

## SOME ENGLISH EQUIVALENTS OF POLISH DATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS

EWA DĄBROWSKA

*Uniwersytet Gdański*

### *1. English equivalents of the Polish dative in the NOM-DAT-ACC construction*

A Polish sentence with an accusative and a dative object can be translated into English in a variety of ways. The most obvious equivalent is the English 'internal dative' construction:

- (P1) Joanna dała Piotrowi długopis.
- (E1) Joanna gave Peter (DAT) a pen.
- (P2) Joanna upiekła Piotrowi ciasto.
- (E2) Joanna baked Peter (DAT) a cake.

Sentences such as (E1) and (E2) have prepositional analogues in English ((E3), (E4)) which are very similar in meaning to the non-prepositional constructions, and which are also translational equivalents of Polish dative constructions.

- (E3) Joanna gave a pen to Peter.
- (E4) Joanna baked a cake for Peter.

However, it seems that the most *frequent* equivalent of the Polish dative is a possessive modifier before the direct object:

- (P5) Chłopcy stłukli Dorocie okno
- (E5) The boys broke Dorota's (DAT) window.

When the consequences of the action are unpleasant or harmful to the person named by the dative NP, the 'malefactive construction', or the *on*-dative, may be used in English:

- (P6) A teraz rozbił nam samochód.
- (E6) and now he wrecked us-DAT car-ACC
- (E6) And now he's wrecked the car on us.

Finally, the so-called 'ethical dative' is either left out in translation, or else its special implications (irritation, lack of respect for the addressee, etc.) are conveyed lexically:

- (P7) nie obgryzaj mi paznokci.  
don't bite me-DAT fingernails-ACC
- (E7) (For God's sake) don't bite your fingernails.
- (P8) Nie dotykaj mi tej drukarki!  
don't touch me-DAT this printer-ACC
- (E8) Don't you touch this printer!
- (P9) Podgryzał sobie kawałek chleba.  
he munched himself-DAT piece-ACC bread-GEN
- (E9) He was quietly munching a piece of bread.

Thus, there are *five different construction types in English* (corresponding to the Polish NOM-DAT-ACC construction) plus a variety of lexical means.

The situation is rendered even more complex by the fact that both the *to*-dative and the *for*-dative have Polish analogues with the prepositions *do* and *dla*, respectively, which differ in meaning from sentences with dative NPs.

- (P10a) Umył Kasi włosy.  
he washed Kasia-DAT hair-ACC  
'He washed Kasia's hair (for her).'
- (P10b) Umył włosy dla Kasi.  
he washed hair-ACC for Kasia-GEN  
'He washed his hair for Kasia.'
- (P11a) Pisał donosy do Joli.  
he wrote denunciations-ACC to Jola-GEN
- (P11b) Pisał donosy dla Joli.  
he wrote denunciations-ACC for Jola-GEN
- (P11c) Pisał Joli donosy.  
he wrote Jola-DAT denunciations-ACC

(P11a) means that he wrote denunciations and sent them to Jola; (P11b) that he wrote them for her sake, either because she wanted him to, or because she benefited in some way from the activity (for instance, he may have been handsomely paid for writing them, which enabled him to satisfy her expensive needs); the last sentence means that Jola was the informer, but she was either not literate enough or too lazy to write the denunciations herself.

Polish sentences with prepositions differ in distribution from their English structural equivalents. Specifically, Polish frequently does not allow the prepositional variant where English does.

- (E12) He showed the book to his friend.  
(P12) \*Pokazał książkę do przyjaciela.

- (E13) She agreed to lend the book to the journalist.  
(P13) \*Zgodziła się pożyczyć książkę do dziennikarza.

And, of course, Polish also allows the direct object to take possessive modifiers, which occur in the genitive case; but sentences with genitives differ in meaning from those containing dative NPs. In other words, (E5) can be translated into Polish either as (P5) or as (P14).

- (P14) Chłopcy stłukli okno Doroty.  
boys-NOM broke window-ACC Dorota-GEN

In this paper, I will try to specify what determines which of the above English clause-types corresponds to the Polish NOM-ACC-DAT construction in any specific instance, and to spell out the differences in meaning between the Polish and the English sentences, since they are only approximate equivalents.

## 2. Traditional approaches to the study of case

Having established that English has five different construction types where Polish apparently has only one, the logical question to ask is whether all Polish sentences with an accusative and a dative object are instances of the same construction, or whether they should be treated as superficially similar instances of different underlying structures (perhaps analogous to the five English construction types). The latter approach would amount to a claim that in 'deep' /semantic structure, Polish makes at least some of the distinctions that English does, but they are subsequently obscured in 'surface' structure.

