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1. Introduction

In the literature, three views on the status of dative case have been expressed, in different forms, in GB and Minimalist writings: (a) dative is non-structural Case, usually called “inherent” (Chomsky 1986) or “lexical” (i.e. idiosyncratically determined). Inherent dative, like other inherent cases, is retained throughout the derivation. Being thematically licensed (e.g. D-structure Case in GB; Interpretable Case in Minimalism), it does not alternate with nominative in passives and unaccusatives. For approaches that crucially link NP-movement to Case licensing, this entails that dative arguments do not undergo A-movement, unlike structural accusatives. (b) According to another view, which has been motivated by research on Icelandic (Zaenen, Maling and Thráinsson 1985 and many others following them), dative is quirky Case, i.e. it is idiosyncratically determined by the selecting verb and, as such, it does not become nominative in NP-movement environments (Chomsky 1995 and others). In principle, however, dative arguments do qualify as subjects with respect to a number of subjecthood criteria. This has led to a dissociation of Case and (EPP-) Licensing (as in Marantz 1991; Harley 1995; cf. Yip et al. 1989). (c) One can also find mixed positions in the literature. Dative is held to be ambiguous, qualifying as structural Case in certain languages and as inherent or quirky in others. Dative arguments carrying structural Case enter into case alternations (Broekhuis & Cornips 1994; Svenonius 2002, 2006). Dative has been argued to have a double status even within one language: in certain environments, it is structural, while it is inherent/lexical in others (Harley 1995, Webelhuth 1995).

In this paper, we examine the conditions under which dative-nominative alternations take place across languages. In particular, we investigate the properties of bekomen/krijgen passives in different varieties of Dutch and German and compare these passives to other instances of Dat-Nom alternations attested in Japanese, Ancient Greek and Icelandic. We consider two parameters of variation: (i) the environments where Dat-Nom alternations take place (monotransitives and

* Previous versions of this paper were presented at the GGS 2010 in Berlin in May 2010, at the 25th Comparative Germanic Workshop at the University of Tromsoe in June 2010, and at NELS 41 at the University of Pennsylvania in October 2010. We are grateful to these audiences for their comments and suggestions. Alexiadou’s research was supported by a DFG grant to the project B6 part of the Collaborative Research Center 732, Incremental Specification in Context, at the University of Stuttgart.
ditransitives or only ditransitives) and (ii) the extent to which these depend on the organization of the Voice systems in the languages under discussion (passives or non-passives). The proposal we defend is that mixed approaches towards dative are correct. There are three types of languages: languages where dative is always structural, languages where dative is never structural and finally languages where dative qualifies as structural in some environments and as inherent/lexical in others.

2. **Datives in German and Dutch**

German has morphologically distinct nominative, accusative, dative and genitive case. Certain mono-transitive verbs like *helfen* ‘help’ take a dative object. German ditransitives have four distinct realizations that differ in the morphological marking of the direct (DO) and indirect object (IO) as well as the “unmarked linearization” of the two objects (Lenerz 1977; Höhle 1982; Fanselow 1991, 2000), see (1), from Beermann (2001):

\[
\begin{align*}
(1) & \quad \text{a. Sie hat dem Mann das Buch geschenkt} \\
& \quad \text{She-nom has the man-dat the book-ac given} \\
& \quad \text{‘She has given the man the book’} \\
(1) & \quad \text{b. Er hat den Patienten der Operation unterzogen} \\
& \quad \text{He-nom has the patient-acc the operation-dat submitted} \\
& \quad \text{‘He has submitted the patient to the operation’} \\
(1) & \quad \text{c. Sie hat die Schüler das Lied gelehrt} \\
& \quad \text{She-nom has the students-acc the song-acc taught} \\
& \quad \text{‘She has taught the students the song’} \\
(1) & \quad \text{d. Man hat den Mann des Verbrechens beschuldigt} \\
& \quad \text{One-nom has the man-acc the crime-gen accused} \\
& \quad \text{‘One has accused him of the crime’}
\end{align*}
\]

Morphological dative marks IOs in (1a) and what has been argued to be oblique arguments in (1b). Morphological accusative canonically marks DOs, but it may also exceptionally mark IOs, as in (1c), (1d).

