

An Integrational Approach to Possessor Raising, Ethical Datives, and Adversative Passives

Author(s): Masayoshi Shibatani

Proceedings of the Twentieth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society: General Session Dedicated to the Contributions of Charles J. Fillmore (1994), pp. 461-486

Please see “How to cite” in the online sidebar for full citation information.

Please contact BLS regarding any further use of this work. BLS retains copyright for both print and screen forms of the publication. BLS may be contacted via <http://linguistics.berkeley.edu/bls/>.

The Annual Proceedings of the Berkeley Linguistics Society is published online via [eLanguage](#), the Linguistic Society of America's digital publishing platform.

An Integrational Approach to Possessor Raising, Ethical Datives, and Adversative Passives

Masayoshi Shibatani

Kobe University

1 Introduction

In her recent paper entitled 'The situated interpretation of possessor raising,' O'Connor (to appear) identifies several basic problems pertaining to the analysis of the Possessor Raising construction, exemplified here with her own Northern Pomo example in (1b) together with its non-PR paraphrase (1a).

- (1) a. man mo:w-a² yasis-nam phaley-ka (Non-PR form)
 3SF.A 3SM-OBL knee-DET burn-CAUS
 'She burned his knee.'
- b. mo:w-al man yasis-nam phaley-ka (PR form)
 3SM-P 3SF.A knee-DET burn-CAUS
 'She burned his knee.'

In her own words: 'One puzzle is ...the nature of the syntactic relationship between the raised possessor and the verb, between the possessed object nominal and the verb, and between the possessor and possessed nominals themselves' (p.2). Instead of answering this rather longstanding question that has been addressed in formal treatments, O'Connor takes one giant step toward answering another, pragmatically formulated question that 'concerns the contextually situated interpretation of the construction: although the two sentence alternants [a PR form and its non-PR paraphrase] are truth conditionally equivalent, the very existence of an alternation raises the question whether there are expressive differences that distinguish the two.' (p.2)

In this paper I wish to tackle the issue concerning the relationship between the possessor and possessed nominals mentioned in the first quotation from O'Connor. Contrary to her formulation of this relationship as a syntactic relationship, and contrary to the syntax-based formal treatments in terms of relation-changing processes as in Relational Grammar and Baker's Incorporation Analysis (Baker 1988), I would like to advance a semantico-pragmatic account that places the PR construction within a larger framework that embraces other constructions such as ethical datives in Indo-European languages and elsewhere, adversative passives in Asian languages, and 'double subject' or topic constructions in diverse languages. In the course of our investigation, it becomes apparent that the popular relation-changing accounts, which derive PR forms from the corresponding non-PR counterparts, are overly simplistic. Indeed, the facts point to the integrational account proposed here that assembles clausal elements in terms of the semantic contribution they make toward the (re)construction of the described scene. We are thus using the term 'PR construction' simply as a label for the construction in question without subscribing to a derivational account that 'raises the possessor' out of the adnominal position.

2 The body-part reading and the adversity reading

A first clue to our problem is found among those languages in which the analogs of the PR construction are not isolated constructions but constitute

subconstructions within a larger construction type. The construction type in question is the dative construction of various kinds widely seen among Indo-European languages. First observe the relevant body-part expressions illustrated here by the German and French examples below:

- (2) a. Man hat ihm den Arm gebrochen.
'They broke his arm.'
- b. Sie wäscht dem Paul die Haare.
'She washes Paul's hair.'

- (3) a. On lui a cassé le bras.
'They broke his arm.'
- b. Elle lave les cheveux à Paul.
'She washes Paul's hair.'

Notice that, under normal circumstances, the referents of the body-part nominals in these expressions are understood to belong to, or, more accurately, to be inalienably possessed by, the referents of the dative nominals, despite the fact that the body-part nominals are marked by the definite, rather than the genitive, articles. This body-part reading, however, is not the only possibility with these IE analogs of the PR construction. For example, the following syntactically identical dative constructions involve no body-part expressions.

- (4) a. Otto hat ihr ihren Teller zerbrochen.
'Otto broke her plate on her.'
- b. Man hat ihm seine Frau getötet.
'They killed his wife on him.'

- (5) a. Jean lui a cassé sa vaisselle.
'Jean broke her dishes on her.'
- b. On lui a tué sa femme.
'They killed his wife on him.'

As the translations of the above examples indicate, these dative constructions with no body-part nominals convey a sense of adversity or inconvenience befalling the referents of the dative nominals. Dative constructions with these features appear to be a widespread Indo-European trait as they are also observed in Slavic languages (see Wierzbicka 1988). But they are also seen elsewhere; e.g. in modern Hebrew we again notice expressions paralleling those seen above in German and French (Berman 1982).¹

- (6) ima raxaca le dan et ha panim
Mom washed to Dan OM the face
'Mom washed Dan's face.'

- (7) ha tinok lixlex li et ha xulca
the baby dirtied to-me OM the shirt
'The baby dirtied the shirt on me.' (Berman 1982)

An important point to notice here is the fact that the dative nominals systematically receive distinct interpretations depending on whether or not a body-part is involved. That is, when a body-part is involved, as in (2), (3), and (6), no adversative interpretation is forced, while when a non-body part expression is involved, the adversity reading accrues, as in (4), (5), and (7). The adversity meaning discussed here and below should be distinguished from the adversity meaning expressed lexically. That is, in (2a), (3a), and (7) the verbs themselves convey a negative meaning. But the adversity meaning relevant to our discussion is something conveyed by the expression as a whole whose sense is closer to that of inconvenience or misfortune.

Many languages also allow these dative constructions to express benefactive readings. But since the adversity reading seems to be dominant in the relevant types of construction discussed in this paper, I shall focus on the adversity reading. For now, our point is that these adversative meanings emerge when the body-part reading is not possible and that they are either absent or very slight when the body-part reading is possible.²

A similar situation appears to hold even in those languages in which the PR construction results from noun incorporation. Observe the following examples from Mohawk (Mithun 1984:868) and Chukchee (Polinskaja & Nedjalkov 1987:259).

- (8) Wa-hi-'sereht-an^vhsko. (Mohawk)
 PAST-he/me-car-stole
 'He car-stole me.' = 'He stole my car.'
- (9) a. ətləg=in ətl²a w²i=g²i (Chukchee)
 the=father's mother died
 'The father's mother died.'
 b. ətləg=ən ətl²a=w²e=g²e
 father=ABS mother(inc.)=died=3S(aor.)
 'The father's mother died.'

It is said that in Iroquoian languages 'possessor stranding' is generally restricted to inalienably possessed objects, with the results whereby the stranded nominals and the incorporated nominals are related in terms of the notion of inalienable possession. The situation observed in (8), involving alienable possession, is characterized as 'pragmatically conditioned' by Mithun; i.e., the adversative connotation supports the stranded pronominal.³

Polinskaja and Nedjalkov call our attention to the parallel reading between the PR form in (9b) and the Japanese adversative passive expression *Titi wa haha ni sinareta* 'The father had his mother die.'⁴

Indeed, the so-called adversative or indirect passives in Japanese and other Asian languages that have parallel constructions exhibit the very meaning contrast under discussion. When a body-part is involved, no obvious adversative meaning is detected, while the adversity reading is associated with a non-body part passive form. Compare the following Japanese examples:

- (10) a. Taroo-wa Hanako-ni atama-o nagur-are-ta.
 -TOP -DAT head-ACC hit-PASS-PAST
 'Taro was hit on the head by Hanako.'

- b. Taroo-wa Hanako-ni piano-o hik-are-ta.
 -TOP -DAT piano-ACC play-PASS-PAST
 'Taro was adversely affected by Hanako's playing the piano.'
- c. Taroo-wa Hanako-ni nagur-are-ta.
 -TOP -DAT hit-pass-past
 'Taro was hit by Hanako.'

(10a) and (10b) are formally identical in that they exhibit the valency-increasing property characteristic of indirect passives. Yet, while (10b) yields the adversity reading, (10a), with the body-part possessor interpretation, does not. There is no noticeable difference between (10a) and the regular direct passive form in (10c), where the adversative connotation, due to lexical meaning, is qualitatively different from the adversative meaning observed in (10b). The adversity reading obtains with respect to (10a) only when the head in question is understood to be somebody else's than Taro's.