This assumption is implicit in both traditional grammar and in 'case grammar'. Traditional grammarians provided, for each of the morphological cases, a list of 'uses' (e.g. 'dative of interest', 'dative of possession', 'dative of purpose'). One could then compare the uses of the same case in different languages, or try to discover how meanings which in language A were expressed by a 'dative of interest' were conveyed in language B, which might not have a dative case, or which might lack morphological case altogether. The labels used as names for the various 'uses' were believed to be universal and self-explanatory; thus, they fulfilled the function of semantic primitives. This approach failed to reveal the relationships between different 'uses' of the same case, and, when the same labels were attached to different cases, no attempt was made to account for the differences in meaning. Moreover, different analysts often came up with different sets of labels; and, most importantly, the labels themselves were so vague that it was often impossible to determine under which heading any particular usage should be classified, even in the same language. Obviously, the problems were compounded whenever the analyst attempted to compare data from several languages.

The 'case grammarians' attacked the problem from another direction. They started out with a set of what seemed to be sensible semantic distinctions for languages to make (participant roles such as Agent, Patient, Instrument, Location,

etc.), and then attempted to relate these to the grammatical markers present in a specific language. Inevitably, it was found that 'surface' structure obscured and distorted the relationships supposedly present in 'deep' structure, but this was considered to be an imperfection of natural language of little theoretical significance.

Having adopted a particular array of 'deep' cases for descriptive purposes (say, Agent, Patient, Instrument, Recipient, Beneficiary, Experiencer, Possessor, and a few 'adverbial' cases), one could then proceed to describe how each of these underlying categories was represented in surface structure. For example, the Recipient in Polish might be coded either by the dative case or by the preposition *do*; the Beneficiary, by the dative case or by the preposition *dla*; the Possessor, by the genitive or the dative case; and the Experiencer, by the dative or the nominative case. English would emerge as a much more logical language, with the Possessor consistently marked with the Saxon genitive, the Recipient preceded by the preposition *to*, the Beneficiary by the preposition *for*, and the Experiencer occupying the subject position unless there is an Agent in the sentence, in which case it would become the direct object. One would also need a rule of Indirect Object Movement to handle the 'internal dative' construction, and a set of conditions on the application of the rule.

The approach outlined above presents a number of problems. There is no obvious basis for choosing one array of 'deep' cases over another, and there has been a great deal of disagreement over what should be included among these supposedly universal categories. Moreover, traditional case grammar cannot capture the differences in meaning between the various 'surface' exponents of a particular deep case, and the underlying distinctions postulated by the theory are frequently lost in surface structure. The Polish dative, for example, would have to be considered a surface exponent of *four different role archetypes, each of which also has other surface realizations*. Having observed this, one can well ask how we Poles ever understand each other. The universal 'deep' cases, case grammarians tell us, need not be directly reflected in 'surface' phenomena such as morphological endings, prepositions, position in the sentence, etc. But one may legitimately ask *why should these basic, universal semantic relations be obscured in surface structure?* Why should a language be complicated and inconsistent when it could be simple and logical? Moreover, when one compares the extremely illogical Polish system with the neat and orderly division of labor in English, the inevitable suspicion arises that perhaps the proposed array of cases had less to do with the properties of universal grammar and more with the native language of the early case theorists—English. It would indeed be an embarrassment if the Polish dative turned out to be a unified semantic category.

In the following analysis, I have adopted a strategy which is the reverse of that pursued both by traditional grammarians and by case theorists. My basic assumption is that *grammatical markers reflect important semantic distinctions*; therefore, the logical point of departure for the analysis should not be a hypothetical array of universal categories, but the actual 'surface' markers in a particular language, from which the semantic distinctions can be deduced. It seems reasonable to as-

sume that the most basic concepts related to the participant structure of situations are the most likely to be directly coded by the grammar, though not all languages must necessarily code the same distinctions.<sup>1</sup> This, of course, is consonant with another traditional approach to case, one which sought to establish a 'basic meaning' for each case: the accusative is the case of the directly affected or Patient; the dative, of the 'interested person' or Recipient; genitive endings are attached to NPs denoting Possessors; the instrumental case signals the Instrument of the action, etc. I would claim that these generalizations, though admittedly vague, are essentially correct. To substantiate them, of course, it is necessary to flesh out mnemonic labels such as 'interested person' or 'instrument of the action' with more specific meanings, and to show how less basic meanings or 'uses' are related to the category prototype. This is what I will presently attempt to do for the dative case.

### 3. The core meaning of the Polish dative and its variants

To say that the dative case is the grammatical exponent of the Recipient prototype is to invite the question, "What is a Recipient?" Since the label has been used quite indiscriminately in the literature, I will henceforth use Wierzbicka's term, 'Target Person,'<sup>2</sup> and restore the term 'recipient' to its non-technical use: to denote the individual who receives something in an act of transfer. (The lower case 'r' is intended to indicate this informal use.)

What, then, is the Target Person? Whatever the label, the concept continues to elude attempts at definition. It is fairly easy to enumerate the properties of at least a prototypical Agent or Patient. However, unlike an Agent or a Patient, the Target Person is not directly involved in the action. To be classified as one, an individual need not do anything, or be the object of any action; in fact, he or she need not even be present at the scene of the action, or be aware that anything noteworthy has happened. Thus, if I say,

(P15) Jakiś szaleniec zamordował Arturowi żonę.  
some madman murdered Artur-DAT wife-ACC  
'Some madman murdered Arthur's wife.'

only the madman and the wife had to be present at the scene of the murder; Arthur himself might have been happily drinking beer in a bar.