Dutch is like English in that it does not have a distinction between dative and accusative case. According to Broekhuis and Cornips (1994, 2010), Dutch ditransitives are very restricted. Standard Dutch mostly has **goal ditransitives**, and there is also an extremely small set of verbs licensing benefactive ditransitives.

3. **Werden vs.bekommen/krijgen** Passives in German and Dutch

Both German and Dutch cannot form passives of IOs with the auxiliary *werden/worden*. These only permit direct passives (passive of the DO). We illustrate this on the basis of German (2-3):

\[
\begin{align*}
(3) & \quad \text{* Er wurde die Blumen geschenkt} \quad \text{German} \\
& \quad \text{He-nom was the flowers-acc given} \\
& \quad \text{‘He was given the flowers’} \\
(3) & \quad \text{a. Die Blumen wurden ihm geschenkt} \\
& \quad \text{The flowers-nom were him-dat given} \\
& \quad \text{‘The flowers were given to him’}
\end{align*}
\]
Passives of IOs can be formed, but only with the auxiliary *bekommen/krijgen* (Dutch data from Everaert 1990: 127 and Broekhuis and Cornips 1994: 176):

(4) a. Er bekam die Blumen geschenkt  German  
    He-nom got the flowers-acc given  
    ‘He was given the flowers’

    b. Hij kreeg de boeken op zijn kantoor bezorgd  Dutch  
    He got the books at his office given  
    ‘He got the books delivered at his office’

In the literature, there are two main views regarding the status of (4). According to the first one, the examples in (4) are not true passives (see Haider 1984, 1985 Vogel & Steinbach 1998). The opposing view argues that (4) has all the properties conventionally associated with the passive (see Wegener 1985; Reis 1985; Fanselow 1987; Webelhuth and Ackerman 1994 for German; Broekhuis and Cornips 1994, 2010 for Dutch), and the surface subject is an externalized indirect object. Crucially for us, if the latter view is correct, then dative in German and Dutch must be structural Case, at least in the environments where *bekommen/krijgen*-passivization is possible.

The most serious argument in favor of the first view is that *bekommen/krijgen*-passives seem to be subject to idiosyncratic restrictions and, as such, they cannot be considered a productive construction, like the passive usually is. However, *krijgen*-passives in Dutch are very canonical with verbs of transmission and communication. *Bekommen* passives in German are regular with verbs expressing a concrete transfer of possession to the recipient and communication verbs. If a construction is regularly attested under well-defined conditions then it cannot be regarded as idiosyncratic.

Note that there is considerable dialectal variation within/among German and Dutch dialects when it comes to the availability of this passive with monotransitives, unlike ditransitives. For instance, (5) is not acceptable by all speakers across dialects of German (see Lenz 2009).

(5) *Er bekam geholfen  
    He got helped

There are two ways to understand the monotransitive vs. ditransitive asymmetry with *bekommen/krijgen*-passives: Either the meaning of the *bekommen/krijgen* auxiliary, that of a possession relation between the goal and the theme, makes it compatible only with the double object frame, or, alternatively, *bekommen/krijgen* passivization is only possible in environments where dative is structural Case, and dative is in many dialects inherent/lexical Case in monotransitives (because it is more idiosyncratic in monotransitives than in ditransitives, where it is canonically associated with goals). Evidence from dialectal variation militates against the former option. As already alluded to above, in certain dialects of German, e.g. Luxemburg German, monotransitives permit *kréien*-passives:

---

1 Provided that they denote actual transmission of the theme to the goal/beneficiary/inalienable possessor, with the mode of transmission specified (Broekhuis & Cornips (1994) and (2010)).
2 These verbs need not have the mode of transmission specified, see Lenz (in print).
3 Other dialects that allow the passive with monotransitives are those of the West Middle area (Rhine-Franconian/Mosel dialects).
The contrast between (5) and (6) suggests that in Low and Upper German, dative is inherent in monotransitives and structural Case in ditransitives, explaining why *bekommen/krijgen* passives are possible only with ditransitives.