The extent to which the valency-increasing, indirect passive construction obtains varies from one language to another—Japanese, Even and Evenki being on the wider side and Korean and Chinese being on the restricted pole—but the adversity reading in such a construction obtains across languages when body-part expressions are not involved. For example:

- (11) a. Etiken nugde-du gia-o-j ma-v-ra-n. (Even)
 oldman.NOM bear-DAT friend-NOM-REF POS S G kill-PASS-NONFUT-3SG
 'The old man had his friend killed by the bear.' (Malchukov 1993)
- b. Na-nun sensayngnim-eykey ilum-ul cek-hi-ess-ta. (Korean)
 I-TOP teacher-DAT name-ACC write-down-PASS-PAST-IND
 'I had my name written down by the teacher.' (Kim to appear)
- c. Wǒ bèi Zhāng Sān tōukānle rìjì (Chinese)
 I PASS steal.look.ASP diary
 'I had my diary read by Zhang San.'

The point of all this comparison between the body-part reading and the adversity reading is to show that the possessive relationship between the possessor and possessed nominals ascribed to the PR construction is not something that is inherent in the construction but something motivated by the construction just like the adversative meaning observable in related constructions. Just to bring this point home, let us look at topic constructions in Japanese and other languages.

The topic constructions of the following type also impose an interpretation in which a relationship of inalienable possession obtains between the topic and the body-part nominals.

- (12) a. Zoo-wa hana-ga nagai. (Japanese)
 elephant-TOP nose-NOM long
 'As for the elephant, its nose (=trunk) is long.'
 (Cf. Zoo-no hana-ga nagai. 'The elephant's nose is long.')
- b. Nèi-xie shùmu shù-shēn dà. (Chinese)
 those trees tree-trunk big
 'Those trees, the trunks are big.' (Li & Thompson 1976)
 (Cf. Nèi-xie shùmu de shù-shēn dà 'The trunks of those trees are big.')

- c. Si Juan dako ang ulu. (Cebuano)
 TOP big TOP head
 'Juan, the (his) head is big.'
 (Cf. *Dako ang ulu ni Juan.* 'Juan's head is big.')
- d. Ali kepala-nya besar. (Indonesian)
 head-3P big
 'As for Ali, his head is big.'
 (Cf. *Kepala-ku besar.* 'My head is big.')

For example, in Indonesian example (12d), the nominal for 'head' is marked by the third person pronominal clitic whose referent can be anybody, but the sentence cannot mean something like 'As for Ali, his (e.g. Ketut's) head is big.' However, the possessive relationship observed here is not an inherent property of the topic construction in these languages, as the following topic constructions with no stipulated possessive meanings are all possible.

- (13) a. Hana-wa sakura-ga itiban ii. (Japanese)
 flower-TOP cherry-NOM first good
 'As for flowers, cherry blossoms are the best.'
- b. Dòngwu wǒ zùzhāng bǎo-shòu zhèngcè. (Chinese)
 animal I advocate conservation policy
 'Animals, I advocate a conservation policy.' (Li & Thompson 1977)
- c. Si Maria mi-duol sa babaye. (Cebuano)
 TOP AF-approach DIR woman
 'Maria, (she) approached the woman.'
- d. Anak itu, Ali pukul dia. (Indonesian)
 child that hit him
 'The child, Ali hit him.'

What we have observed above with regard to the PR construction, its dative analog, and the indirect passive construction is the trade-off relationship between the body-part reading and the adversity reading. I consider this to be an important observation that forces us to treat all these constructions in a unified manner so that the semantic peculiarities and specific restrictions observed with respect to each construction fall out naturally from the general analysis.

3 The semantic integration of extra-thematic arguments

A widely observed characteristic of the relevant dative constructions is the extra-thematic nature of the dative nominals in question. By 'extra-thematic,' I mean a situation where an argument exists that is not part of the case frame of the verb with which it occurs, or that does not bear a theta role specified by the verbal head. Thus, Kliffer (1973:41) agrees that the Spanish dative of interest is 'not an argument of the surface main verb in deep structure.' Likewise, Berman (1982:39) characterizes the 'ethical' dative of modern Hebrew as the dative 'which introduces a grammatically and pragmatically extraneous argument, a nonparticipant in the event's occurrence...' In French linguistics the kind of dative being considered is termed the 'datif étendu' with the recognized extra-thematicity (Leclère 1976, 1978).

In the GB framework, too, researchers (e.g. Borer & Grodzinsky 1986 and Authier & Reed 1992) have been concerned with ways of assigning theta roles to these extra-thematic datives. Jaeggli (1986:23) remarks:

The requirement that clitic pronouns be thematically interpreted raises a question concerning ethical dative clitics. They are clearly not linked to a θ role which is assigned to an argument position of the verbs that they appear attached to. In fact...their thematic interpretation is vague with respect to the predicate they are associated with.

A similar concern has also been expressed by O'Connor (to appear:13) working on a 'true' PR construction. Thus, with regard to the thematic role of the 'raised possessor' in (14b) (her 24b), she remarks that:

The verb *lok* 'to fall or collapse,' if predicated of a whole person, e.g. 'the man,' means that the person fell down or collapsed. If predicated of a body-part, as in the examples below, it means that the body-part fell off the human possessor's body. Thus if the verb *lok* in example [(14b)] took *mo:wal* 'him' as its Theme argument, it would mean 'He fell.' Example [(14b)], however, continues to mean that the person's toe fell off, not that he himself fell or collapsed, with or without the toe.

- (14) a. *mo:wa?* *xamabu:sa-nam lok'-a* (Non-PR form)
 3SM.OBL big toe spec fall/drop
 'His big toe fell off.'
 b. *mo:waw-al xamabu:sa lok'-a* (PR form)
 3SM.P big toe fall/drop
 'His big toe fell off.'

A widely adopted solution to the above problem is to posit either a case role (-like feature) such as [affect] or AFFECTEE as in Kliffer (1973) and Berman (1982) or to assume special mechanisms that assign the possessor theta role and the benefactive/affected theta role as in Jaeggli (1986), Borer & Grodzinsky (1986), and Authier & Reed (1992). A similar solution has been advanced for the subject theta role of the passive constructions in Japanese such that when that subject does not instantiate any role defined by the verb, as in the case of indirect, adversative passives, a thematic role such as 'experiencer' or 'affectee' is posited as a way of licensing what I call extra-thematic arguments (Miyagawa 1989, Washio 1993). I find all these approaches problematic.

The analysis that assigns two separate theta roles as in the GB framework divides up the dative construction into two types, while its form and the semantic trade-off relationship discussed earlier indicate its uniform character (cf. Tuggy 1980). That is, the analysis called for is the one that tells us why certain constructions yield the body-part possessor reading while others are associated with the adversity reading rather than the one that simply assigns separate theta roles, without seeking a unified treatment over the entire range of the relevant constructions. The analysis that posits a case role (-like feature) has problems of its own. Firstly it is not clear what licenses such a role. Since it is not licensed by a verb, we must assume that the construction itself is associated with the feature. But what construction? The constructions with which the particular dative nominals occur are both varied and limited. As will be seen subsequently, they can be intransitive constructions or transitive constructions, but only of particular kinds. Furthermore, a vague role such as [affect] or AFFECTEE must be interpreted

anyway, as it sometimes represents a body-part possessor and sometimes a person more indirectly affected negatively or positively. In fact, more important are a descriptive account of the semantics of the relevant dative nominals and their realization patterns and a theoretical account for the phenomenon than an argument over whether or not a case role like [affect] is appropriate.⁵

As it turns out, a closer observation reveals that the PR construction and the relevant dative construction are neither general nor stable enough to be submitted to the formal treatments in terms of well-defined theta roles or in terms of general syntactic relation-changing rules. As will be detailed in the next section, these constructions across languages are constrained by various factors, such that, for example, the PR construction is limited to body-part possession in Northern Pomo (O'Connor, to appear) and the dative construction is constrained by various factors such as person features. Furthermore, there is a great deal of individual variation over the acceptability judgment of dative constructions. Thus Kliffer (1973) found that while three of his informants said 'sí' to the Spanish form in (15a), the other five replied 'no'. The situation is similar in French such that according to Iguchi's (1991) survey, only one person each accepted and rejected (15b), while three informants considered the sentence questionable.

