt the food.’  
       (11) a. *Juan* parece habérselo dicho a *Pedro*.  
               John-NOM seem-PRES-3SG have.SE.it-ACC told to Peter-DAT  
               ‘Juan seems to have told Pedro about it.’

- b. *La obra* parece gustarle *al público*.  
 the play-NOM seem-PRES-3SG to.like.him-DAT to.the audience-DAT  
 ‘The audience seems to like the play.’ (Fernández-Soriano 1999a, 97 (10’ a, c))

So, in contrast with impersonal constructions illustrated in (10) above, where datives behave as subjects, Fernández-Soriano claims that raising the nominative in psych constructions is preferred. Our Spanish informants, though, prefer to raise the dative and not the nominative in all-focus sentences. For instance, as an answer to *What’s up?* the most natural answer will be (12):

- (12) A *la audiencia* parece gustarle *la obra*.  
 to the audience-DAT seem-PRES-3SG to.like.him-DAT the play-NOM  
 ‘The audience seems to like the play.’

In (12) the dative has been raised to spec-TP.

## 2.2. Binding

A further argument put forward by Fernández-Soriano (1999a) to argue for the subject status of dative Experiencers in unaccusative *se* constructions has to do with binding facts. More than testing subjecthood, binding can be used to confirm that DEs move to spec-TP in all-focus sentences.

- (13) a. A *cada<sub>i</sub>* cocinero se le quemó *su<sub>i</sub>* pescado.  
 to each cook-DAT SE him burn-PST.3SG his fish-NOM  
 b. \**Cada<sub>i</sub>* pescado se le quemó a *su<sub>i</sub>* cocinero.  
 ‘Every cook burned his fish.’
- (14) a. A *cada<sub>i</sub>* participante en el concurso se le  
 to each participant-DAT in the contest SE him  
 escapó *su<sub>i</sub>* canario.  
 fly.away-PST-3SG his canary-NOM  
 ‘His canary flew away from each participant in the contest.’  
 b. *Cada<sub>i</sub>* canario se le escapó a *su<sub>i</sub>* propietario.  
 each canary SE him fly.away-PST.3SG to its owner-NOM  
 ‘Each canary flew away from its owner.’  
 (Fernández-Soriano 1999a, 97–98 (12a, b, c, d))

Following Miyagawa (2010) and Jiménez-Fernández & Miyagawa (2014), the reason why the quantifier *cada* ‘each’ can bind the possessive in the



nominative argument is that the dative has moved to an A-position, spec-TP, which reverses the binding configuration.

### 2.3. Floating quantifiers

Floating quantifiers (FQ) have been argued to be the consequence of movement of DP to an A-position (López 2009). More precisely, Jiménez-Fernández and Miyagawa (2014) have shown that FQs are possible when an object is preposed to spec-TP to be a Given Topic:

- (15) Los exámenes los ha corregido todos este profesor.  
 the exams them have-PRES-3SG corrected all this teacher  
 ‘This teacher has corrected all the exams.’  
 (Jiménez-Fernández & Miyagawa 2014, 294)

In a similar vein, datives with psych verbs can also co-occur with FQs, which clearly indicates that they move to spec-TP, thereby explaining their subject properties:

- (16) A los banqueros les gusta a todos tener cuentas en Suiza.  
 to the bankers them like-PRES-3SG to all to.have accounts in Switzerland  
 ‘All bankers like having accounts in Switzerland.’

This sentence can be used as an answer to *What’s up?* Hence it is all-focus. This possibility of using a FQ supports our claim that the dative moves to spec-TP in broad focus sentences.<sup>5</sup>

### 2.4. Position in interrogatives

Fernández-Soriano (1999b) argues that locatives in Spanish show subject properties. One of these traits is that in interrogative sentences locatives

<sup>5</sup> An anonymous reviewer points out that the FQ test seems to show that the Experiencer is an internal argument, as is the case in (15), where an object has been preposed. Note that external arguments can also be preposed and still leave an FQ in its original place:

- (i) Mis estudiantes han aprobado todos el examen final.  
 my students have-PRES-3PL passed all the exam final  
 ‘My students have all passed the final exam.’