The monotransitive vs. ditransitive asymmetry in Low and Upper German is reminiscent of a pattern reported from other languages as well, such as Japanese, where datives alternate only in ditransitive, not in monotransitive passives (see Fukuda, to appear, Ishizuka 2010 for a recent discussion and references). On the other hand, the Luxemburg German pattern is attested in Ancient Greek, where datives alternate both in monotransitive and in ditransitive passives (Anagnostopoulou & Sevdali 2009, 2010).

There is independent evidence that the *bekommen*-passive is sensitive to the distinction between structural vs. non-structural dative. Dative IOs in (7) can be passivized when the auxiliary is *bekommen*, while dative oblique objects in (8) cannot do so, see Beermann (2001):^4^

(7) Der Mann bekam ein Buch geschenkt
The man-nom got a book-acc given
‘The man was given a book’

(8) *Die Operation bekam den Patienten unterzogen
The operation-nom got the patient-acc submitted

In the double accusative frame, accusative indirect objects become subjects in *bekommen*-passives, as shown in (9) (Beermann 2001). This suggests that it is the higher argument with structural Case that becomes subject in *bekommen*-passives. This argument is dative in “regular ditransitives”, while accusative direct objects become the subjects of *werden*-passives, as in (9b):

(9) a. Die Schüler bekamen das Lied gelehrt
The students-nom get the song-acc taught
‘The students are taught the song’

b. Ein Buch wurde dem Mann geschenkt
A book-nom was the man-dat given
‘A book was given to the man’

In addition to the observation that oblique datives do not become nominative in German, unlike structural ones, as shown in (7-9), there is additional evidence suggesting that the dative can in principle be either structural or inherent case in German. Bayer, Bader & Meng (2000) note that while certain verbs with a single dative object can form a *bekommen*-passive others cannot, once again suggesting that dative objects of monotransitives do not always have structural Case, even in the

---

^4^ As also discussed in Fanselow (2000), and Cook (2006), the *bekommen*-passive is possible and acceptable for all speakers only for ditransitive verbs with the basic/unmarked word order dat >> acc ‘*schenken*’ and not with verbs with the basic/unmarked word order acc >> dat ‘unterziehen’ (see also Czepluch 1988, Molnárfi 1998, McFadden 2004).
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dialects which, in principle, have monotransitive verbs assigning structural dative:\(^5\)

(10) a. Alle gratulierten dem Opa
all congratulated the grand-dad-dat
‘Everybody congratulated the grand-dad’

b. ??Der Opa bekam von allen gratuliert
the grad-dad-dat got by all congratulated

This correlates with the fact that dative is not productive in German. Structural Case is supposed to be productive and therefore ‘on the rise’. This has been argued to be the case with Icelandic dative (Barðal (2001), Maling (2002), Svenonius (2002)\(^6\)) but crucially not with the German dative. We will return to the Icelandic system in the following section.

Turning to Dutch, Broekhuis and Cornips (2010) argue that the formation of krijgen-passives with ditransitives is subject to two generalizations: (i) the verb indicates what mode of transmission is involved and (ii) the referent of the indirect object is the goal (and not the source) of transmission. As already mentioned, the regularity of the process argues against a lexical analysis and in favor of a transformational one. In turn, this suggests that Dutch dative is structural Case.

