

WG1: Affectees in MWEs: German and Modern Greek

Stella Markantonatou (ISLP, Athens) & Manfred Sailer (Goethe-University, Frankfurt a.M.)

Introduction In both Modern Greek (EL) and German (DE), a large group of verbal MWEs come in a syntactic structure that includes an additional free oblique argument, marked in italics.

- (1) a. DE: *jemandem.DAT* einen Strick um den Hals legen
someone.DAT a rope around the neck put
b. EL: *tou.GEN* vazo ti thilia sto lemo
HE.DG put the noose to-the neck 'to force somebody to do something'

We investigate to which extent the occurrence of these free datives (DE) and dative-genitives (EL) within the MWEs are subject to the same constraints as in compositional combinations.

Affectee structures Hole 2014 discusses free datives (FD) in DE. He argues that they should be analyzed as syntactic complements of the verb and as additional participants in the eventuality denoted by the verb. The datives have thematic entailments such as being (i) causally affected (entirely, or a part of them), (ii) consciously involved and/or (iii) intended beneficent/maleficent. We call this thematic role 'Affectee'. An Affectee complement can be used iff the denoted eventuality has a participant with Affectee entailments, but these do not yet follow from the thematic entailments associated with the other argument slots [Affectee Argument Condition, AAC]. Consequently, a free dative can be coreferential with another argument as long as the other argument slots do not come with an Affectee entailment.

- (2) Alex_i hat *sich_i* die Haare gewaschen.
Alex has herself.DAT the hairs washed 'Alex washed her hair.'

In many cases, a sentence with free datives (3a) entails the truth conditions of a similar sentence with a possessive NP (3b), which does not require the Affectee entailment.

- (3) a. Alex hat *Kim* die Haare gewaschen. |= b. Alex hat Kims Haare gewaschen.
Alex has Kim.DAT the hair washed Alex has Kim's hair washed
'Alex washed Kim's hair.'

As shown by the English translations, the free dative can be interpreted as an external possessor of a definite co-argument in DE (Haspelmath, 1999). Since the meaning difference between (3a) and (3b) is rather small, the two structures can often be used interchangeably.

EL uses dative-genitive clitics (DG) (4a) with much the same function as DE free datives. Coreference with another argument, as in (2), is excluded because there are no reflexive clitics in EL (5). An external possessor interpretation is available (4b) with a range of verb predicates.

- (4) a. I Aleka *tou* elouse ta mali |= b. I Aleka elouse ta malia tou Kosta
the Aleka he.GEN washed the hair the Aleka washed the hair the Kostas.GEN
(5) the Alexa_i she.GEN_{*i/j} elouse ta malia

Hypotheses for MWEs We explore whether free datives (FD)/dative-genitives (DG) in MWEs behave largely like their counterparts in free combinations. We test the following hypotheses:

H1: The occurrence of a free dative/dative genitive in MWEs is subject to the AAC.

H2: The alternation illustrated with (3) and (4) is possible with MWEs, i.e. whenever the structure in (3a/4a) is possible, so is (3b/4b).

	DE (of 92 MWEs with FD)	EL (of 81 MWEs with DG)
No causally affected entailment	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
No bene-/male-ficient entailment	10 (11%)	8 (10%)
No consciously involved entailment	2 (2%)	4 (5%)

Table 1. Distribution of DE/EL MWEs according to AAC entailments.

To test our hypotheses, we collected about 150 MWEs from each language that contain either

FD/DGs or non-fixed possessives and classified them as shown in Table 1 and Table 2. DE MWEs were extracted from *Duden 11 Redewendungen*. All EL MWEs that fitted the description in a collection of 1200 EL MWEs were used.

Evaluation H1 is confirmed for both DE and EL. All FD/DG structures were subject to at least one of the three AAC entailments.

H2 could not be confirmed in either DE or EL. Line 2 of Table 2 shows that FD/DG may occur in structures with no possession at all (EL) despite the fact that the DG is an obligatory component of the MWE (cf. 6(a)). Line 3 shows that not all MWEs with a FD/DG allow for a possessive variant (without the FD/GD argument) in both DE and EL. The situation is similar if only MWEs with a body part possessum (line 5) are considered; EL seems to be more permissive with alternations than DE.

		DE	EL
1	MWEs with a FD/DG	92 (61% of 151 MWEs)	81 (52% of 155 MWEs)
2	MWEs with FD/DG and possession	92 (100% of MWEs with FD)	76 (94% of MWEs with DG)
3	MWEs alternating between FD/DG and possessive NP	34 (37% of MWEs with FD)	42 (52% of MWEs with DG)
4	MWEs with DG/FD involving body parts	68 (74% of MWEs with FD)	46 (57% of MWEs with DG)
5	MWEs with body part possessum alternating between FD/DGs and possessive NPs	26 (38% of MWEs with FD and body part possessum)	35 (76% of MWEs with DG and body part possessum)

Table 2. Distribution of DE/EL MWEs according to possession and FD/DG alternation.

For illustration, (6a) is a Greek MWE that contains a DG but no possession. In (6b) we provide a German MWE that alternates and in (6c) we show one that does not.

- (6) a. *kati tou vgeni ksino* / #*kati vgeni ksino kapiou*. GEN `smbd does not enjoy smth'
 smth he.GEN turns sour / smth turns sour smbd's
- b. *jemandem die FüÙe küssen* / *jemandes FüÙe küssen*
 someone.DAT the feet kiss / someone's feet kiss `kiss someone's feet'
- c. *jemandem auf die FüÙe treten* / #*auf jemandes FüÙe treten*
 someone.DAT on the feet step / on someone's feet step `step on someone's feet'

These data suggest that FD/DGs in MWEs are interpreted just as in free combinations. However, the Affectee entailment must be considered a fixed semantic part of the meaning of the majority of these MWEs and, consequently FD/DGs are a lexicalized part of the non-alternating MWEs.

Conclusion Our study shows a differentiated picture of regularity and idiosyncrasy within MWEs: while the syntactic structures of the considered MWEs are all regular and the FD/GDs are interpreted as in free combinations, the presence of these additional arguments is idiosyncratically required in the majority of our data. The DE-EL comparison shows a striking similarity in the semantics of the additional Affectee arguments and in their use in MWEs, though the corresponding syntactic structures are considerably distinct.

References Duden 11. 2002. *Redewendungen*. Dudenverlag. * Haspelmath, M. 1999. External possession in a European areal perspective. In D.L. Payne & I. Barshi. *External Possession*. Benjamins. 109-135. * Hole, D. 2014. *Dativ, Bindung und Diathese*. Akademie Verlag.