Objects are affected when some force is directed at them and they undergo a

<sup>1</sup> By making the observable linguistic forms rather than a preconceived set of supposedly universal categories the starting point of the analysis, this approach has the additional advantage of tightly constraining the grammar.

See Langacker (1983: 62-67) for a discussion.

<sup>2</sup> The term 'Target Person' is also somewhat misleading, since it suggests that the referent must be human. However, since all the TP's dealt with in this paper *are* human, and since animals and institutions can only become TP's to the extent that they are seen to be *like* humans, it seemed unnecessary to coin a new term. More punctilious readers are invited to substitute 'Target' for 'Target Person' throughout this paper.

change as a result. Sentient beings, on the other hand, might also be affected when their relatives die, when their prized possessions are mutilated or taken away, or when embarrassing details of their lives are exposed to public view. To define the Target Person category, therefore, it is necessary to introduce the notion of *personal sphere*<sup>3</sup> – the persons, objects, and locations sufficiently closely associated with an individual that changes in them are likely to affect this individual as well. The Target Person, then, is *an individual who is perceived as affected by a change, activity, or state in his or her personal sphere*.

It is important to note that an individual's personal sphere cannot be predetermined. In the final analysis, whether or not a person or object will be included will not depend on any fixed set of rules, but on an individual speaker's subjective judgement about whether the Target Person is affected by the action and about his addressee's ability to work out *how* he or she might be affected. To be sure, some objects, such as body parts or personal articles, are more central to one's personal sphere than others, and reference to them tends to enhance grammaticality even when the verb does not describe a change of state; but a number of other factors will bear on the coding decision made by the speaker.

Just to get the flavor of this, let us look at a few examples.

- (P16a) Pies polizał mi rękę.  
dog licked me-DAT hand-ACC  
'The dog licked my hand.'
- (P16b) Pies polizał mi bułkę. [Wierzbicka 1988:402]  
dog licked me-DAT bread roll-ACC  
'The dog licked my bread roll'
- (P16c) ?Pies polizał mi but. [Wierzbicka 1988:402]  
dog licked me-DAT shoe-ACC  
'The dog licked my shoe.'
- (P16d) ??Pies polizał mi zderzak.  
dog licked me-DAT bumper-ACC  
'The dog licked my (car) bumper.'

Licking does not normally cause any change in the Patient: yet (P16a) is acceptable because body parts are central elements of one's personal sphere and one experiences a certain sensation when one's hand is licked. One's shoe or a bread roll one is about to eat are much less central elements. However, (16b) is acceptable because a dog's licking a bread roll will for most people render it inedible; therefore, the bread roll, unlike the shoe, may be said to have undergone a change of state. It is much more difficult, though not entirely impossible, to envisage how one might be affected when one's shoe is licked. Licking might be interpreted as a friendly gesture, or if the shoe was spotlessly clean, licking it might ruin its perfect gloss. How one could be affected if a dog licked the bumper of one's au-

<sup>3</sup> This term is also used by Wierzbicka.

tomobile is still more difficult to envisage, though, with some ingenuity, an appropriate context could be invented.

- (P17) a. ??Piotr wszedł Kasi do biura.  
Piotr entered Kasia-DAT into office  
'Piotr entered Kasia's office.'
- b. ?Piotr wszedł Kasi do sypialni.  
'Piotr entered Kasia's bedroom.'
- c. Piotr wkradł się Kasi do sypialni.  
'Piotr sneaked into Kasia's bedroom.'
- d. Piotr włamał się Kasi do biura.  
'Piotr broke into Kasia's office.'
- (P18) a. ??Piotr wskoczył Kasi do basenu.  
Piotr jumped Kasia-DAT into swimming pool  
'Piotr jumped into Kasia's swimming pool.'
- b. Piotr wskoczył Kasi do łóżka.  
'Piotr jumped into Kasia's bed.'

A location does not undergo a change of state if someone merely moves into it; accordingly, the person associated with the location would not normally be seen as affected. Hence the low acceptability of (17a) and (18a). If, however, the location is a central element of one's personal sphere, such as one's bedroom or secret hideaway, then merely moving into it might be interpreted as an intrusion on one's privacy, and hence legitimate Target Person coding on the NP naming the individual in question. (Cf. (17b); the use of the verb *wkraść się*, 'to steal/sneak into,' in (17c), which helps to evoke the 'breach of privacy' interpretation, enhances the acceptability of the sentence still further.)

Such an interpretation will be strengthened whenever there is additional contextual evidence enabling the addressee to compose a plausible scenario of how the Target Person came to be affected. Thus jumping into someone's bed is readily interpreted as an invitation to have sex, or even a successful seduction; hence the full acceptability of (18b). A dative construction will also be acceptable if the entry into the location is forceful, or if anything is likely to be damaged (example (17d)).