What we claim is that in order to license the FQ, its antecedent must move to spec-TP. This is exactly what happens in (16), where the DE *a los banqueros* has moved to spec-TP.

can occur in between an auxiliary and the main verb, as in (17a), which also characterizes agentive subjects, as in (17b):

- (17) a. ¿Habr<sup>a</sup> aquí ocurrido lo mismo?  
           have-FUT-3SG here happened the same?  
           ‘Has the same happened here?’  
       b. ¿Habr<sup>a</sup> Juan hecho lo mismo?  
           have-FUT-3SG Juan done the same  
           ‘Has Juan done the same?’

*Mutatis mutandis*, datives exhibit exactly the same behavior. Fernández-Soriano gives examples with datives occurring with non-psych verbs:

- (18) ¿Cómo puede a una persona tan lista faltarle valor  
       how can-PRES.3SG to a person so smart to.miss.her-DAT courage  
       en este momento?  
       at this moment  
       ‘How can such a smart person lack courage in a moment like this?’

However, from sentence (19) it seems that dative Experiencers pattern with subjects with respect to their possible position in interrogatives:

- (19) ¿Cómo puede a María gustarle la sopa?  
       how can-PRES-3SG to Maria to.like.her-DAT the soup  
       ‘How can Mary like soup?’

## 2.5. Nominalizations

Another argument in favor of analyzing dative Experiencers as displaying subject properties comes from nominalizations. Fernández-Soriano (1999b) argues that locatives and datives share the property of using the preposition *de* ‘of’ when their relevant verbs are nominalized:

- (20) a. la falta de valor de/\*a Juan  
           the lack of courage of/to John  
           ‘John’s lack of courage’  
       b. la entrega del premio \*de/a Juan  
           the gift of.the price of/to John  
           ‘the gift of the prize to John’

As shown in (20), the dative *a Juan* changes the preposition when the verb *faltar* ‘lack’ is nominalized, as opposed to goal datives. The very same strategy is exhibited by psych verbs of the *gustar*-type.

- (21) El gusto de/\*a Lucía por la ópera  
       the taste of/to Lucy for the opera  
       ‘Lucy’s taste for the opera’

It seems that DEs have the typical subject properties, which support our analysis of DEs as moving to spec-TP.

### 3. Moving the dative in Polish

The problem of Dative Experiencers in Polish is under constant debate. The status of Experiencers in nominative-less constructions is discussed in Bondaruk & Szymanek (2007). Assuming standard tests for subjecthood proposed for other languages, they suggest the following criteria for checking the subject status of Dative arguments in Polish: raising, anaphor binding, control, and resumption (but see Haspelmath 2001 for some possible objections as to the reliability of the so-called subjecthood tests).

#### 3.1. Testing monadic psych verbs for subjecthood

In this section we present different tests used by Bondaruk and Szymanek (2007) to test the subject properties of the single argument (dative) selected by monadic Experiencer predicates. We are going to use these tests in our next section to explore the subjecthood of datives in dyadic psych verbs.

##### 3.1.1. Raising in intransitive dative constructions

Bondaruk and Szymanek (2007) justify the existence of raising in Polish with examples in (22):

- (22) a. \*Wyduje się [Marek być smutny].  
       seem-PRES-3SG REFL Mark to.be sad  
       ‘Mark seems to be sad.’  
       b. Marek wydaje się [być smutny].  
       Mark seem-PRES-3SG REFL to.be sad  
       ‘Mark seems to be sad.’

Sentence (22a), in which *Marek* ‘Mark’ does not leave the non-finite complement, is ungrammatical and it becomes acceptable only if this DP moves to the subject position in the matrix clause, as shown in (22b).

Another example of raising in Polish is given in (23):

- (23) Dzieci      wydawały      się      wszystkie spać.  
 kids-NOM seem-PST-3SG REFL all              to.sleep.  
 ‘All the kids seemed to sleep.’

Assuming the availability of raising in Polish, Bondaruk and Szymanek analyze the data in (24) and (25) and conclude that the dative Experiencer *Markowi* ‘Mark’ in (24) has not raised from within an embedded clause, but in fact functions as a dative argument of the matrix verb *wydawać się* ‘seem’.

- (24) Markowi wydawało się [być smutno/żał, że przegrał].  
 Mark-DAT seem-PST-3SG REFL to.be sad-ADV/sorry that lose-PST-3SG  
 ‘It seemed to Mark to feel sad/sorry that he had lost.’

- (25) Markowi wydawało się (\*nam) [być smutno/żał, że przegrał].  
 Mark-DAT seem-PST-3SG REFL us-DAT to.be sad-ADV/sorry that lose-PST-3SG  
 ‘Mark seemed to us to feel sad/sorry that he had lost.’