But are krijgen/bekommen-passives true passives, in the sense of containing an implicit external argument? It is generally agreed upon that the external argument is implicitly present in passivization, as it is semantically and syntactically active. This is suggested by e.g. the licensing of (i) agentive by-phrases, (ii) purpose clauses, and (iii) agentive adverbs. In the remainder of this section we apply these tests to the Dutch and German krijgen/bekommen-passives.\(^7\)

In Dutch, door-phrases are used with the regular passive, while van-phrases are ruled out (with the exception of Limburg- and Belgian/Flemish- Dutch were van is used alongside with door):

(11) Het boek werd hem ?door/*van Peter toegestuurd
The book was him through/by Peter sent
‘The book was sent to him by Peter’

Both in Standard and Heerlen Dutch door-phrases are somewhat marked with the krijgen-passive but the majority of our informants prefer door over van, as in all regular passives:

(12) Jan kreeg het boek gisteren ?door/#van Peter doorgestuurd
Jan got the book gestern through/by Peter sent
‘Jan got the book sent by Peter yesterday’

---

\(^5\) Dative verbs which permit the bekomen passive are beipflichten (‘agree’) and widersprechen (‘object-to’); verbs which don’t are ausweichen (‘avoid’), dienen (‘serve’), vertrauen (‘trust’).

\(^6\) Svenonius (2002) argues that the fact that Icelandic dative is spreading in novel contexts and neologisms provides evidence that speakers do not learn where dative is used on a verb-by-verb basis (as a lexical approach to dative would predict).

\(^7\) Many thanks to Hans Broekhuis, Leonie Cornips, Timothy Colleman, Liliane Haegeman, Jeroen van Craenenbroeck, Marc van Oostendorp, and Jan-Wouter Zwart for Dutch judgements and to Matthias Jilka, Alexandra Lenz, Winfried Lechner, Susanne Lohrmann, Sabine Mohr, Marcel Pitteroff and Florian Schäfer for German judgements.
In German passives, *von*-phrases introduce agents, and *durch*-phrases introduce causers/forces, and causing events:

(13) Die Vase wurde von Peter/ durch den Erdstoß zerbrochen
The vase was broken by Peter / through the earth tremor

‘The vase was broken by Peter / through the earth tremor’

All our informants accept *von*-phrases in the *bekommen*-passive, see also Leirbukt (1997) for a detailed survey.

(14) Peter kriegte das Paket von der Mutter geschickt
Peter got the parcel by the mother sent

‘Peter got sent the parcel by the mother’

While in both Standard and Heerlen Dutch, control into purpose clauses is possible, the German situation is rather unclear. For several speakers (16) is acceptable, while for others not:

(15) Zij kreeg de prijs overhandigd om haar vriendje te irriteren
She got the prize awarded to her friend to annoy

‘She was awarded the prize to annoy her boyfriend’

(16) Unclear Der Junge kriegt das Paket zugeschickt um die Eltern zu ärgern
The boy gets the parcel sent in order to annoy the parents

‘The boy gets the parcel sent in order to annoy the parents’

A similar state of affairs is observed concerning agentive adverbs. While all our Dutch informants accept them (17), (18) is acceptable for some speakers, but not for others:

(17) Zij kreeg opzettelijk het verkeerde boek toegestuurd
She got deliberately the wrong book sent

‘She got deliberately sent the wrong book’

(18) Unclear Der Junge kriegte absichtlich das falsche Paket zugeschickt
The boy got deliberately the wrong parcel sent

‘The boy got deliberately sent the wrong parcel’

We conclude that the Dutch *krijgen*-passive does contain an implicit external argument, as does the German *bekommen* passive of certain of our German informants. This does not hold for all speakers, though, i.e. some speakers do not view these constructions as true passives containing an implicit external argument, at least as far as the control and agentive adverbs tests are concerned. The fact that *von*-phrases are accepted by all speakers might suggest that this is not the most reliable diagnostic for the presence of an implicit external argument. The reasons for this split among speakers/ dialects of German seem to be quite complex, relating presumably to the status of the grammaticalization of the verb *bekommen*. Here, we will treat German as being similar to Dutch.

---

8 Agentive *by*-phrases are licit in English nominalizations, which are taken to lack an implicit external argument, see Fox & Grodzinsky (1998), Alexiadou (2001) for discussion.
4. A Different System: Icelandic Dat-Nom Alternations

Icelandic presents a different system to what we have seen so far. First, dative –
nominative alternations never happen in passives. They happen in -st middles (and
also certain anticausatives and adjectival passives, see Zaenen & Maling 1990).

