

Inversion as Rightward-dative Shift in Icelandic Ditransitives

Cherlon Ussery
Carleton College

This paper builds on previous work which investigates the nature of double object constructions in Icelandic. Icelandic ditransitives display two intriguing patterns with respect to case and complement frames. The first pattern is that while the indirect and direct objects can appear in a variety of case combinations (the subject is always nominative) in the DP-DP variant, the DP-PP variant (in which the PP is headed by *til* 'to') is restricted to constructions in which the direct object undergoes physical (not syntactic) movement. The second pattern is that some verbs allow a surface order in which the direct object precedes the indirect object even though there is no preposition and the DP-PP variant is not available. Collins and Thráinsson (1996) argue that this inversion structure is neither derived via object shift of the direct object nor rightward extraposition of the indirect object. I agree that inversion is not object shift. However, I argue that inversion is a special type of rightward extraposition of the dative. I propose a modified version of Bruening's (2010) R(ightward)-dative shift operation. In line with Bruening's (2010) analysis for English, I show that there is a relationship between rightward projection of the specifier of ApplP and A-bar extraction in Icelandic. Building on this proposal, I argue that movement of the Appl head to V projects a higher specifier and that extraction occurs from this higher position. Additionally, I extend this proposal to account for constructions in which extraction occurs from a leftward projected specifier. The motivation for the overall argument is that the distribution of the DP-PP frame illustrates that inversion and DP-PP frames have unique derivations.

With respect to English, there is considerable debate about the degree to which DP-DP frames map to a meaning that is distinct from that of DP-PP frames (Beck and Johnson 2004, Rappaport Hovav and Levin 2008, Harley and Jung 2015, a.o.). For the distinct meanings camp, the DP-DP frame encodes possession and the DP-PP frame encodes motion. Icelandic provides evidence for this approach. While both *senda* 'send' and *sýna* 'show' allow the DP-DP variant, only *senda* allows the DP-PP variant, shown in (1).

- (1) a. Haraldur sendi mér ost. b. Haraldur sendi ost til mín. c. *Hann sýndi bátinn til strákanna.
H sent me.Dat cheese.Acc H sent cheese.Acc to me.Gen he showed the boat.Acc to the boys.Gen
'Harold sent me (some) cheese.' 'Harold sent (some) cheese to me.' 'He showed the boat to the boys.'
(Thráinsson 2007:173-174)

Even though *sýna* does not allow the DP-PP variant, it does allow both the standard order in (2)a and the inverted order in (2)b. While the interpretation of (2)b is the same as a DP-PP variant, the unavailability of this frame suggests that (2)b has a derivation distinct from (1)b.

- (2) a. Við sýndum foreldrunum_i krakkana sína_i. b. Við sýndum krakkana foreldrum sínum_i.
we showed the parents.Dat kids.Acc their(refl) we showed the kids.Acc parents.Dat their (refl)
'We showed the parents their kids.' 'We showed the kids to their parents.' (C&T 1996:416)

Collins and Thráinsson (1996) make four observations about inversion. First, inversion is not object shift (of the accusative DP) since inversion does not depend on verb movement. Second, inversion changes binding whereas standard rightward extraposition does not. The binding facts in (2) suggest that the dative c-commands the accusative in (2)a and that the accusative c-commands the dative in (2)b. Third, only dative-accusative standard orders allow inversion. Fourth, the dative is either phonologically heavy or stressed. Adopting the first observation that inversion is not object shift, I build on work by Jónsson (2000) and Bruening (2010) to illustrate that the second, third, and fourth observations are actually related.

While the direct object of a DP-DP variant can map to accusative, dative, or genitive, the indirect object can only map to accusative or dative. Jónsson (2000) illustrates that the case on indirect objects reflects their thematic properties. Indirect objects that are recipients and benefactives are dative, while indirect objects