- (15) a. ?Mi marido se me compró un pantalón nuevo.
'My husband bought himself a new (pair of) pants on me.'
- b. ?On a cassé le bras à ce garçon.
'They broke the arm on the boy.'

Berman (1982) remarks that ethical datives in modern Hebrew are a recent innovation and that some consider them to be non-normative, a situation in which a great deal of variation in acceptability is expected.

Similarly, adversative passives in Japanese and other languages regularly require extraneous semantic support such as an intimate connection between the referent of the subject and that of the person responsible for bringing about the adverse effect. Thus, in (16a) below, it is normally understood that Taro and Hanako were in a special relationship such as being a married couple or lovers. No such stipulation is called for in such constructions as the causative and the direct passive, whose arguments are licensed by clearly defined theta roles, or even in a construction involving an actual experiencer, as in (16d).

- (16) a. Taroo-wa Hanako-ni sin-are-ta.
-TOP -DAT die-PASS-PAST
'Taro had Hanako die on him.'
- b. Taroo-wa Hanako-ni hon-o yom-ase-ta.
-TOP -DAT book-ACC read-CAUS-PAST
'Taro had Hanako read a book.'
- c. Taroo-wa Hanako-ni nagur-are-ta.
-TOP -DAT hit-PASS-PAST
'Taro was hit by Hanako.'
- d. Taroo-wa Hanako-ga suki-da.
-TOP -NOM like-COP
'Taro likes Hanako.'

On the basis of these facts I contend that these constructions involve no theta-roles such as the possessor and the affectee roles; instead I maintain that the meanings suggested by these roles are imputed to these constructions as a way of integrating the extra-thematic nominals into clausal semantics. I think that all the proposals for case roles such as [affectee] and mechanisms for assigning theta roles to these arguments in question originate in the state of mind that is so captivated by the charm of Fillmorean Case Grammar or the Chomskyan theta criterion. What these extra-thematic arguments call for is a theory of semantic integration of sentential elements much broader than that countenanced in the framework of Case Grammar or GB syntax. Perhaps the following modified version of the slogan formulated by Fillmore and Kay (1992:4.22) might be a good first approximation:

- (17) a. We must find everything we need;
- b. we must account for everything we find.

All the constructions discussed in this paper challenge the second part of the slogan as they contain extra-thematic arguments, which by definition fail to be accounted for in terms of the theta roles associated with the verbal head. The most straightforward account for them is in terms of semantically integrating them into the propositions stated by the rest of the sentences such that the referents of these extra-thematic arguments are integrated into the scenes evoked by the propositions. The major factor holding the key to such an integration is the relevance that the referent of the extra-thematic argument has to the described scene.

The notion of relevance must be defined, and we will attempt to do so in the next section. But for now, it is intuitively seen that the possessor of an inalienably possessed body-part is by far the most relevant to the scene of the described event when that event involves a body-part. When an inalienably possessed head is hit, for example, its possessor is at the scene and is directly affected by having his head hit. Thus integrating an extra-thematic argument as the possessor of an inalienably possessed body-part is the simplest way of accounting for or justifying the existence of that argument. The PR construction, the dative construction, the indirect passive construction, and the topic construction all permit the possessor of an inalienably possessed body-part as an extra-thematic argument in their most restrictive domains; that is, these constructions in some languages may not permit any other types of extra-thematic arguments than those construable as the possessor of an inalienably possessed body-part (see below).

When the body-part reading is available, no additional semantic support or augmentation is needed. But when no such reading is possible, an additional meaning relationship must be sought in integrating the extra-thematic argument in the described scene. The adversity reading is tied to the integration of its referent as an indirect participant being (negatively) affected by the described main event. The trade-off relationship between the body-part reading and the adversity reading discussed in the preceding section is a reflection of this situation. Namely, when the semantic integration of an extra-thematic argument is possible on the account of the body-part and the possessor relationship, no additional semantic support is required, but when such an account is not possible, semantic augmentation is required that doctors up the relevance of the referent of the extra-thematic argument to the described scene. (Cf. Croft 1985 for a semantic analysis similar to ours in spirit.)

Our account predicts that a greater amount of semantic augmentation is required as the ostensible relevance between the referent of an extra-thematic

argument and the described scene gets smaller. This prediction is borne out. For example, among the following Japanese indirect passives, the amount of semantic stipulation needed differs significantly.

- (18) a. Taroo-wa Hanako-ni atama-o nagur-are-ta
 -TOP -DAT head-ACC hit-PASS-PAST
 'Taro was hit on the head by Hanako.'
- b. Taroo-wa Hanako-ni kiteiru huku-o yogos-are-ta.
 -TOP -DAT wearing clothes-ACC dirty-PASS-PAST
 'Taro had the clothes he/she was wearing dirtied by Hanako.'
- c. Taroo-wa Hanako-ni gohan-o zenbu tabe-rare-ta.
 -TOP -DAT meal-ACC all eat PASS-PAST
 'Taro was adversely affected by Hanako's eating all the meal.'

No adversity meaning is imputed to (18a), as pointed out earlier. (18b) dramatically shows the effect of the proximity, a component feature defining the notion of relevance. When the clothes are understood to have been worn by Taro, we can easily see his relevance to the scene and the negative effect he received is easily established without further semantic stipulation. But when the clothes are construed to be those worn by Hanako, then we must immediately search for the justification for Taro's being relevant to the scene; e.g. Taro was responsible for keeping Hanako's clothes clean or he was obliged to pay for Hanako's laundry, etc., etc. By the same token, for an expression like (18c), we normally assume that Taro was hoping to eat at least some meal ---the assumption that justifies the integration of Taro in the described scene as an adversatively affected party. Perhaps discriminating French speakers might find themselves making similar efforts in interpreting the following examples.

- (19) a. Pierre lui a coupé les cheveux.
 'Pierre cut her hair.'
- b. Le gosse lui a démolé son pull.
 'The kid ruined her/his sweater on her.'
- c. Jean lui a mangé tout le fromage.
 'Jean ate all the cheese on him/her.'

We have more to say about the semantics of all these sentences involving extra-thematically licensed arguments in later sections. And we shall now turn to specific factors controlling the well-formedness of this type of sentence. These factors are again consistent with our view that the problems of the PR construction and the adversative constructions are better handled in terms of a broader notion of semantic integration as outlined above than in terms of thematic roles or relation-changing syntactic machinery. In particular, they all point to the conclusion that: 1) the higher the relevance of the extra-thematic argument is to the described scene, the easier it is to integrate it, and 2) the more difficult to integrate an extra-thematic argument is, the more required are semantic augmentation and morphological trappings supporting and overtly indicating its relevance.⁶

4 Factors controlling the integration of extra-thematic arguments

Hyman (1977) is among the rare early works on the PR phenomenon examining not only its syntactic patterns but also the semantic factors controlling the phenomenon. Specifically he identifies the following conditions.

- (20) Creation of a possessor object depends on:
- a. the nature of the possessed noun
 - b. the nature of the verb
 - c. the nature of the possessor. (Hyman 1977:104)

As it turns out Hyman's formulation hits the bull's-eye of the relevant conditions for the PR construction. However, as we are treating the PR construction as an instance of the broader phenomenon involving extra-thematically licensed arguments, the scope of some of Hyman's conditions must be broadened. More significantly, our discussion makes it clear that the relevant conditions are not conditions on the PR construction (or noun incorporation) per se; rather they are conditions on the integration of extra-thematic arguments that apply not only to the PR construction but also to the dative analog of the PR construction, the indirect passive, and to some extent the topic construction.⁷

As the foregoing discussion shows, the concept that plays the key role in the integration of extra-thematic arguments is 'relevance'. The higher the relevance of the referent of an extra-thematic argument is to the described scene, the easier it is to integrate it. But the notion of relevance must be defined. We will do this by delineating the properties of the optimally relevant participants. The participants constituting the event itself, say an agent and a patient of a scene construed as involving a prototypical transitive activity, are optimally relevant to the scene of the event. They show two characteristic features. One is their physical presence and the other, the affecting and affected roles they play in constituting a transitive event. These two features, physical proximity and the affecting or the affected role can be used as parameters defining the notion and the degree of relevance. The phenomena we are considering are crucially related to the parameters of physical proximity and affectedness, the affecting role being relevant to other semantic situations such as causatives. These two parameters are related such that one who is present in the scene is more directly affected than one that is not attendant on the scene.