In sentence (25) the dative DP *Markowi* ‘Mark’ is accompanied by another dative phrase *nam* ‘us-DAT’, an argument of the verb *wydawać się* ‘seem’. The unacceptability of this sentence suggests that the dative *Markowi* is an argument of the verb *wydawać się* ‘seem’. The failure to undergo raising by dative DPs indicates that in sentences like (24) datives at the beginning of the sentence are not the result of A-movement to the spec-TP position.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>6</sup> In Spanish, to obtain this syntactic configuration in which the dative is an argument of the matrix verb, it must be doubled with a clitic and the subordinate clause should be finite. Hence no raising is involved as opposed to the structure we saw above in the section about Spanish raising and datives:

- (i) A Juan le              parece              que (a él) le              gusta  
 to John him-DAT seem-PRES-3SG that to him him-DAT like-PRES-3SG  
 la      ensalada.  
 the salad  
 ‘It seems to Juan that he likes salad.’

### 3.1.2. Binding in dative intransitive constructions

In Polish there are two possessives: possessive pronouns, such as *mój* ‘my’, *twój* ‘your’, *jej* ‘her’, *jego* ‘his’, *nasz* ‘our’, *wasz* ‘your’, *ich* ‘their’, and the possessive reflexive *swój* ‘self’s’.<sup>7</sup> Their distribution is presented in (26) below. The possessive reflexive is a subject oriented anaphor.

- (26) a. Janek<sub>i</sub> uderzył Marysię<sub>j</sub> swoim<sub>i</sub>/\*<sub>j</sub> parasolem.  
 John-NOM hit-PST-3SG Mary-ACC POSS.REFL umbrella  
 ‘John hit Mary with self’s (= his) umbrella.’  
 b. Janek<sub>i</sub> uderzył Marysię<sub>j</sub> jego<sub>\*i</sub>/ jej<sub>j</sub> parasolem.  
 John-NOM hit-PST-3SG Mary-ACC his her umbrella  
 ‘John hit Mary with \*his/ her umbrella.’

As illustrated above, the possessive reflexive is bound by the subject, whereas the possessive non-reflexive pronoun is not. In contrast, the former cannot be bound by the object, whereas the latter can.

Dative Experiencers without nominative Stimulus (i.e., single argument datives), illustrated in (27) can bind the possessive reflexive (assumed to be subject-oriented) as in (28).

- (27) Jankowi<sub>i</sub> jest smutno.  
 John-DAT be-PRES-3SG sad-IMPERSONAL  
 ‘John is sad.’  
 (28) Jankowi<sub>i</sub> jest smutno z powodu swojej<sub>i</sub>/ #jego<sub>i</sub> porażki.  
 John-DAT be-PRES-3SG sad-IMPERSONAL because of self’s his failure  
 ‘John is sad because of his failure.’  
 (29) Jankowi<sub>i</sub> jest żal swojej<sub>i</sub>/ #jego<sub>i</sub> siostry.  
 John-DAT be-PRES-3SG pity self’s his sister-ACC  
 ‘John feels pity for his sister.’

As is clear from the above examples the dative can bind the reflexive possessive, which supports the view that this dative sits in spec-TP.

### 3.1.3. Control in intransitive DE verbs

Following Bondaruk & Szymanek (2007), control structures, i.e., another subjecthood diagnostics, are illustrated for such ‘intransitive’ DEs in

<sup>7</sup> Possessive pronouns and the possessive reflexives are inflected for gender.

(30) – a gerundive clause, (31) – an adversative clause, and (32) – a participial clause:

- (30) Po PRO<sub>i</sub> przyjściu do domu, zrobiło *nam<sub>i</sub>* się przyjemnie/wstyd.  
 after coming to home start-PST-3SG us-DAT REFL nice-ADV/shame  
 ‘After coming back home, we started feeling nice/ashamed.’
- (31) Mimo PRO<sub>i</sub> słuchania wesołej muzyki, było *mu<sub>i</sub>* nadal smutno/żal.  
 despite listening cheerful music be-PST-3SG him-DAT still sad-ADV/pity  
 ‘Despite listening to cheerful music, he was still sad/pitiful.’
- (32) PRO<sub>i</sub> Wróciwszy do domu, zrobiło *mu<sub>i</sub>* się smutno/żal.  
 coming to home start-PST-PST-3SG him-DAT REFL sad-ADV/pity  
 ‘On coming back home, he started feeling sad/pitiful.’