(19) a. Ég týndi úrinu
   I-nom lost the watch-dat
   ‘I lost the watch’

b. Úrið týndist
   The watch-nom lost-middle
   ‘The watch got lost’

An important difference between the middle and the periphrastic passive in Icelandic
is that the former does not imply agency while the latter does (see Sigurðsson 1989 for
discussion). E.g. middles do not license by-phrases (20b) while periphrastic passives
do (20a) (Sigurðsson 1989: 268; Svenonius 2006):

(20) a. Hundurinn var drepinn (af lögreglunni)
   The dog-nom was killed by the police
   ‘The dog was killed by the police’

b. Hundurinn drapst (*af lögreglunni).
   The dog-nom killed-middle by the police
   ‘The dog got killed’

Another important characteristic of the Icelandic system is that causative change of
state monotransitive verbs may assign dative case. As Maling (2002) notes, the object
is a theme which undergoes a change of location. In (21) the dative Case seems to
require a locative adverbial:

(21) a. þeir mokuðu skaflinum burt
    they shoveled snow-drift-the-dat away
    ‘They shoveled the snow drift away’

b. þeir mokuðu skaflinn
    they shoveled/dug through snow-drift-acc
    ‘They shoveled through the snow drift’

Finally, Sigurðsson (1989) points out that only DO theme datives alternate in
ditransitives (Jónsson 2000 provides a list of some verbs that can do this). The dative
case of benefactive IOs does not alternate. This also holds for the -st verbs, where
dative IOs stay dative, even under -st:

(22) a. Jón gaf mér þetta tækifæri
    John-N gave me-dat this opportunity-acc
    ‘John gave me this opportunity’ (Sigurðsson 1989:270)

b. Mér gaf-st þetta tækifæri (*viljandi)
    me-D gave-st this opportunity-nom (*willingly)
    ‘I happened to get this opportunity’ (Sigurðsson 1989:270)

We thank Florian Schäfer and Jim Wood for many (e-mail) discussions over this point.
A comparison between the German/Dutch and the Icelandic system leads to a generalization along the following lines:

(23) **Dat-Nom Generalization**

Dat-Nom alternations happen 'high' (i.e. in passives and passive-like constructions) when the case affected is assigned on non- prototypical DO arguments of monotransitives (non-themes) and IOs in ditransitives. Dat-Nom alternations happen 'low' (i.e. in anticausatives and anticausative-like constructions) when the case affected is assigned on prototypical DOs (themes) both in monotransitives and in ditransitives.

5. **Sketching an Analysis**

We propose to link the two different types of Dat-Nom alternations in (23) to properties of two different heads in the vP domain. More specifically, Alexiadou, Anagnostopoulou & Schäfer (2006) argue that (change-of-state) verbs are syntactically decomposed into a Voice, a v and a Resultant state component:

(24) \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{[Voice [v [RootP/Resultant state ]]]}
\end{array}
\]

Under the Voice Hypothesis (Kratzer (1996)), the functional projection of Voice is responsible for the introduction of external arguments. The same head introduces a DP in the active and licenses a PP in the passive. v introduces event implications and is crucially implicated in causatives (see Pylkkänen 2002/2008; cf. Ramchand’s 2008 process head). This decomposition makes available two heads that could in principle be involved in Case licensing-absorption, Voice and v. Based on this, we argue for the following:

(25) **Case assignment/ absorption hypothesis**

Dative 'assignment' and 'absorption' are mediated through the same head. The head that licenses dative when it is active cannot license it when it is non-active. (Anagnostopoulou & Sevdali (A&S) 2009, 2010)

Following Svenonius (2002, 2006) and Sigurðsson (2009a), we assume that structural dative Case is a property of the Root (since it is sensitive to the semantics of the root, it is partially idiosyncratic etc.), but it is licensed by a higher head (Voice or v). We propose that the two language-types in (23) differ with respect to the head licensing dative: (a) In German, Dutch, AG and Japanese the higher head Voice licenses dative when it is active. Passive Voice is defective, 'absorbing' (i.e. not licensing) structural dative. (b) In Icelandic, dative is licensed by the lower head v. Dative 'absorption' is failure of licensing by a defective v in middles, stative passives and anticausatives. Structural dative continues to be licensed in passives because the higher Voice[+ passive] does not interfere with the properties of the lower v. In what follows, we illustrate first how this works for monotransitives, proceeding from there to ditransitives.

We propose that structural dative in AG and German dialects permitting the formation of bekomen-passives with monotransitives is licensed by Voice. In passives, the Case features on Voice are inactive (a deficiency perhaps reducible to the presence of a deficient set of phi-features in Voice), and the DP object cannot be
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licensed by Voice. It is licensed by T. The result is that the single DP argument carries Nom.

\[(26)\]
a. VoiceP 
   |   
   vP 
   |   
   \[+A\]

Since change of state/ causative verbs always assign accusative in these languages, we propose that Acc is located in v (27a), and hence is absorbed at that level (27b):

\[(27)\]
a. VoiceP 
   |   
   vP 
   |   
   \[+A\]

Note that (26) is inapplicable to Dutch and German dialects with monotransitives not forming *bekommen*-passives, because in these cases, dative is not structural (similarly for Japanese). (26) is applicable to AG, Luxemburg German and the dialects permitting *bekommen*-passives with monotransitives.\(^{10}\)

In Icelandic, Dat is licensed by v explaining why it can surface on objects of causative verbs. Hence, Voice[Pass] does not interfere with assignment of Dat by the lower v. Since Voice[Pass] only 'absorbs' Acc in Icelandic, we propose that Voice[Act] licenses Acc:\(^{11}\)

\[(28)\]
a. VoiceP 
   |   
   \[DA\]
   |   
   vP 
   |   
   \[+D\]

Dative is 'absorbed' in middles (stative passives and anticausatives) which contain Case deficient variants of v head and lack Voice:\(^{12}\)

\(^{10}\) If German *bekommen*-passives lack Voice (as Control and adverbs suggest for some speakers), then the structure is like Icelandic (29), except that there is no suppressed Dat feature.

\(^{11}\) See Svenonius (2006) who argues that dative case in Icelandic is assigned structurally by a combination of v(our Voice) and a VD (our v). cf. also Schäfer (2008: 290f.) who argues that dative case is licensed by Voice\(\text{DAT}\).

\(^{12}\) There is an alternative analysis proposed in the spirit of Svenonius (2006) in slightly different variants in Schäfer (2008) and Sigurðsson (2009). According to these three authors, the situation in Icelandic is related to the absence of Voice, which characterizes anticausatives and stative passives. Since Voice is absent, the higher argument will get structural nominative instead, following Marantz (1991) and Yip & al. (1987). The -sr facts could be captured in this analysis assuming that an expletive Voice is involved (Schäfer 2008).
Turning to ditransitives of all languages, we assume that they have a structure where the IO and the DO are introduced in the lower part of the tree and \( v \) and Voice are merged above them. In AG and German dative assignment and absorption happens at the level of Voice and accusative assignment and absorption happens at the level of \( v \):

\[
\text{VoiceP} \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{Voice} \\
\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{vP} \\
\end{array} \\
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Voice} \\
\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{v} \\
\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{IO} \\
\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{DO} \\
\end{array} \\
\end{array}
\]

In Icelandic, Dat-Nom alternations never affect IOs, only DOs. This is so because Voice and \( v \) are both involved in the assignment of structural accusative or dative Case on the DO, as in monotransitives. The IO dative is licensed by a lower applicative head, the head that thematically introduces it, and is preserved under passivization (i.e. the IO has inherent dative; Anagnostopoulou 2003, Wood 2010 among others).