Relevant to our discussion here is the pioneering work on body-part syntax by Bally (1926), who discussed similar concepts in terms of the notions of 'solidarity' (*solidarité*) and 'personal sphere' (*sphère personnelle*). The notion of solidarity relates to the transitive relationship of affectedness; that is when an action is exerted on a part, the whole is also affected. The concept of personal sphere defines the range over which the affectedness relationship extends between the affected object and the person transitively affected; e.g. a body-part and its owner, kinsmen and their relations, etc. We shall see below that various factors controlling the integration of an extra-thematic argument are specific manifestations of these two key concepts defining the relevance of the referent of an extra-thematic argument to the described scene.

4.1 Inalienability and physical proximity

As pointed out above and in all the relevant literature, the possessor of an inalienably possessed object, typically a body-part, is the most preferred target for the PR construction and the related constructions studied here. This is easily

understandable from our point of view. Namely, the possessor of a body-part is the easiest to integrate into the scene because it has high relevance to the described scene; when a body-part is affected in an event, its possessor is present at the scene and is also affected by the transitivity effect. Our approach, in fact, trivializes the notion of inalienability in the relevant constructions, as the condition based on it is derivable from the proposed theory of semantic integration, which crucially hinges on the notion of relevance (see also Fox 1981 for a similar view).

Our approach predicts that when the relevance to the scene is guaranteed, the possessor of a detachable object can easily be integrated, more readily, in fact, than the person whose kin is involved in the event. Thus, Newari allows (21a.b), but not (21c).

- (21) a. Ji dhaaten chon syaa.
 I really head hurt
 'I really hurt in the head.'
 (Cf. Ji-gu chon dhaaten syaa. 'My head really hurts.')
- b. Ji dhaaten wosa phohar.
 I really clothes dirty
 'I am really dirty-clothed.'
 (Cf. Ji-gu wosa dhaaten phohar. 'My clothes are really dirty.')
- *Ji baa dhani.
 I father rich
 (Cf. Ji-mi baa dhani. 'My father is rich.')

(21b) illustrates one of the favorite scenes discussed by most of the researchers working on the PR and related constructions (see Diffloth 1974, García 1975, Hyman 1977, Tuggy 1980, Berman 1982, Wierzbicka 1988, Kim, to appear). They all agree that the person to be integrated into the scene must be actually wearing the clothes in question; PR is difficult or impossible when the clothes are hanging in the closet. The crucial factor here, then, is not really the absolute relationship between the possessor and the possessed, as is often assumed when discussion of the issues of inalienability is carried out in terms of an alienability hierarchy,⁸ but is rather whether or not the possessor is physically involved in the scene.

That this constraint applies equally to the PR construction and to the indirect passive is seen in Korean, where both these constructions are possible when the referents of the extra-thematic arguments are construed to be present in the scene. Thus, the following Korean PR sentence and indirect passive sentence are possible only when 'John' was wearing the clothes and the shoe when the described events happened.

- (22) a. Mary-nun John-ul os-ul ccic-ess-ta.
 -TOP -ACC clothes-ACC tear-PAST-IND
 'Mary tore the clothes off of John.'
- b. John-un Mary-ekey sinpal-ul pal-hi-ess-ta.
 -TOP -DAT shoe-ACC step on-PASS-PAST-IND
 'John had his shoe stepped on by Mary.' (Kim, to appear)}

Chinese is not usually characterized as having the PR construction (but see Fox 1981), but it is well-known for the omission of the associative marker *de*,

which, among others, connects the possessor and the possessed (see Chapell & Thompson 1992 for the details on the omissibility of *de*. However, when this particle is absent in certain positions such as subject and object positions, the expressions receive interpretations characteristic of the PR construction in other languages. Thus, the meaning difference between Chinese forms (23a) and (23b) parallels that between Northern Pomo examples (24a) and (24b).⁹

- (23) a. Tā de tóu téng
 he ASSOC head hurt
 'His head hurts.'
 b. Tā tóu téng
 he head hurt
 'He hurts in the head/He has a headache.'
- (24) a. mo:waʔ xama:nam dithal-e
 3SM.OBL foot-DET hurt-PRES
 'His foot hurts.'
 b. mo:wal xama: dithal-e
 3SM.P foot hurt-PRES
 'He has foot pain.' (O'Connor, to appear)

Now, when the associative *de* is missing in the object position of certain expressions, the possessor is likely construed to be physically involved in the scene. The same also applies to the indirect passive as in the Korean PR and indirect passive constructions. Thus, in (25a,b) the speaker is assumed to have been wearing the clothes.

- (25) a. Zhāng Sān sībòle wǒ yīfu.
 tear-ASP I clothes
 'Zhang San tore my clothes.'
 b. Wǒ bèi Zhāng Sān sībòle yīfu.
 I PASS tear-ASP clothes
 'I had the clothes torn by Zhang San.'

Languages differ in the extent to which the notion of relevance is stretchable. Those (e.g. Northern Pomo) permitting PR only to the body-part expression are most restrictive. In other languages that permit the integration of extra-thematic arguments other than a body-part possessor, the cutoff point varies from one language to another, and even within a single language a great deal of individual variation over the acceptability judgment is observed (see the discussion regarding the previous examples in (15)). In cross-linguistic comparison, the two parameters of proximity and affectedness must be considered together so that the specific effects of each parameter for the displayed pattern can be recognized. This point can be illustrated by the following patterns exhibited by French, German, and Spanish.

- (26) a. *Sa femme lui est morte. (French)
 'His wife died on him.'
 b. Mir ist meine Mutter gestorben. (German)
 'I had my mother die on me.'

- c. Se me murió mi madre. (Spanish)
'I had my mother die on me.'
- (27) a. *Son bébé lui a pleuré toute la nuit. (French)
'Her baby cried on her all night.'
- b. ?Mein Baby hat mir die ganze Nacht geweint. (German)
'My baby cried on me all night.'
- c. Mi bebé me lloró toda la noche. (Spanish)
'My baby cried on me all night.'
- (28) a. *El bebé del vecino me lloró toda la noche. (Spanish)
'The neighbor's baby cried on me all night.'

Both Spanish and German show a greater latitude in the affectedness dimension, as they show a greater range of the adversative datives (or Dativ Incommodi) than French. This is demonstrated by the fact that both Spanish and German permit intransitive-based forms as in (26), while French doesn't. But, as shown in (27), Spanish and German too are sensitive, to a different degree, to the difficulty in establishing the relevance of an extra-thematic argument. The German form (27b) is highly questionable, while the Spanish counterpart (27c) is readily accepted. The contrast between (26b) and (27b) indicates that the gravity of the effect upon the referent of the dative nominal plays a role in its integration. That is, not only physical impact but mental impact controls the relevance of the affected party to the described scene. By asterisking (28), we are making a crucial assumption regarding the scene of description; namely, the neighbor's baby cried in its house, while I was trying to sleep in my house. Should our assumption have been that the neighbor's baby cried clutching my leg, the sentence would have been all right. That is, the proximity dimension of relevance is playing a crucial role here.

The Japanese indirect passive, allowing the greatest latitude in the satisfaction of the relevance requirement, permits all these forms that are prohibited to varying degrees in these different languages. Thus, in (29a), unlike Korean and Chinese, the shoe in question needn't be on my foot; it could be the one that I had polished and left at the door. Indeed, it needn't even be mine, it could be Hanako's. By the same token, unlike Spanish form (28), (29b) is possible even if the baby had cried three houses away.