Bondaruk and Szymanek conclude that since Experiencer datives can control PRO in all the above sentences and since objects can never do so, as illustrated in (33), the dative Experiencers seem to resemble subjects.

- (33) \*Po PRO<sub>i</sub> złożeniu podania, pracodawca wezwał Marka<sub>i</sub>.  
 after submitting application employer call-PST-3SG Mark  
 ‘After submitting an application, an employer called Mark.’

Moreover, generally dative DPs in Polish can control PRO, as shown in (34):

- (34) Maria poleciła *mu<sub>i</sub>* [PRO<sub>i</sub> być wesołym].  
 Mary order-PST-3SG him-DAT to.be cheerful  
 ‘Mary ordered him to be cheerful.’

Exactly the same control pattern can be observed with dative Experiencers, which is supported by the following sentence:

- (35) Jest *mu<sub>i</sub>* smutno/wstyd [PRO<sub>i</sub> przegrywać mecze].  
 be-PRES-3SG him-DAT sad-ADV/shame to.lose matches  
 ‘It is sad/a shame for him to lose matches.’

Finally, as far as control is concerned, following Dziwirek (1994), Bondaruk and Szymanek (2007) assume that the phrase *po pijanemu* ‘while drunk’, as used in (36), is subject-oriented and conclude that dative Experiencers behave like subjects:

- (36) Było            mu            smutno/wstyd po    pijanemu.  
 be-PST-3SG him-DAT sad-ADV/shame while drunk  
 'He felt sad/ashamed while he was drunk.'

### 3.1.4. Relative clauses with *co* 'what'

The last subjecthood test employed by Bondaruk and Szymanek for dative Experiencers in Polish is based on resumption. Resumptive pronouns appear in colloquial Polish in relative clauses introduced by the complementiser *co* 'what' in all but the subject position, as illustrated in (37):

- (37) a. Dziewczyna, co    ją    widziałem    na ulicy, jest            moją  
 girl                    what her see-PST-1SG in    street be-PRES-3SG my  
 koleżanką z        pracy.  
 colleague from work  
 'The girl that I saw in the street is my colleague.'
- b. Dziewczyna, co    (\*ona) rozmawiała    ze mną, jest            moją  
 girl                    what she talk-PST-3SG to me    be-PRES-3SG my  
 koleżanką z        pracy.  
 colleague from work  
 'The girl that was talking to me is my colleague.'

Sentence (37a) is grammatical, as the resumptive pronoun *ją* 'her' appears in the object position, while (37b), with the resumptive pronoun *ona* 'she' in the subject position, is illicit. Resumptive pronouns in the subject position, in contradistinction to similar pronouns in other sentence positions, lead to ungrammaticality. Therefore, Bondaruk and Szymanek conclude that any position in which pronouns of this kind are banned corresponds to a subject position.<sup>8</sup> Let us now test whether dative Experiencers can be replaced by resumptive pronouns. This seems to be possible, as confirmed by the grammaticality of (38) below:

<sup>8</sup> Interestingly, Bondaruk and Szymanek also quote an alternative conclusion suggested by the reviewer that the resumptive pronoun test is sensitive to nominative case, rather than to a subject position. Bondaruk and Szymanek claim that since nominative marked DPs always function as subjects in Polish, it seems impossible to verify which of these two alternatives is correct. This entails that they treat the nominative case as a decisive subject marking property.

- (38) To jest                    ten człowiek, co    *\*(mu)*            było            smutno/żał,  
       this be-PRES-3SG the man        what    him-DAT be-PST-3SG sad-ADV/sorry  
       że przegrał.  
       that lose-PST-3SG  
       ‘This is the man that felt sad/sorry that he had lost.’

The above sentence without the resumptive dative pronoun *mu* ‘him’ is unacceptable, which provides an argument against treating dative Experiencers as subjects.

On the whole, Bondaruk and Szymanek conclude that the status of dative Experiencers is unclear, because their behavioral properties are divided: “On the one hand, dative Experiencers behave like typical subjects in that they can bind subject-oriented anaphors and can control PRO in three types of non-finite adjunct clauses. On the other hand, they differ from regular subjects in that they do not undergo raising and can be replaced by resumptive pronouns” (*ibid.*, 81).