Thus, inclusion in an individual's personal sphere depends on a number of contextual factors. Moreover, it is to a significant degree a matter of subjective construal, and as such cannot be predicted *a priori*. Nevertheless, part of our linguistic knowledge is a set of *inclusion strategies*, or conventional links between a person not directly involved in the action and a direct participant. Thus, conventionally included in one's personal sphere are members of one's family, and to a lesser extent, friends (P15); parts of one's body (P19); and facts one knows or is aware of at the moment (P20-P21). These strategies, of course, are motivated by common beliefs and assumptions about people: that one is likely to be affected by the fate of one's relatives, and, to a lesser degree, friends; that how one feels is largely determined by what one knows or is thinking of, etc.

- (P19) Jacek nadepnął Kasi na palec.  
Jacek trod Kasia-DAT on toe  
'Jacek trod on Kasia's (DAT) toe.'
- (P20) Romek powiedział Kasi o swoich planach.  
'Romek told Kasia (DAT) about his plans.'
- (P21) Kasi przypomniały się wspólnie spędzone chwile.  
'Kasia (DAT) remembered the moments (NOM)  
they had spent together.'

Another set of inclusion strategies allows for the incorporation into an individual's personal sphere of any person or object one exercises control or influence over, including one's possessions (P22), and especially personal articles; the objects one is using or available for one's use (P23, P24); and one's subordinates (P25). The last example, (P26), shows again that inclusion in a person's sphere of influence depends on the situational context.

- (P22) Piotr rozbił/naprawił Arturowi samochód.  
'Piotr crashed/repared Arthur's (DAT) car.'
- (P23) Piotr wyrwał Arturowi nóż z ręki.  
'Piotr snatched the knife from Arthur's (DAT) hand.'
- (P24) Piotr naostrzył Arturowi ołówek.  
'Piotr sharpened the pencil for Arthur (DAT).'
- (P25) Robotnicy mu strajkują.  
workers him-DAT strike  
'His workers are on strike.'
- (P26) a. ?Studenci mu śpią.  
students him-DAT sleep  
b. Studenci mu śpią na wykładach.  
'[He lets] students sleep during his lectures.'

These 'inclusion strategies' are basically analogous to the case 'uses' of traditional grammar. Viewing them as processing strategies linking the category schema to more specific instances of it, however, helps to bring out the fact that relatives, subordinates, possessions, objects available for use, etc., are all *special cases* of items belonging to the personal sphere: in other words, in spite of the diversity of its members, the personal sphere does form a unified category. It also throws into relief the cultural facts which motivate their existence. Furthermore, the fact that the above list is obviously not exhaustive no longer poses a problem. The inclusion strategies cited here were only intended as examples; a more complete account would obviously have to include more. The important point, however, is that no list could ever be exhaustive, because an individual's personal sphere is open-ended, and inclusion in it is largely a matter of subjective construal. Conventional inclusion strategies are 'beaten track' methods of analyzing typical situations. Analysis of other situations may require more creative effort and stronger contextual support. The strategies facilitate inclusion in the personal sphere, but

do not rule out the establishment of other links between an object and the Target Person.

A detailed analysis of how the various special uses of the dative case elaborate the schematic definition proposed here is beyond the scope of this paper. However, I do hope to have demonstrated that the Target Person category, though not homogenous, is nonetheless fairly unified and cohesive.<sup>4</sup>

#### 4. Grammatical exponents of the target person in English

Most of the distinctions which are signaled by case endings in many other languages are conveyed in English by means of word order and prepositions. What merits special attention is the fact, somewhat obscured by the case grammarians' preoccupation with 'deep' case, that there is no 'surface' exponent of the Target Person relation.<sup>5</sup> I would take this to be strong direct evidence that *the Target Person does not exist as a distinct grammatical category in English* or at least not

<sup>4</sup> The 'Target Person' definition is not general enough to subsume *all* datives, though it does apply to datives in a wide range of construction types. In the examples below, the semantic relationship between the verb and the TP is the same regardless of the number of arguments.

- (1) a. Ktoś zabrał mi papierosy.  
someone took away me-DAT cigarettes-ACC  
'Someone has taken my cigarettes.'
- b. Zabrakło mi papierosów.  
lacked-IMPRES mi-DAT cigarettes-GEN  
'("It lacks cigarettes to me.")
- c. Skończyły mi się papierosy.  
finished me-DAT REFL cigarettes-NOM  
'I have run out of cigarettes.'  
'("Cigarettes have finished themselves on me.")
- (2) a. Kelner wylał mi zupę na spodnie.  
waiter-NOM spilled me-DAT soup on trousers  
'The waiter has spilled soup on my trousers.'
- b. Zupa wylała mi się na spodnie.  
soup-NOM spilled me-DAT REFL on trousers  
'I've spilled soup on my trousers.'