- (29) a. Boku-wa Hanako-ni kutu-o hum-are-ta.
I-TOP -DAT shoe-ACC step on-PASS-PAST
'I had the shoe stepped on by Hanako.'
- b. Boku-wa tonari-no akatyan-ni hito ban zyuu nak-are-ta.
I-TOP neighbor-GEN baby-DAT one night throughout cry-PASS-PAST
'I had the neighbor's baby cry on me all night.'

However, even in Japanese some connection must be stipulated between the referent of the extra-thematic argument and the described event. For example, if the shoe in (29a) had belonged to Hanako, we would assume that Taro had something to do with the shoe such as his having an obligation to polish Hanako's shoes regularly. And in (29b), the speaker must have been actually bothered by the neighbor's baby crying; and so if the speaker could not hear it cry, then there will be no necessary connection to integrate the speaker to the scene of the baby's

crying. The adversative constructions, thus, obtain on a delicate balance between the direct involvement and the remoteness of relevance. The direct involvement as a body-part possessor necessitates no semantic augmentation and no adversity reading obtains. But a person too removed from the scene of an event cannot be integrated as an affected party and under such a circumstance the adversative construction cannot be sustained.

4.2 Transitivity and affectedness

Even though with sufficiently convoluted logic any event can be construed as affecting an individual, many languages require some obvious indication as to how such an individual can be an interested party to the described event. As is clear from the observations so far, the possessive relationship between a possessor and an alienable object is next to the inalienable possessive relationship that helps to establish the relevance of the possessor to a scene crucially involving the possessed object. That is, when the possessed object is affected, its owner, though he may not be physically present at the scene, is also affected; e.g. he may have lost his possession or he may have been annoyed by something undesirable happening to his possession. Most of the relevant examples given so far in this paper, thus, receive an interpretation that the referent of an extra-thematic argument is a possessor of an object directly affected. Indeed, in some languages, overt marking of such a relation is favored for the integration of an extra-thematic argument, as can be seen in the contrast in the following French examples (see section 4.4. below on a related phenomenon).

- (30) a. On lui a cassé sa vaisselle.
'They broke her dishes on her.'
b. ?On lui a cassé la vaisselle.
'They broke the dishes on her.'

Transitivity is crucially related to the notion of affectedness. The greater the impact, the greater the effect upon the interested party; e.g. the more radical a change an object undergoes, the more affected its possessor. But the concept of transitivity relevant to the notion of affectedness is not directly correlated to syntactic transitivity. We already noted that French in general does not permit adversative datives with intransitive verbs (see (26a) and (27a)). But when the referent of a dative clitic is physically involved in the described scene, or when the negative effect upon the interested party is clearly perceived, adversative expressions are possible, as shown below.

- (31) a. Les insectes lui couraient sur les jambes.
'The insects crawled on his legs.'
b. Des pierres lui tombaient sur la tête.
'Stones fell on his head.'
- (32) a. 'Le chiot lui a pissé dans ses laitues.
'The puppy peed on his lettuce on him.'
b. Les gosses lui ont gribouillé sur tous les murs.
'The brats scrawled all over the walls on her.'

Indeed, the concept of transitivity relevant here is not that of syntactic transitivity, as even syntactically transitive clauses fail to permit adversative datives when the referent of a dative clitic is not physically involved in the event. Thus, the following forms are not possible.

- (33) a. *Elle lui pensait aux oreilles.
 'She was thinking about his ears.'
 b. *Tu lui aimes bien les jambes.
 'You really like her legs.'

The transitivity effect is also observed in languages with a true PR construction, and, thus, Yeon (1993) observes the following pattern of acceptability gradation in Korean.

- (34) a. John-i Mary-lul son-ul ttayli-ess-ta.
 -NOM -ACC hand-ACC hit-PAST-IND
 'John hit Mary on the hand.'
 b. ?John-i Mary-lul tali-lul po-ess-ta.
 -NOM -ACC leg-ACC see-PAST-IND
 'John saw Mary's leg.'
 c. *John-i Mary-lul moksolu-lul tul-ess-ta.
 -NOM -ACC voice-ACC hear-PAST-IND
 'John heard Mary's voice.'

Again, this notion of semantic transitivity has an interesting correlation with the general semantics of the constructions with extra-thematic arguments. As seen in (33), a weak transitive scene, in which the referent of a dative object nominal is not physically affected, the clitic is difficult to integrate. However, when a weak transitive sentence is augmented with the adversity reading, so that the relevance of the referent of the clitic is implicated, then such a sentence may successfully incorporate the dative clitic. Thus, Diffloth (1974) tells us that the following French sentences in (35) imply a sense of advertence or inconvenience in relation to the referent of the dative clitic; i.e. 'I saw her navel against her consent, or without her knowledge, my seeing it somehow affecting her... perhaps in a negative way,' and 'I saw his head although he was trying to hide himself.' (133) In the same vein, Hyman (1977) elaborates on his translation of the Haya PR sentence in (35) that it 'implies that what I saw of the child was only his arm, possibly also that I wasn't supposed to see it.' (105) (See also the relevant discussion by García 1975:282.)

- (35) a. Je lui ai vu le nombril.
 'I saw her navel.'
 b. Je lui ai vu la tête.
 'I saw his head.'
- (36) η-ka-bón' ómwáán' ómukôno.
 I-P3-see child arm
 'I saw the child's arm.'

So, again we see the adversative meaning coming in to augment the relevance of an extra-thematic argument when its integration is more difficult on other accounts.

This correlation between the adversity reading and the degree of affectedness is also seen in indirect passives. Thus, when the verb involved is one of high impact, no adversity reading, other than the lexically conveyed negative meaning, is detected, while the involvement of a verb of low impact entails a strong adversity reading, as observed in the following contrast:

- (37) a. Hanako-wa Taroo-ni hoppeta-o nagur-/har-/tuner-are-ta.
 -TOP -DAT cheek-ACC hit/slap/pinch-PASS-PAST
 'Hanako had her cheek hit/slapped/pinched by Taro.'
 b. Hanako-wa Taroo-ni hoppeta-o sawar-/nader-/mitume-rare-ta.
 -TOP -DAT cheek-ACC touch/stroke/stare-PASS-PAST
 'Hanako was adversely affected by Taro's touching/stroking/staring at her cheek.'

The parameters of affectedness and physical proximity show an interesting trade-off relationship in German such that when the transitivity is low and hence the affectedness is less clearly perceived, a more direct involvement of the referent of a Dativ Incommodi is required, while when the transitivity is high, a remoter involvement is permitted. This can be illustrated by *brennen* 'to burn' and its high transitivity derivative *verbrennen* 'to scorch, to burn out' (see Abraham 1971 and Ogawa 1989).

- (38) a. Der Hut, den ich auf dem Kopf trug, brannte mir.
 'The hat, which I carried on the head, burned on me.'
 a' *Der Hut, der auf dem Hutständer hing, brannte mir.
 'The hat, which hung on the hat stand, burned on me.'
 b. Der Hut, den ich auf dem Kopf trug, verbrannte mir.
 'The hat, which I carried on the head, burned out on me.'
 b' Der Hut, der auf dem Hutständer hing, verbrannte mir.
 'The hat, which hung on the hat stand, burned out on me.'

Certain Chukchee adversative PR forms seem to require both the affectedness and the physical proximity parameters satisfied to appropriate degrees. Thus, Vladimir P. Nedjalkov (p.c.) informs me that (39b) from Polinskaja & Nedjalkov (1987) is possible only when the father was at the scene, witnessing his reindeer's running away; hence ungrammaticality results when the reindeer had run away from his son's place. And if the reindeer wasn't the father's, he couldn't care less, and the adversative expression wouldn't be called for.¹⁰

- (39) a. ətləg=in qaa= (akka=ypə) gəntek=w²e=t
 father=GEN reindeer=ABS son=ABL ran away
 'The father's reindeer ran away (from the son).'
 b. ətləg=ən (*akka=ypə) qaa=gəntak=w²e
 father=ABS son=ABL reindeer=run=off=3S.AOR
 'The father lost his reindeer (*from the son).'