They also argue extensively that DEs in Polish are not quirky subjects, but that they appear in the CP domain for discourse-related reasons. In other words, DEs in Polish “intransitive” structures are generated in the specifier position of lexical projections (either VP or AdvP) and can undergo scrambling to the CP domain, which is a kind of topicalisation. In the next section we examine dyadic psych verbs in order to see how dative Experiencers compare with the nominative Stimulus with respect to subject properties.

### 3.2. Subjecthood of datives in dyadic psych verbs

Importantly, Bondaruk and Szymanek (2007) analyze dative Experiencers in constructions other than dyadic psych verbs, i.e., in constructions without the nominative Stimulus. Of vital importance to our problem is to see what the subjecthood tests can tell us about the distribution of subject properties in dyadic DE psych verbs, where the other argument is marked as nominative. Let us then apply those tests to DE transitive psych verbs.

#### 3.2.1. Raising in DE dyadic verbs

Żychliński (2013) claims that the data in (24)–(25) in section 3.1.1. above provide an argument against dative arguments acting as subjects. Note that in those examples we have DEs without the Stimulus DP. Dative Experiencers in constructions with a nominative argument are discussed



below.<sup>9</sup> Let us take a sentence with a dative Experiencer verb *podobać się* ‘please/appeal to’:

- (39) Markowi podobają się uliczki Starego Miasta.  
 Mark-DAT please REFL streets-NOM Old-GEN Town-GEN  
 ‘Mark likes the streets of the Old Town.’

Let us check the possibilities of raising. In (40) the dative Experiencer is moved to the subject position of the verb *wydawać się* ‘seem’. The Stimulus remains nominative in post-verbal position. The sentence is totally ungrammatical, as exemplified in (40):

- (40) \*Markowi wydawało się podobać uliczki Starego Miasta.  
 Mark-DAT seem-PST-3SG REFL to.please streets-NOM Old-GEN Town-GEN  
 ‘The streets of the Old Town seem to please Mark.’ (Żychliński 2013, example (249))

However, if we raise the Stimulus, we get a good result as in (41), in both orders: SVD (Stimulus–Verb–Dative) and DVS. Note that in both word order configurations it is the nominative Stimulus that agrees with the verb.

- (41) a. Uliczki Starego Miasta wydawały się podobać Markowi.  
 streets-NOM Old-GEN Town-GEN seem-PST-3PL REFL to.please Mark-DAT  
 ‘The streets of the Old Town seemed to please Mark.’  
 b. Markowi wydawały się podobać uliczki Starego Miasta.  
 Mark-DAT seem-PST-3PL REFL to.please street-NOM Old-GEN Town-GEN  
 ‘Mark seemed to like the streets of the Old Town.’

In contrast to Spanish (where there is a clear preference for DVS in all-focus sentences), both (41a) and (41b) could be used in out-of-the-blue sentences.

More data that show a clear contrast with Spanish are given below:

- (42) \*Dzieciom wydawało się wszystkim podobać uliczki  
 kids-DAT seem-PST-NEUTER3SG REFL all to.please streets-NOM  
 Starego Miasta.  
 Old-GEN Town-GEN  
 (43) a. <sup>?</sup>Jankowi wydaje się to danie być przypalone.  
 John-DAT seem-PRES-3SG REFL this dish-NOM to.be burnt

<sup>9</sup> The examples are variations of the evidence provided in Żychliński (2013, 122–125).

- b. To danie wydaje się Jankowi być przypalone.  
 this dish-NOM seem-PRES-3SG REFL John-DAT to.be burnt.  
 ‘This dish seems burnt on John.’/‘John burned this dish.’

Both (43a) and (43b) are possible. In both (43a) and (43b) the nominative Theme/Neutral argument agrees with the verb. Another example that illustrates the same property is presented in (44):

- (44) Przedstawienie wydaje się podobać publiczności.  
 performance-NOM seem-PRES-3SG REFL to.please audience-DAT  
 ‘The performance seems to appeal to the audience.’

As demonstrated above, raising does not obtain with dative Experiencers in Polish. At the same time the raising of Stimulus is quite good. There is a sharp contrast between the two constructions: totally unacceptable (40) and (42) vs. acceptable (41), (43) and (44). Note also that in raising constructions in (43) the word order SVD is better than DVS, which, we believe, provides an additional argument for the raising of the Stimulus to spec-TP.