Turning, finally, to Dutch, recall that there are two-modes of dative passivization: \textit{werden}-passive, where dative is preserved; \textit{krijgen}-passive where dative is absorbed. It seems that two different structures feed the two modes: an applicative structure the \textit{werden}-passive vs. a non-applicative one the \textit{krijgen}-passive. As Broekhuis & Cornips (2010) note, Dutch ditransitive verbs must denote actual transmission of the theme argument in order to be able to undergo \textit{krijgen}-passivization. Example (31a), their (34), implies actual transmission of the package to Marie, and \textit{krijgen}-passivization is possible; example (31b), on the other hand, is an idiomatic example, which does not imply transmission of \textit{de rillingen}, and \textit{krijgen}-passivization is excluded.

\[(31) \quad \text{a. Jan bezorgde Marie/haar het pakje} \\
\text{Jan delivered Marie/her the package} \\
\text{‘Jan brought Marie the package’} \]

---

\(^{13}\) It is irrelevant, for the moment, whether they are Spec and complement of a low applicative or a small clause head, Spec and complement of the Root, or the DO is argument of the Root and the IO specifier of a high applicative head. But see right below for evidence that the presence of an applicative head matters to the analysis of Icelandic and Dutch.

\(^{14}\) In terms of EPP-driven movement in passives, Icelandic is order preserving: the higher dative becomes the subject and the lower nominative theme is an object (see Holmberg & Platzack 1995; Collins & Thráinsson 1996 among others for a discussion of EPP driven movement in Icelandic passives from the point of view of locality).
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a'. Marie/Zij kreeg het pakje bezorgd
Marie/she got the package delivered
‘Marie was brought the package’

b. De heks bezorgde Marie/haar de koude rillingen
the witch delivered Marie/her the cold shivers
‘The witch gave Marie the creeps’

b'. *Marie/Zij kreeg de koude rillingen bezorgd
Marie/she got the cold shivers delivered

This contrast is reminiscent of a well-known difference in English ditransitives which, in turn, is suggestive of the type of dative that enters *krijgen*-passivization in Dutch. While the double-object example (32b) can have a “causative reading, this is not possible in the PP-example (32a) (these are the well known “Oehrle facts”; see Pesetsky 1995 for discussion and references):

(32)  a Nixon gave a book to Mailer  
      agentive/*causative

       b. Nixon gave Mailer a book  
      causative/agentive

Assuming that the IO in the English double-object construction in (32b) is licensed by an Applicative head (Baker 1988; Marantz 1993; Pylkkänen 2002; Anagnostopoulou 2003 and many others), the contrast in (31) suggests that in Dutch it is the non-applicative version of a ditransitive that undergoes *krijgen*-passivization. In Dutch *krijgen*-passives (as in Japanese and AG passives) the higher head Voice licenses dative when active. Passive Voice 'absorbs' (i.e. does not license) dative. On the other hand, an applicative structure is involved in *werden*-passivization; in this structure the applicative head licenses the Case of the IO and the DO must alternate.

6. Conclusions

In this paper, we looked at Dat-Nom alternations in dialects of German and Dutch and compared the patterns attested in these languages to AG, Japanese and Icelandic. We argued that there are three main factors regulating variation within and across languages: (a) Whether the alternations are limited to ditransitives (Low and Upper German, Dutch, Japanese) or they are also found with monotransitives (Luxemburg German, AG, Icelandic). (b) Whether the alternations affect IOs in ditransitives and non-theme DOs of monotransitives (Luxemburg German, AG) or only DOs in ditransitives and monotransitives (Icelandic). (c) Whether the alternations happen in passives, i.e. constructions containing an implicit external argument (AG, Dutch, Japanese, German for a group of speakers) or in non-passives, i.e. constructions lacking an implicit external argument (Icelandic, German for another group of speakers). Factor (a) has been attributed to the mixed status of dative: structural vs. inherent/ lexical. Factors (b) and (c) have been argued to reduce to properties of the voice system, more specifically to properties of the heads Voice and v.

15 See Anagnostopoulou (2005) for arguments that there is no necessary correlation between the category of Indirect Objects (PP vs. DP) and the absence vs. presence of an applicative head.
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