4.3 Person hierarchy

The key notion in our treatment of extra-thematic arguments is that of relevance, whose affectedness dimension underpins the notion of personal interest in the described scene. In fact, constructions similar to what we have been examining were discussed in terms of the concept of the *personne intéressée* by Bally (1926). In the case of inalienable possession, the involvement of the possessor as an interested person is obvious. But as the solidarity between a possessed object and its possessor becomes weaker, the identification of an interested person becomes more difficult. Likewise, when no possessive relation can be established, the relevance of the described scene to anyone other than those directly involved in the event, i.e. those thematically licensed, becomes far more difficult to determine. However, such an event can be highly relevant to the discourse participants, especially to the speaker, as he is the one speaking about it.

Our approach, with the claim that the extra-thematic argument is pragmatically integrated into clausal structure on the basis of the notion of relevance, makes a prediction that the person hierarchy plays a role in the relevant constructions. This is borne out at a general level in PR constructions, as they obtain more generally with first and second person possessors (Hyman 1977, Blake 1984, O'Connor, to appear). Person features, in fact, have a far-reaching effect on the displayed pattern in the integration of extra-thematic arguments. The general pattern is this. When the integration of an extra-thematic argument is highly motivated, as in the case of the possessor of an inalienably possessed body-part, any type of noun is permitted. But as the establishment of the relevance becomes more difficult, only pronouns, or first and second person pronouns, or only first person pronouns are integrable.

First, French shows that when the interpretation of a body-part possessor is possible, both full nouns and pronominal clitics are integrable, though the latter are preferable particularly with less conventional activities (see the difference between (40b) and (41b)). However, when the interpretation of body-part possessor is not possible, only pronominal clitics are readily integrable. Thus, whereas the (a) forms in (42) and (43) receive a high acceptability rating, the corresponding (b) forms are rejected by far more speakers than those accepting them (see Iguchi 1991 as well as Authier & Reed 1992).

- (40) a. Elle lui lave les cheveux.
'She washes his hair.'
- b. Elle lave les cheveux à Jean.
'She washes Jean's hair.'
- (41) a. On lui a cassé le bras.
'They broke his arm.'
- b. ?On a cassé le bras à ce garçon.
'They broke the boy's arm.'
- (42) a. Jean lui a cassé sa vaisselle.
'Jean broke her dishes.'
- b. *Jean a cassé sa vaisselle à Marie.
'Jean broke Marie's dishes.'

- (43) a. Le chiot lui a pissé dans ses laitues.
 'The puppy peed on his lettuce on him.'
 b. *Le chiot a pissé dans ses laitues à Paul.
 'The puppy peed on his lettuce on Paul.'

The same kind of restriction applies to what Borer & Grodzinsky (1986) call 'ethical datives' in modern Hebrew, by which they mean those datives that cannot be construed either as possessors or as reflexives. But modern Hebrew is more lax than French in that they permit the integration of a full noun that is construable as a possessor.

- (44) a. *hem mitxatnim l -Rani kol ha-zman
 they marry to-Rani all the-time
 'They marry on Rani all the time.'
 b. ha-yalda kilkela l -Dan 'et ha-radio
 the-girl spoiled to-Dan ACC the-radio
 'The girls broke the radio on Dan.' (Borer & Grodzinsky 1986)

Spanish seems to be more restrictive than French and modern Hebrew in that it is said to allow only first and second person clitics with the non-possessive, i.e., ethical dative, construction (Jaeggli 1986:25). This restriction appears to be an original Indo-European feature (see Kliffer 1973:3). German, though it permits a wide range of dative constructions, allows only first and second person pronouns in what is called the *Dativ ethicus* construction in the relevant literature. The *Dativ ethicus* occurs in exclamatory sentences, as shown below, and in such expressions only *mir/luns*, *dir/leuch* are permitted (Wegener 1989, Ogawa 1991). Furthermore, the German *Dativ ethicus* in the imperative mood, as illustrated in (46), is limited to first person singular.

- (45) Der war mir/dir wieder betrunken! (Wegener 1989:57)
 'He was drunk again (to my/your surprise)!'
 (46) a. Fall mir nicht!
 'Don't fall (for my sake)!'
 b. Du gehst mir jetzt sofort nach Haus!
 'You go home right now (for my sake)!'

Spanish also has a construction that permits only the first person singular clitic. This is the so-called 'outer' dative in a sequence of clitics. The example used to illustrate this point by Kliffer (1973:42) is (47), but my informant from Madrid rejects this sentence.

- (47) El perro se me le escapó a Luis.
 'The dog escaped from Luis on me.'

However, García (1975) makes the same point more cautiously in connection with the following sentences, about which she says that the progression from (48a) to (48c) 'moves from difficult to barely tolerable to impossible, as the extra relevance-giving Dative sinks from first to second to third person.' (443)

- (49) a. Me le pintaste la mesa.
 'You painted his table "on" me.'
 b. Te le pinté la mesa.
 'I painted his table "on" you.'
 c. Se le pinté la mesa.
 'I painted his table "on" her.'

What these restrictions indicate is that with respect to those situations whose relevance to a third party is difficult to establish, only discourse participants are or only the speaker is authorized to claim their or his relevance.¹¹

The relevant restrictions extend beyond person features such that between an animate and an inanimate entity, the PR construction obtains more freely with the former, while the adversative constructions are only limited to sentient beings who can feel the sense of adversity (see Bally 1926, Hyman 1977, Fox 1981, O'Connor, to appear).

4.4 Possessor marking

In some languages the possessor has a marker indicating it as a possessor even in PR constructions. Thus, the Guugu Yimidhirr form in (49b) has the genitive marker *aga* on the possessor even though it is discontinuous to the possessed nominal.

- (490 a. Biiba yarrga-aga-mu-n gudaá gunda-y
 father boy-GEN-mu-ERG dog.ABS hit-PAST
 'The boy's father hit the dog.'
 b. Yarrga-aga-mu-n gudaá gunda-y biiba-ngun
 boy-GEN-mu-ERG dog.ABS hit-PAST father-ERG
 'The boy's father hit the dog.' (Haviland 1979)

A form like (49b) appears to give prima facie evidence for the raising analysis that lifts the possessor nominal from a NP complex containing an adnominal, genitive-marked possessor nominal. However, the facts are slightly more complex and they, in fact, argue for our integrational analysis. In line with Dixon's (1980) observation, the Guugu Yimidhirr pattern observed in (49) obtains only with respect to alienable possession, including the relationships between kinsmen, and when inalienable possession is involved, no possessor marking occurs. E.g.:

- (50) Dyidyii-nda nganhi dyinda-y ngaabaay
 bird-ERG 1SG.ACC peck-PAST head-ABS
 'The bird pecked me [in the] head.' (Haviland 1979)

In another Australian language, Kalkatungu, the possessor of an inalienable object can be extra-thematically integrated without possessor marking, but the integration of the possessor of an alienable object requires the goal marking in the verb in addition to the optional marking on the possessor (also notice the adversative meaning of (51b)).

- (51) a. kalpin-tu ngai lha-yi-nha ityintyi
 man-ERG me hit-Ø-PAST nose
 'The man hit me on the nose.'
 b. kuntu gnai wairra nuu a-nghi thuma-nytyami yalkapari nga-tyi
 not I heart lie AUX-me break-GOAL boomerang me-GEN
 'I don't want him to break my boomerang on me.' (Blake 1984)}

A similar pattern of the possessor marking in PR constructions is reported for a Hachijōjima dialect of Japanese by Kaneda (1993), where the combinations of the genitive marker and the case marker are observed. In fact, the forms corresponding to the following standard Japanese forms are possible in this dialect. (Standard Japanese allows neither (52b) nor (52c).)

- (52) a. taiko-no kawa-o yabut-ta.
 drum-GEN skin-ACC break-PAST
 '(I) broke the drumhead of a drum.'
 b. taiko-no-o kawa-o yabut-ta.
 drum-GEN-ACC skin-ACC break-PAST
 lit. '(I) broke (of) the drum (of) its drumhead.'
 c. taiko-o kawa-o yabut-ta.
 drum-ACC skin-ACC break-PAST
 lit. '(I) broke the drum (of) its drumhead.'