Moreover, the definition is readily applicable to many 'lexically-governed datives,' since the notion of personal sphere must figure prominently in the semantic characterization of the verbs which require them. This is particularly obvious with 'potency' verbs such as *pozwolić*, to allow; *zabronić*, to prohibit; *pomagać*, to help; *przeszkadzać*, to disturb; *ułatwiać*, to facilitate. Dative experiencers are automatically included if the personal sphere is assumed to include a "sphere of awareness" in which mental experience is construed to take place. The definition also subsumes the 'ethical dative,' whose special implications hinge on the addressee's understanding of the notion of 'sphere of influence' (see Dąbrowska forthcoming). This leaves prepositionally-governed datives and non-human dative objects, which can also be related to the category prototype, though the links are admittedly more tenuous.

<sup>5</sup> This, of course, is viewing the English data from the point of view of the conceptual structure of Polish.

as a salient element of grammatical structure.<sup>6</sup> This, of course, does not mean that speakers of English are not aware of the fact that animate entities, and humans in particular, are often indirectly affected by some actions, or that they fail to perceive this effect on any particular occasion. However, the grammar of their language does not provide them with a specialized device for coding this kind of information. They are thus forced to attend to different aspects of the situation for expressive purposes, and to resort to different coding strategies. A few examples should illustrate the point clearly enough.

- (P27a) Piotr rozbił samochód Artura  
Piotr crashed car-ACC Artur-GEN
- (P27b) Piotr rozbił Arturowi samochód.  
Piotr crashed Artur-DAT car-ACC
- (E27) Peter crashed Arthur's car.
- (P28a) Studenci Kowalskiego śpią na (jego) wykładach.  
Students Kowalski-GEN sleep during (his) lectures.
- (P28b) Studenci śpią Kowalskiemu na wykładach.  
Students sleep Kowalski-DAT during lectures
- (E28) Kowalski's students sleep during (his) lectures.

The sentences in (27) describe a certain event, in which an Agent (Peter) does something to a Patient (a car).

The car belongs to an individual named Arthur, who let us assume, was not present at the scene of the accident. The question is: how do we bring Arthur into the picture? Polish gives two options: the speaker may either add a possessive modifier to the direct object or introduce a new participant, the Target Person, which will receive dative marking. The resulting sentences will differ in meaning, (P27b) carrying the implication that Arthur was affected by the action (he cannot

<sup>6</sup> In traditional case grammar, case roles were supposed to be universal.

Moreover, all distinctions were of equal status: they either existed or they did not exist. This led to the postulation of spurious differences in many languages which had no correlations in the data. It also led to well-known problems with various special instances: should possessors and inanimate 'forces,' for example, be considered distinct roles, or should they be subsumed under Agent and Beneficiary, respectively? The problem was never fully resolved, because valid arguments were advanced for both solutions.

I would suggest that case-role distinctions are a largely language-specific phenomenon, though some may be more obvious or 'natural' than others. I find Langacker's analogy quite helpful here: what he calls 'archetypal' case roles may be thought of as "the highest peaks in a mountain range [which] coexist with others that may be significant despite their lesser salience." (Langacker 1987:29) I would elaborate on the metaphor and say that each language chooses a particular perspective or point of view of the mountain range; and seen from this particular point, some lesser peaks may seem larger. The most prominent ones will be coded most clearly, the lowest ones, though present in cognitive structure, may remain sub-linguistic. In other words, some distinctions are more obvious than others, and some may be more important in one linguistic system than in another. In Polish, the Target Person is a major conceptual category. In English, it may have some linguistic significance, but it is largely overshadowed by other distinctions.

use the car, getting it fixed will cost him a lot of trouble and money, etc.) English only allows the first option. Similarly, (P28a) is merely a statement of the fact that certain students sleep during lectures; (28b) implies that Kowalski is responsible for this state of affairs (his students are in his sphere of influence during his lectures, and should not be allowed to sleep). Of course, (P28a) and (E28) do not rule out the implication that Kowalski is responsible; the point is that (P28b) specifically invites such an interpretation. (In fact, without the possessive modifier on the object NP, (P28a) would not even be interpreted as meaning that it is specifically during Kowalski's lectures that the students sleep.)

- (P29) a. Piotr otworzył Arturowi drzwi.  
Piotr opened Arthur-DAT door.  
b. Piotr otworzył drzwi dla Artura.  
Piotr opened door for Arthur.
- (E29) Peter opened the door for Arthur.
- (P30) a. Piotr naostrzył Arturowi ołówek.  
Piotr sharpened Arthur-DAT pencil-ACC  
b. Piotr naostrzył ołówek dla Artura.  
Piotr sharpened pencil-ACC for Arthur.
- (E30) Peter sharpened the pencil for Arthur.