### 3.2.2. Binding in transitive dative psych verbs

As noted in the preceding sections, binding facts have been standardly taken as relevant tests for subject properties. Also, in section 3.1.2 the role of the contrast between the possessive pronoun and the possessive reflexive in Polish was introduced. Let us recall that the possessive reflexive is bound by the subject and thus is treated as a subject-oriented anaphor, in contrast to the possessive pronoun, which is in the complementary distribution with the possessive reflexive. In other words, we expect the possessive reflexive in the VP to be bound by the subject DP. If the preverbal dative was in the position relevant for establishing binding configurations (i.e., spec-TP) then we would expect it to function as a binder for the reflexive possessive. The facts are quite the opposite, as illustrated in (45)–(46):

- (45) a. \*Jankowi<sub>i</sub> podoba się swoja<sub>i</sub> żona/swój<sub>i</sub> samochód.  
 John-DAT please-PRES-3SG REFL self's wife/self's car  
 ‘John likes his own wife.’  
 b. Jankowi<sub>i</sub> podoba się jego<sub>i</sub> żona/jego<sub>i</sub> samochód.  
 John-DAT please-PRES-3SG REFL his wife/his car  
 ‘John likes his wife/ his car.’

- (46) a. Marek<sub>i</sub>      podoba                      się      swojej<sub>i</sub>      żonie.  
 Mark-NOM please-PRES-3SG REFL self's-DAT wife-DAT  
 'Mark<sub>i</sub> pleases/appeals to self<sub>i</sub>'s wife.'
- b. \*Marek<sub>i</sub>      podoba                      się      jego<sub>i</sub>      żonie.  
 Mark-NOM please-PRES-3SG REFL his-DAT wife-DAT  
 'Mark pleases/appeals to his wife.'

In (45a) the dative Experiencer DP does not serve as a binder for the reflexive possessive in the post verbal nominative Stimulus DP, only the possessive pronoun is possible there, as in (45b). In contrast, the sentences in (46) demonstrate that the nominative Stimulus is a perfect binder for the reflexive possessive and does not tolerate a possessive pronoun in the dative Experiencer DP. This suggests that the nominative Stimulus passes the binding test for subjecthood properties, whereas the dative Experiencer does not.

With datives other than Experiencer datives we obtain similar results, namely the dative cannot serve as a binder for the reflexive possessive, as illustrated in (47a) and (48a). In contrast, the nominative Theme can bind the reflexive possessive embedded in the internal dative argument, as in (47b) and (48b):

- (47) a. Każdemu<sub>i</sub> kucharzowi przypaliła      się      \*swoja<sub>i</sub>/jego<sub>i</sub> ryba.  
 each-DAT cook-DAT burn-PST-3SG REFL self's/his fish  
 'Each cook had his fish burnt.'
- b. Każdy<sub>i</sub>      nowy samochód w końcu się      pobrudzi  
 each-NOM new car in end REFL get.dirty-FUT-3SG  
 swojemu<sub>i</sub> właścicielowi.  
 self's-DAT owner  
 'Each new car finally will get dirty on its owner.'
- (48) a. Każdemu<sub>i</sub> uczestnikowi konkursu uciekł                      \*swoj<sub>i</sub>/jego<sub>i</sub> kanarek.  
 each participant-DAT in.contest escape-PST-3SG self's/his canary-NOM  
 'His canary flew away from each participant in the contest.'
- b. Każdy<sub>i</sub> kanarek uciekł                      swojemu<sub>i</sub>/\*jego<sub>i</sub> właścicielowi.  
 each canary escape-PST-3SG self's-DAT/ its owner-DAT  
 'Each canary flew away from its owner.'

The Dative does not bind the reflexive possessive pronoun (both with psych verbs and with other verbs). In contrast, the nominative Stimulus (or whatever argument is in the nominative case) is a better binder for the anaphor embedded in the dative Experiencer (or another dative argument).

### 3.2.3. Control and DE dyadic verbs

Let us now examine control structures, as illustrated in (49):

- (49) Po PRO<sub>i</sub> wejściu na salę taneczną, Marysia<sub>i</sub> spodobała się Jankowi\*<sub>i</sub>.  
 after entering on hall dancing Mary-NOM impress-PST-3SG REFL John-DAT  
 ‘After entering the dancing hall, Mary impressed John.’
- (50) Mimo PRO<sub>i</sub> słuchania hałaśliwej muzyki,  
 despite listening noisy music  
 dzieci<sub>i</sub> zaimponowały rodzicom\*<sub>i</sub>.  
 children-NOM impress-PST-3PL parents-DAT  
 ‘Despite listening to noisy music, the children impressed the parents.’
- (51) PRO<sub>i</sub> Wróciwszy do domu, Janek<sub>i</sub> zaimponował Marysi\*<sub>i</sub>.  
 coming to home John impress-PST-3SG Mary-DAT  
 ‘On coming back home, John impressed Mary.’