Kaneda (1993:174) reports that the genitive marker, as seen in (52b), is more omissible, as in (52c), as the relationship between the possessor and the possessed is predictable as in body-part possession and the whole-part combination.

Finally, possessor marking interacts with person features in Newari, such that, as predicted, first and second persons may omit the possessor marking, but not the third person. Observe:¹²

- (53) a. Ji-gu dhaaten chon syaa.
 I-GEN truly head hurt
 'I truly hurt in the head.'
 (Cf. Ji-gu chon dhaaten syaa 'My head truly hurts.')
 b. Ji dhaaten chon syaa.
 I truly head hurt
 'I truly hurt in the head.'
- (54) a. Chan-gu dhaaten chon syaa la?
 you-GEN truly head hurt Q
 'Do you really hurt in your head?'
 b. Chan dhaaten chon syaa la?
 you truly head hurt Q
 'Do you really hurt in your head?'
- (55) a. Wo-yu dhaaten chon syaa hon.
 he-GEN truly head hurt I.hear
 'I hear that he truly hurts in his head.'

- b. *Wo dhaaten chon syaa hon.
 he truly head hurt I.hear
 'I hear that he truly hurts in his head.'

This observation, in fact, all the observations in section 4, are highly consonant with our integrational approach. The marking on the possessor is required where the integration of the extra-thematic argument requires more effort. To put it the other way around, the more predictable the relevance of the extra-thematic argument to the described scene is, the less need there is for morphologically indicating its relevance.

5 Remaining problems

Space limitations do not permit us to pursue them, but we should briefly touch upon those remaining problems that must be addressed in a full treatment of extra-thematic arguments. A first problem is the range over the adversity/benefactive reading. As noted earlier, a fair number of languages permit both adversity and benefactive readings with regard to extra-thematic arguments. Whether the construction permits such an option depends on a number of factors. Firstly, when an extra-thematic argument occurs in a construction with a semantic constraint of its own, its occurrence may be licensed by satisfying such a constraint, and therefore it requires no further semantic augmentation leading to the adversity/benefactive reading. A case in point is the topic construction. As we saw earlier, the 'double subject' or topic construction permits extra-thematic arguments in topic position. But they are not associated with the adversity reading even when they are not possessors of a body-part. This has to do with the general condition associated with the topic construction. Namely, the topic construction must satisfy the so-called 'aboutness condition' such that the comment-part must appropriately characterize the topic. As long as the topic expression satisfies this condition, no further semantic support is required (see note 9).

Whether the extra-thematic argument construction is exclusively associated with the adversity reading or it permits the benefactive reading depends to a great extent on whether or not a given language has a distinct benefactive construction. Japanese, for example, has a distinct benefactive construction, and therefore its indirect passive is typically associated with the adversity reading. In languages like German and Spanish, in which the benefactive construction involves dative nominals just like body-part datives and ethical datives, the range of the adversity/benefactive reading seems to be determined on the basis of how widely the benefactive construction has encroached on the domain of dative constructions. When the benefactive construction remains severely limited, as in German, by the basic give-schema, which stipulates the transfer of an object to a goal (beneficiary) (see Shibatani, to appear), a larger portion of extra-thematic dative constructions is associated exclusively with the adversity reading, while if the benefactive construction has been generalized, as in Spanish, then extra-thematic dative constructions tend to be more freely given the benefactive reading, though the adversity reading still seems to be predominant even in such a situation. The contrast under discussion is illustrated by the following Spanish example, which yields both adversity and benefactive readings. German, however, only permits the adversity reading for such an expression.

- (56) *Le tomé la sopa a Mamá.* (Kliffner 1973)
'I drank soup on Mom/I drank soup for Mom.'

There are several syntactic problems associated with the constructions involving extra-thematic arguments. One issue has to do with the syntactic position of an argument with which an extra-thematic argument may hold a possessive relationship. This problem arises only in those constructions in which an extra-thematic integration is carried out in terms of the possessive relationship. This problem has been addressed in Relational Grammar in terms of the host for PR. Many languages (e.g. Northern Pomo, see O'Connor, to appear) seem to restrict the host argument to absolute positions, e.g. the object of a transitive clause and the subject of inactive intransitive clause ---the positions encoding a patient role. Yet some other languages, e.g. Newari, restrict the host to be the patientive subject. A possible explanation for this restriction may be obtainable from the notion of the affectedness discussed in this paper and that of the 'aboutness condition' of the topic construction just noted above.¹³

Finally, another syntactic problem has to do with the syntactic status of extra-thematic arguments. Again, there has been a considerable amount of literature, especially the Relational Grammar literature, on the problem. Though there appears to be a fair amount of variation on the syntactic effect of the integration of an extra-thematic argument, a general tendency seems to emerge. That is, the syntactic status of an integrated argument firstly depends on how entrenched the construction permitting it is. In those languages in which PR is a well-established phenomenon, the integrated argument tends to hold the grammatical relation of the host (see the Relational Grammar literature). Secondly, the syntactic status of an integrated argument depends on the ease and the stability of the integration. For example, those arguments integrated in terms of the possessive relationship hold a stronger syntactic relation to the clause than those that are integrated as adversely affected entities. Thus, Borer & Grodzinsky (1986) note that the ethical datives, as opposed to the possessive datives, in modern Hebrew cannot be questioned. And the same point is made by Authier & Reed (1992) with regard to what they call affected datives in French. This is reminiscent of the fact that even in English, an extra-thematically licensed argument cannot be readily questioned (see Goldberg 1993 and Shibatani, to appear for the discussions bearing on this point). Compare:

- (57) a. John gave Bill a CD.
b. Who was given a CD by John?
- (58) a. John bought Bill a CD.
b. ?Who was bought a CD by John?

These syntactic facts are consistent with our analysis of extra-thematic arguments; namely those that are integrable easily, e.g. a body-part possessor, acquire a firmer syntactic status than those that are integrated on the basis of a flimsier semantic relationship. Thus the integrational approach advocated in this paper offers promising leads to these remaining problems, which seem to have been approached from wrong angles in the past.

* I am grateful to the following colleagues for helping me with the data, the relevant literature, and their interpretations in their languages of specialization: Ruth

Berman (Modern Hebrew), Noritaka Fukushima (Spanish), Hiroshi Hayashi (French), Marianne Mithun (Amerindian languages), and Akio Ogawa (German). I have unashamedly plagiarized from them their data, observations, and ideas. With this acknowledgement, I absolve *myself* from the responsibility over any remaining errors! This work was in part supported by a grant-in-aid (# 04301059) from the Japanese Ministry of Education, Science and Culture.

NOTES

¹ But Berman (1982:36) notes that the relevant usage 'is quite generally attributed to Slavic-Yiddish influence...'

² Transitivity also plays some role for the distinction here; see section 4.2 below.

³ Anticipating our conclusion, it is not correct to impose 'lexical' restrictions (e.g. body-part items only) on PR (Baker 1986, O'Connor, to appear, and others). The restriction is not on PR per se, but rather on the integration of extra-thematic arguments (see section 4).

⁴ See also Wierzbicka (1988, Chaps. 2 and 4), where, in a spirit similar to ours, she compares the Japanese adversative passive with the IE dative constructions.

⁵ See García (1975), who also argues against a treatment of the Spanish ethical dative clitics in terms of thematic roles. The domain designated by the term 'ethical dative' varies from one linguistic tradition to another. But for our purposes, we can call 'ethical datives' those extra-thematic dative arguments whose referents are not construed to be possessors of body-parts and other objects.

⁶ Cf. Kuno (1983:204ff) for a similar account in terms of the notion of 'involvement'.

⁷ In fairness to Hyman, we should mention that he also compares the PR construction and its dative analog in European languages and draws cross-constructural similarities.

⁸ See, for example, Polinskaja & Nedjalkov (1987). The discussion here points out the importance of the situated interpretation of the relevant constructions; cf. O'Connor (to appear).

⁹ The expression in (23b) is normally characterized either as a double-nominative/subject or topic construction. Indeed, Northern Pomo examples like (24b) involving an extra-thematic argument in relation to a subject nominal are treatable as a topic construction, and their semantic properties can be made to follow from the general property of a topic construction, which stipulates that the topic and the remaining portion of the sentence must be related in terms of the aboutness condition; i.e. the comment portion must describe a property that appropriately characterizes the topic.

¹⁰ Recall Diffloth's French example, *On lui a tiré dans les pneus* 'People shot in his tires,' which requires the understanding that 'he was in the car, in fact in the driver's seat, at the time of shooting, with the whole vehicle, tires included, considered to be in his personal sphere.' (Diffloth 1974:132)

¹¹ See Iwasaki (1993) for the discussion of wide-ranging phenomena where the person hierarchy, especially the speaker's subjective involvement, plays a role.

¹² Significantly, the genitive marker does not drop in a regular adnominal expression as in; *Ta changu chon kha* 'This is your head.' In the adnominal position, the kinship relation allows greater freedom of the genitive-marker

dropping than the possession of a body-part, as in Mandarin Chinese (see Chapell & Thompson 1992)).

¹³ In the object position, Newari uses a construction that grammatically licenses the body-part possessor and the body-part nominals, as in; *Won jita chenne dala* 'He hit me in the head,' where, just like English, the possessor is marked by the object marker and the body-part by the locative marker. Transitivity also plays a role in these constructions in which arguments are fully grammatically (i.e. thematically) licensed; e.g. **I saw her on the leg* (see Fox 1981 and Wierzbicka 1988, Chap. 2).

REFERENCES

- Abraham, Werner. 1971. Der "ethische" Dativ. Fragen der strukturellen Syntax und kontrastiven Grammatik, hg. von H. Moser. Düsseldorf.
- Authier, Jean-Marc. & L. Reed. 1992. Case theory, theta theory, and the distribution of French affected datives. The proceedings of the tenth West coast conference on formal linguistics. 27--39.
- Baker, Mark. 1988. Incorporation: A theory of grammatical function changing. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bally, Charles. 1926. L'expression des idées de sphère personnelle et de solidarité dans les langues Indo-européennes. In F. Fankhauser & J. Jud (eds.), Festschrift Louis Gauchat. Aarau: Sauerländer. 68--78.
- Berman, Ruth. 1982. Dative marking of the affectee role: Data from modern Hebrew. *Hebrew Annual Review* 6. 35--59.
- Blake, B. 1984. Problems for possessor ascension: Some Australian examples. *Linguistics* 22. 437--453.
- Borer, H. & Y. Grodzinsky. 1986. Syntactic cliticization and lexical cliticization: The case of Hebrew dative clitics. In H. Borer (ed.), *The syntax of pronominal clitics. Syntax & Semantics* 19. Orlando: Academic Press. 175--217.
- Chapell, H. & S. Thompson. 1992. The semantics and pragmatics of associative *de* in Mandarin discourse. *Cahiers de Linguistique Asie Orientale* XXI, No. 2. 199--229.
- Croft, William. 1985. Indirect object "lowering". Proceedings of the eleventh annual meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society. 39--51.
- Diffloth, G. 1974. Body moves in Semai and French. Papers from the tenth regional meeting. Chicago Linguistic Society. 128--138.
- Dixon, R. M. W. 1980. *The languages of Australia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Engelen, Bernhard. 1986. *it Einführung in die Syntax der deutschen Sprache*. Bd. 2. Baltmannsweiler.
- Fillmore, Charles & Paul Kay. 1992. *Construction grammar course book*. University of California, Berkeley.
- Fox, B. 1981. Body-part syntax: Towards a universal characterization. *Studies in Language* 5.3. 323--342.
- García, E. 1975. *The role of theory in linguistic analysis: The Spanish pronoun system*. Amsterdam: North Holland.
- Goldberg, Adele. 1992. *Argument structure constructions*. Ph.D. Dissertation. University of California Berkeley.

- Haviland, J. 1979. Guugu Yimidhirr. In R. M. W. Dixon & B. J. Blake (eds.), *Handbook of Australian languages* Vol. 1. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 27--182.
- Hyman, Larry. 1977. The syntax of body-parts. In E. Byarushengo, A. Duranti & L. Hyman (eds.), *Haya grammatical structure*. Department of Linguistics, University of Southern California. 99--117.
- Iguchi, Y. 1991. Jean lui a cassé sa vaisselle/le bras/ ni mirareru yokaku ni tuite. *Huransugo Kenkyuu* 25. 77-79.
- Iwasaki, S. 1993. Subjectivity in grammar and discourse. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Jaeggli, O. 1986. Three issues in the theory of clitics: Case, doubled NPs, and extraction. In H. Borer (ed.), *The syntax of pronominal clitics* (Syntax & Semantics 19). Orlando: Academic Press. 15--42.
- Kaneda, A. 1993. 'Nizyuu' hyoozigenyoo o megutte---Hatizyoozima Mitune hoogen o rei ni---. In Y. Nitta (ed.), *Nihongo no kaku o megutte*. Tokyo: Kurosio Syuppan. 163--189.
- Kim, K. to appear. Adversity and retained object passive constructions. In N. Akatsuka (ed.), *Japanese/Korean Linguistics 4*. CSLI, Stanford.
- Kliffer, M. 1973. The Spanish dative: Selected syntactic and semantic problems. Ph.D. Dissertation. Cornell University.
- Kuno, Susumo. 1983. *it Sin nihon bunpoo kenkyuu*. Tokyo: Taishukan.
- Leclère, Ch. 1976. Datifs syntaxiques et datif éthique. In C. J. Chevalier & M. Gross (eds.), *Méthodes en Grammaire Française*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Leclère, Ch. 1978. Sur une classe de verbes datifs. *Langue Française* 39.
- Li, Charles & Sandra Thompson. 1977. Subject and topic: A new typology of language. In C. N. Li (ed.), *Subject and Topic*. New York: Academic Press. 457--490.
- Malchukov, A. 1993. The syntax and semantics of adversative constructions in Even. *Gengo Kenkyu* 103. 1--36.
- Mithun, Marianne. 1984. The evolution of noun incorporation. *Language* 60. 847--894.
- Miyagawa, S. 1989. Structure and case marking in Japanese. *Syntax & Semantics* 22. San Diego: Academic Press.
- O'Connor, Mary Catherine. to appear. The situated interpretation of possessor raising. In M. Shibatani & S. A. Thompson (eds.), *Grammatical constructions: Their form and meaning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ogawa, A. 1989. Über Realisationsbedingungen des Dativs im Gegenwartsdeutsch. *it Beiträge zur Germanistik* 18. 29--66. Deutsches Seminar, Universität Kobe.
- Ogawa, A. 1991. Sankaku to meidai---'kansin no sankaku' ni kansuru kasetu---. *Beiträge zur Germanistik* 20. 31--54. Deutsches Seminar, Universität Kobe.
- Polinskaja, M. & V. Nedjalkov. 1987. Contrasting the absolutive in Chukchee: Syntax, semantics and pragmatics. In R. M. W. Dixon (ed.), *Studies in ergativity*. Amsterdam: North-Holland. 239--270.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi. to appear. Applicatives and benefactives: A cognitive account. In M. Shibatani & S. A. Thompson (eds.) *Grammatical constructions: Their form and meaning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tuggy, D. 1980. !'Ethical dative and possessor omission sí, possessor ascension no! *Work Papers of the Summer Institute of Linguistics, University of North Dakota*, 24. 97--141.

- Washio, R. 1993. When causatives mean passive: A crosslinguistic perspective. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 2. 45--90.
- Wegener, H. 1989. Eine Modalpartikel besonderer Art: Der Dativus Ethicus. *Sprechen mit Partikeln*. hg. von H. Weydt. Berlin/New York.
- Wierzbicka, Anna. 1988. *The semantics of grammar*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Yeon, J.-H. 1993. The degree of transitivity in Korean: A functional typological approach. *Language Research* 29. 107--136. Seoul National University.