In examples (29) and (30) there are again two nuclear participants, an Agent and a Patient, and a third participant who neither does anything nor is acted on, but becomes implicated in the action because it is performed for his benefit. In a standard case grammar analysis, the dative ending in the (a) sentences and the preposition *dla* in the (b) sentences would be considered exponents of the same 'deep' semantic case, "Beneficiary." (cf. Niedzielski 1979). However, the sentences differ in meaning because they exploit different aspects of the objective scene for coding purposes. The use of the dative case implies that the action impinges on some aspect of Arthur's personal sphere—in this particular case, it affects his potency: in (P29a), opening the door enables him to pass through it; in (P30a), sharpening the pencil makes it available for his use. The preposition *dla*, on the other hand, suggests that the action is performed for Arthur's sake, with a view to pleasing Arthur, though not necessarily in order to enable him to go through the door or use the pencil. Moreover, in the sentence with the preposition, Arthur need not be affected in any way (for example, he may not even be aware that Piotr has done something for his sake). In the (b) sentences, pleasing Arthur is seen as the *purpose* of performing the action; the use of *dla* is thus similar to typically adverbial uses of the preposition in expressions such as *dla przyjemności*, 'for fun,' *dla ułatwienia*, 'in order to facilitate (some action); *dla (czyjegoś) widzimisię*, 'to satisfy (somebody's idle) whim.'

English does not have a specialized grammatical device for coding indirect affectedness, and the preposition *for* is used with both kinds of 'Beneficiaries.' In the above examples, this barely affects communicative efficiency, as the situations

described by the (b) sentences are rather unusual. (In fact, it is difficult to construct a plausible scenario in which one would sharpen a pencil for somebody's sake, but not in order to enable him to use it.) Any ambiguities can be resolved by means of possessive modifiers on the direct object:

- (P31) Piotr pomalował Hani płot.  
Piotr painted Hania-DAT fence-ACC
- (E31) Peter painted Hania's fence for her.
- (P31) Piotr pomalował płot dla Hani.  
Piotr painted fence-ACC for Hania-GEN
- (E32) Peter painted the fence for Hania.
- (P33) Hania odrobiła Oli lekcje.  
Hania did Ola-DAT homework-ACC
- (E33) Hania did Ola's homework for her.
- (P34) Hania odrobiła lekcje dla Oli.  
Hania did homework-ACC for Ola.
- (E34) Hania did her homework for Ola [to please Ola]<sup>7</sup>

The next batch of examples involves situations in which an Agent transfers a Patient to a new location, and the direction of the movement is defined with respect to another animate (usually human) participant:

- (P35) Artur ukradł dokument Piotrowi.  
DAT
- (E35) Arthur stole the documents from Piotr.
- (P36) Artur odebrał Piotrowi rewolwer.  
DAT
- (E36) Arthur took the revolver away from Peter.  
(Arthur took away Peter's revolver.)
- (P37) Artur wysłał dokumenty Piotrowi.  
DAT
- (E37) Arthur sent the documents to Peter.
- (P38) Artur zwrócił Piotrowi książkę.  
DAT
- (E38) Arthur returned the book to Peter.

Here again Polish and English speakers will typically focus on and exploit different aspects of the scene for coding purposes. The human participant from whom the Patient is taken away may be viewed as a special kind of source, and receive source marking (in English, the preposition *from*), and the participant with respect to whom the final destination of the Patient is defined may be seen as a kind of goal, and receive goal marking (in English, the preposition *to*). (E35) and (E37) are thus essentially analogous to (E39) and (E40):

<sup>7</sup> (E31)-(E34) thus combine the 'possessive strategy' with the use of the preposition *for*.

- (E39) Arthur stole the documents from the safe.  
(E40) Arthur sent the documents to the office.

Alternatively, since people are likely to be affected when objects become available to them or are taken away from them, the non-Agentive human participant may receive Target Person marking. This is the favored strategy in Polish, though it is also possible to use the source preposition *od* and the goal preposition *do* when the verb describes purely physical movement to a different spatial location (i.e., with verbs such as *odebrać*, 'to take away'; *rzucić*, 'to throw'; *wysłać*, 'to send'; *przynieść*, 'to bring'; etc.), but not when it describes a more abstract kind of transfer (e.g. not with verbs such as *ukraść*, 'to steal'; *dać*, 'to give'; *pożyczyć*, 'to lend'; *zapłacić*, 'to pay'; *oddać*, 'to give back').<sup>8</sup> Thus, the prepositional analogue of (P37) is grammatical, while that of (P38) is not:

- (P41) Artur wysłał dokumenty do Piotra.  
'Artur sent the documents to Piotr.'
- (P42) \*Artur zwrócił książkę do Piotra.  
'Artur returned the book to Piotr.'

In English, on the other hand, the source and goal markers are freely used with verbs describing all kinds of transfer, including change of possession, 'future having' (e.g. *promise*, *assign*, *offer*), and communication (which is construed metaphorically as the transfer of a message from the speaker to the addressee).<sup>9</sup> The wider use of these prepositions is hardly surprising in the absence of a competing Target Person marker.