As indicated above, it is the nominative Stimulus and not the dative Experiencer that controls the empty subject of the gerundive or participial adjunct clause. So, again the nominative Stimulus wins the competition for subjecthood.

Now, let us check what happens in sentences with the subject-oriented phrase *po pijanemu* ‘while drunk’. The relevant examples are presented below:

- (52) a. Maria<sub>i</sub> spodobała się Jankowi<sub>j</sub> PRO<sub>i/j</sub> po pijanemu.  
 Mary impress-PST-3SG REFL John-DAT while drunk  
 ‘Mary impressed John while drunk.’
- b. ?Zosia<sub>i</sub> znudziła się swoim<sub>i</sub> koleżankom<sub>j</sub> PRO<sub>i/j</sub> po pijanemu.  
 Sophie bore-PST-3SG REFL self’s friends-DAT while drunk  
 ‘Sophie bored her friends while drunk.’
- c. ?Ta potrawa obrzydła Jankowi<sub>i</sub> PRO<sub>i</sub> po pijanemu.  
 this dish-NOM disgust-PST-3SG John-DAT while drunk  
 ‘This dish disgusted John while drunk.’

The acceptability of the sentences above is dubious. The intuitions of native speakers give inconclusive acceptability judgements. It seems that either both control relations are possible, or the sentence is strange in the first place. We believe that it might be due to the fact that the phrase *po pijanemu* is sensitive to agentivity/eventivity rather than subjecthood and that in unclear cases this control is determined contextually. What is clear,

however, is that both the nominative Stimulus and the dative Experiencer are possible controllers, depending on pragmatic considerations.

### 3.2.4. *co*-relatives and dyadic DE verbs

Finally, let us turn to resumption with dyadic DE verbs:

- (53) a. To jest mężczyzna, co (\**mu*) się  
           this be-PRES-3SG man-NOM what him-DAT REFL  
           spodobała Marysia.  
           please-PST-3SG Mary  
           ‘This is the man whom Mary pleased/appealed to.’
- b. To jest dziewczyna, co (\**ona*) się  
           this be-PRES-3SG girl-NOM what she-NOM REFL  
           spodobała Markowi.  
           please-PST-3SG Mark-DAT  
           ‘This is the girl who pleased/ appealed to Mark.’

Example (53a) with a dative Experiencer shows that it does not behave like a subject in dyadic psych verbs, whereas (53b) shows that in our DE class, the Stimulus behaves like a subject.

## 4. The analysis

Having seen that datives in Spanish, illustrated in (2a), repeated as (54), and datives in intransitive constructions in Polish, repeated for convenience in (55), exhibit A-properties, we suggest that they move to the specifier of TP.

- (54) A Luis le interesa la sintaxis.  
       to Luis him-DAT interest-PRES-3SG the syntax  
       ‘Luis is interested in syntax.’
- (55) Jankowi jest smutno.  
       John-DAT be-PRS-3SG sad-IMPERSONAL  
       ‘John is sad.’

The derivation we propose for these two types of DEs in all-focus dative constructions is as follows:

[CP [C Ø] [TP a Luis<sub>T</sub> le interesa+Ø] [vP [<sub>v</sub> le interesa+Ø] [VP a Luis<sub>V</sub> le interesa] la sintaxis]]]]  
 [pres-tns] [3rd, SG] [EPP]

[CP [C  $\emptyset$ ] [TP Jankowi [T jest+smutno+ $\emptyset$ ] [<sub>v</sub>P [<sub>v</sub> jest+smutno+ $\emptyset$ ] [VP Jankowi [<sub>v</sub> jest+smutno+ $\emptyset$ ]]]]]  
[pres-tns]  
[3rd, SG]  
[EPP]

(58) Marii imponuje postawa Janka.  
Mary-DAT impress-PST-3SG attitude John-GEN  
'Mary is impressed with John's attitude.'

[CP Marii [C  $\emptyset$ ] [TP [T imponuje+ $\emptyset$ ] [vP [imponuje+ $\emptyset$ ] [VP Marii [v imponuje] postawa Janka]]]  
 [Top] [Top] [pres-tns] [3rd, SG]  
 [EF] [3rd, SG]

Acta Linguistica Academica 64, 2017

### Acknowledgements

This research was funded by the grant 2014/15/B/HS2/00588 from National Science Centre, Poland. The first author's research has also been funded by the project of the Spanish Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness (FFI2013-41509-P). We are most grateful to two anonymous reviewers for their insightful comments. All errors remain our responsibility.