Examples (E37) and (E38) both have prepositional variants, and these bring us to the most troublesome of the major equivalents of the Polish dative, the English 'internal dative' construction. The post-verbal recipient is actually the nearest equivalent of the Polish dative case (unlike the possessive or the prepositional analogues, this specifically implies affectedness), and almost always becomes a dative NP in Polish translation.<sup>10</sup> However, the converse is not true, as only some

<sup>8</sup> The sentences with prepositions differ in meaning from those with dative arguments, and the contrast is not always analogous to that found between the 'internal' and 'external' datives in English. See p. 23 for a discussion.

<sup>9</sup> See Reddy (1979). It should be noted that Polish also allows the use of the goal preposition with the addressee after a few (mostly intransitive) verbs:

- (3) Mówię do ciebie  
I am speaking to you.

Unlike the corresponding sentence with a dative object, (3) suggests that the addressee is not listening—in other words, that the words are not 'entering' his consciousness, which of course is a part of one's personal sphere.

<sup>10</sup> Two common exceptions are internal dative sentences with the verbs *teach* and *feed*. In their Polish equivalents, the NP corresponding to direct object in English appears in the genitive or the instrumental case, and the indirect object becomes an accusative NP:

Polish sentences with a dative and an accusative object correspond to 'internal-dative' clauses in English. The obvious question is, which ones?

English 'internal dative' sentences are notorious for their highly idiosyncratic properties, and continue to elude satisfactory linguistic description. The basic problem seems to be that although all 'internal dative' sentences seem to share certain properties, these do not define the class of all and only grammatical internal dative. Therefore, in order to describe what is actually present in the language, it is necessary to complement the general formulation of the commonality with a list of subtypes of the construction which actually do occur and elaborate the semantic 'common denominator' in specific ways. This approach is explicitly advocated by Wierzbicka (1988), who sets up eight subtypes ('transfer,' 'speaking of future having,' 'making,' 'preparing for use,' 'entertaining,' 'telling,' 'teaching,' and 'showing'), which she then proceeds to characterize semantically, and in Gropen et al. (1989), who postulate nine classes partially, though not entirely, coinciding with Wierzbicka's. It is implicit in Green (1974), where constraints on 'dative movement' are stated relative to semantically defined classes of verbs.

I will not opt for any particular inventory of subtypes, as such a description would be vacuous unless accompanied by detailed semantic characterizations of a representative number of verbs occurring in the internal dative construction, which is far beyond the scope of this paper. Thus, I am obliged to confine myself to the admittedly rather unrevealing statement that the nearest English equivalent of a Polish clause with a dative and an accusative object will be the internal dative clause whenever the latter is grammatical in English. The remainder of this section will be devoted to a discussion of a few systematic differences between the English 'internal dative' and the Polish clause-type with a dative and a accusative object.

First, English allows the internal dative only when the verb denotes some kind of transfer (real or potential, physical or metaphorical) of the Patient *into* the Target Person's personal sphere. As a result, the TP's personal sphere is 'inflated' (the Target Person comes into possession of something, some object becomes available for his or her use, etc.), which is generally considered favorable. If the Patient moves *out* of the TP's personal sphere, or if the effect of the action is seen as harmful to the TP, the English speaker must resort to a different coding strategy: the 'malefactive' construction (*And now he's wrecked the car on us*), the source preposition *from* (*Arthur stole the documents from Peter*), or a possessive modifier on the DO (*The boys broke Dorota's window*).

Secondly, it should be noted that the 'Target Person' is not associated with any unique formal marker in English. In the 'internal dative' clause, the recipient/

- (4) *Uczyła go francuskiego.*  
she taught him-ACC French-GEN  
(5) *Karmiła go pomarańczami.*  
she fed him-ACC oranges-INSTR

This use of the accusative case is hardly surprising, since the individual who is taught or fed is directly affected by the action, and thus receives Patient marking.

beneficiary usurps the usual Patient position, that is, that of the direct object. This has the semantic effect of stressing the affectedness of the Target Person at the expense of the Patient. The TP is seen as more affected (hence in some respects more Patient-like) than the 'real' Patient. Thus, 'internal dative' clauses contrast with the semantically very similar sentences with prepositional indirect objects in the degree of affectedness of the Target Person. This may be illustrated by pairs of sentences such as (E43) and (E44).

- (E43) Arthur threw the ball to Peter.  
(E44) Arthur threw Peter the ball.

(E44) suggests that the ball did in fact reach Peter (only then can the effect of the action on the TP be seen as more relevant than the effect on the Patient), whereas (E43) merely specifies the direction in which the ball was thrown. (cf. Langacker 1983: 47-48). A similar contrast can be observed in Polish, though in the Polish equivalent of (E44) the implication of affectedness is weaker: (P44) means that Arthur threw the ball for Peter to catch (rather than merely *towards* Peter), but there is no suggestion that the ball actually reached him.

- (P43) Artur rzucił piłkę do Piotra.  
(P44) Artur rzucił piłkę Piotrowi/Piotrowi piłkę.

This subtle difference is easily accounted for when one recalls that the Target Person in Polish does not have to compete with the Patient for the same formal marker.

Finally, it must be remembered that in Polish, the Target Person – Patient distinction (signaled by case marking) is formally independent of the Secondary Topic – Non-Topic distinction (signaled by word order; cf. the variant order of the object NPs in (P44)), although there is a strong statistical tendency for Target Persons to be Secondary Topics. The fact that the two distinctions are inextricably bound up with each other in English is a further complicating factor in an account of English equivalents of Polish dative constructions. Any actual translation, for example, is likely to preserve the information structure of the sentence, with the semantic nuances discussed above conveyed lexically, through appropriate prefixes on the verb, or sacrificed. Thus, although the semantic contrast between (P45) and (P46) is parallel to the distinction between (E45) and (E46), (E47b) is a better translation of (P47) than (E47a).

- (P45) Ania zrobiła Piotrowi kanapkę.  
(E45) Ania fixed Piotr (DAT) a sandwich.  
(P46) Ania zrobiła kanapkę dla Piotra.  
(E46) Ania fixed a sandwich for Piotr.  
(P47) Ania zrobiła kanapkę Piotrowi<sub>DAT</sub>, ale kategorycznie odmówił usługiwania pozostałym mężczyznom.  
(E47a) Ania fixed Peter a sandwich, but she firmly refused to serve the other men.

(E47b) Ania fixed a sandwich for Peter, but she firmly refused to serve the other men.

### 5. Conclusion

As we have seen, there is no specialized grammatical exponent of the Target Person in English. Consequently, speakers of English must attend to different aspects of conceptual structure for the purposes of linguistic coding, and what Polish classifies as a Target Person may be expressed by a variety of means in English:

- \* if a Patient belonging to the Target Person's personal sphere undergoes a change of state, the TP is coded as a possessive NP;
- \* if the Patient is removed from the Target Person's sphere of influence, the TP is marked with the preposition *from*;
- \* if a pre-existing Patient is brought into the Target Person's sphere of influence, the TP is marked with the preposition *to*;
- \* if the Patient undergoes a change of state and becomes part of the Target Person's personal sphere as a result of the action (i.e., if it is created for the TP or made available for his/her use), the TP is marked with the preposition *for*;
- \* if the TP is seen as more affected than the Patient, the Target Person NP receives Patient marking (i.e., it is 'promoted' to the DO position). The last possibility is available only for the tightly constrained class of verbs allowing the 'internal dative' construction. Also, when the grammar allows a choice between an 'internal' and a 'prepositional' dative, discourse considerations may override other purely semantic distinctions;
- \* sometimes when the action is willfully harmful or unpleasant, the Target Person may be marked with preposition *on* (*She played a trick on us*).

This variety clearly indicates that the semantic category of Target Person is not part of the conceptual apparatus of the English language. What is less obvious is the status of the post-verbal recipient in English vis-a-vis the Polish dative. The Polish dative case is clearly an independent semantico-syntactic category. Although the category schema may be elaborated in a number of ways, there are many local affinities and the various 'uses', whether in one-, two-, or three-argument constructions, grade off into one another to form a closely-knit semantic category with a unique formal exponent (see note 4). The English post-verbal recipient, on the other hand, occurs only in one clause type, the 'internal dative' construction, where it appropriates the position normally reserved for the Patient (or the Secondary Topic). Moreover, the verbs which allow post-verbal recipients form a loose collection of subtypes rather than a unified class. Thus, the Target Person category in English is neither semantically nor formally discrete. The manifest similarity between the English 'internal dative' construction and the Polish clause-type with dative and an accusative object is thus quite deceptive.

### REFERENCES

- Bach, E. and Harms, R.T. (eds). 1968. *Universals in linguistic theory*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Dąbrowska, E. forthcoming. "O tak zwanym datiwie konwencjonalnym, czyli o znaczeniu form poz-bawionych znaczenia". *Poradnik Językowy*.
- Fillmore, Ch. 1968. "The case for case". In Bach, E. and Harms, R.T. (eds). 1968. 1-88.
- Givón, T. 1979. *On understanding grammar*. New York: Academic Press.
- Green, G.M. 1974. *Semantics and syntactic regularity*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Gropen, J. et al. 1989. "The learnability and acquisition of the dative alternation in English". *Language* 65.2. 203-257.
- Langacker, R. 1983. *Foundations of cognitive grammar*. Vols. I and II. Trier: L.A.U.T.
- Langacker, R. 1987. *Transitivity, case, and grammatical relations: A cognitive grammar prospectus*. Duisburg: L.A.U.D.
- Niedzielski, H. 1979. "Lexical realization of benefactive and beneficiary in Polish and English". *PSiCL* 9. 165-180.
- Ortony, A. (ed.). 1979. *Metaphor and thought*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Reddy, M. 1979. "The conduit metaphor". In Ortony, A. (ed.). 1979. 284-324.
- Wierzbicka, A. 1988. *The semantics of grammar*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.