### References

- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y., Robert M. W. Dixon and Masayuki Onishi (eds.). 2001. Non-canonical marking of subjects and objects. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Barðdal, Jóhanna and Thorhallur Eythorsson. 2016. What is a subject? The nature and validity of subject tests. Manuscript. <https://tinyurl.com/kc59eq9>.
- Belletti, Adriana and Luigi Rizzi. 1988. Psych-verbs and  $\theta$  theory. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 6. 291–352.
- Boeckx, Cedric. 2000. Quirky agreement. *Studia Linguistica* 54. 354–380.
- Bondaruk, Anna and Bogdan Szymanek. 2007. Polish nominativeless constructions with dative Experiencers: Form, meaning and structure. *Studies in Polish Linguistics* 4. 61–99.
- Croft, William. 1991. Syntactic categories and grammatical relations: The cognitive organization of information. Chicago: The University Press of Chicago.
- Dowty, David R. 1991. Thematic proto-roles and argument selection. *Language* 67. 547–619.
- Dziwirek, Katarzyna. 1994. Polish subjects. New York: Garland.
- Fábregas, Antonio, Ángel L. Jiménez-Fernández and Mercedes Tubino. forthcoming. What's up with datives? In R. Lopes, J. Avelar and S. Cyrino (eds.) *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory* 12. Selected papers from the 45th Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages (LSRL), Campinas, Brazil. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Fernández-Soriano, Olga. 1999a. Datives in constructions with unaccusative *se*. *Catalan Working Papers in Linguistics* 7. 89–105.
- Fernández-Soriano, Olga. 1999b. Two types of impersonal constructions in Spanish: Locative and dative subjects. *Syntax* 2. 101–140.
- Grimshaw, Jane. 1990. Argument structure (Linguistic Inquiry Monograph 18). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Harley, Heidi. 1995. Subjects, events, and licensing. Doctoral dissertation. MIT.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 2001. Non-canonical marking of core arguments in European languages. In Aikhenvald et al. (2001, 53–84).
- Jiménez-Fernández, Ángel L. 2010. Discourse-agreement features, phasal C and the edge: A minimalist approach. *Diacrítica* 24. 25–49.
- Jiménez-Fernández, Ángel L. and Shigeru Miyagawa. 2014. A feature-inheritance approach to root phenomena and parametric variation. *Lingua* 145. 276–302.

- Jiménez-Fernández, Ángel L. and Bożena Rozwadowska. 2016. The information structure of Dative Experiencer psych verbs. In B. Cetnarowska, M. Kuczok and M. Zabawa (eds.) *Various dimensions of contrastive studies*. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego. 100–121.
- Jiménez-Fernández, Ángel L. and Vassilios Spyropoulos. 2013. Feature inheritance, vP phases and the information structure of small clauses. *Studia Linguistica* 67. 185–224.
- Landau, Idan. 2010. *The locative syntax of Experiencers*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Lazard, Gilbert. 1994. *L'actance*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- López, Luis. 2009. *A derivational syntax for information structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Masullo, Pascual J. 1992. Quirky datives in Spanish and the non-nominative subject parameter. *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 16. 89–103.
- Miyagawa, Shigeru. 2010. *Why agree? Why move? Unifying agreement-based and discourse-configurational languages*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Reinhart, Tanya. 2002. The Theta System: An overview. *Theoretical Linguistics* 28. 229–290.
- Rozwadowska, Bożena. 1989. Are thematic relations discrete? In R. Corrigan, F. Eckman and M. Noonan (eds.) *Linguistic categorization*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 115–130.
- Tubino, Mercedes. 2009. *Preverbal datives in Spanish: How quirky are they? An Agree analysis of gustar*. MA thesis. University of Arizona.
- Wiland, Bartosz. 2013. Paths in remnant movement: A single solution to three problems in the Polish OVS syntax. In C. Kan, C. Moore-Cantwell and R. Staubs (eds.) *Proceedings of NELS 40*. Amherst, MA: GLSA. 253–264.
- Żychliński, Sylwiusz. 2013. *On some aspects of the syntax of object Experiencers in Polish and English*. Doctoral dissertation. Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań.