0. Introduction

It has often been observed that datives and genitives tend to retain Case morphology more stubbornly than nominatives and accusatives. To find the reason for that in morphology proper seems to be unrealistic. I will propose a syntactic account, albeit one which attributes a key role to morphology. The theoretical proposal is that ...

► the structural Cases embrace nominative and accusative but never dative
► structural Cases have their functional structure in the verbal projection
► inherent Cases must supply their own functional structure
► the exponent of the dative's functional structure is its overt Case morphology KASE
► KASE strongly resembles the semifunctional category P
► P is (among other things) itself a Case morpheme, not a Case assigner

1. Case syncretism and Case deflexion

Oblique Cases tend to be morphologically marked, while direct Cases ('casus rectus') may be morphologically unmarked. This holds for earlier stages of Germanic as well as for later stages. Tab. 1 shows the nominal inflection in Old High German (OHG):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a-declension</th>
<th>ò-declension</th>
<th>i-declension</th>
<th>n-declension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;day&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;gift&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;power&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;heart&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>N tag</td>
<td>geb-a</td>
<td>kraft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>G tag-es</td>
<td>geb-a</td>
<td>kref-t-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>D tag-e</td>
<td>geb-u</td>
<td>kref-t-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>A tag</td>
<td>geb-a</td>
<td>kraft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>N tag-a</td>
<td>geb-a</td>
<td>kref-t-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>G tag-o</td>
<td>geb-ono</td>
<td>kref-t-ono</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u</td>
<td>D tag-um</td>
<td>geb-om</td>
<td>kref-t-om</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>A tag-a</td>
<td>geb-a</td>
<td>kref-t-i</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tab.1 – Nominal inflection and Case syncretism in OHG

Although the determiner system was developed at this stage, pure genitive N can still be found in Middle High German (MHG):

(1) a. der was wol rosseloufes wit

He was well horse-run-GEN away
"He was well as far away as a horse can run"

b. dâ wart er vrñuden rôt

there was he joy-GEN red
"He blushed with joy"
c. dar zuo is êren mir geschehen Bit 7377
   there to is honor-GEN me happened
   "I was honored for that"

d. swar ih landes kère MF 52,31
   where-ever I land-GEN go
   "in whatever land I go"

e. si füerten roubes eine magt Pz 122,20
   they bring robbery-GEN a maiden
   "They have with them an abducted maiden"

In modern German such genitives survived only in de-nominal adverbs:

(2)  morgens abends nachts sonntags
morning-GEN evening-GEN night-GEN sunday-GEN
rechts links flugs unversehens
right-GEN left-GEN flight-GEN unknowing-GEN

Although the nominal inflection of the genitive is retained in the masculine and neuter noun, its functionality has disappeared. Case must be marked in functional structure above N:

(3) a. *die Ausfuhr Holzes
   the export wood-GEN
   "the export of wood"

   b. die Ausfuhr (dieses) brasilianischen Holzes
   the export this-GEN Brazilian-GEN wood-GEN
   "the export of (this) Brazilian wood" (Gallmann, 1997)

In many Germanic varieties, genitive Case has been given up entirely. In this case, P-insertion had to make up for the loss of Case morphology, e.g. Dutch:

(4)   de soep van de dag
   the soup of the day

Genitive Case has been equally replaced in dialects such as Swiss-German and Bavarian. But unlike Dutch, these dialects retain distinct dative morphology as shown by the paradigms for the definite article:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>masc.</td>
<td>fem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>de</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>em</td>
<td>de</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>de</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tab. 2 - Proclitic definite article in Zurich German (Cooper, 1994)
The fact that there is Case syncretism in which dative morphology collapses with other Cases (as in the -en of Frauen ("women"), Professoren ("professors"), Dirigenten ("conductors") and the fact that proper names, which are notoriously uninflected in Standard German, (as in: Ich habe Peter gratuliert ("I congratulated PeterDAT"), Ich bin Mick Jagger nachgelaufen ("I ran after Mick JaggerDAT")) leads to the impression that dative Case can be lost without serious consequences for the grammar of the language.

This impression is \( \Box \) WRONG!

Avoiding a discussion of proper names for reasons of time (cf. Bayer, Bader & Meng, 2001)), there is evidence that -en is still a sign of dative Case albeit a highly non-distinctive one. In comparison, -en is not a sign for genitive Case:

(5) a. wenn man Frauen applaudiert
   \( \textit{if one women-DAT applauds} \)

b. wenn man Frauen nachläuft
   \( \textit{if one women-DAT after-runs} \)

c. wenn man den Hans Frauen vorstellt
   \( \textit{if one the Hans-ACC women-DAT introduces} \)
   "If one introduces Hans to women, ...

   \( \textit{the discriminations women-GEN} \)

b. *wenn man sich Frauen erwehren muss
   \( \textit{if one REF women-GEN defend must} \)
   "If one has to defend oneself from women, ...

Tab. 3   - Proclitic definite article in Bavarian
2. The grammar's reactions against the loss of dative

„MORPHOLOGISCHE DIFFERENZIERUNGSMERKMALE ALS ÜBERRESTE DER SUBSTANTIV-DEKLINATION BEWAHRT AM FESTESTEN DER DATIV.“ (Schirrmunski, 1962: 432)
"Morphological signs of differentiation as relics of the nominal declension are strongest in the dative"

(7) –e Affix (Low German, East Middle German)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOM</th>
<th>DAT</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gast</td>
<td>gast-e</td>
<td>„guest“</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lant</td>
<td>land-e</td>
<td>„land“</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hunt</td>
<td>hund-e</td>
<td>„dog“</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

i.e. these dialects retain the OHG-heritage

(8) Vowel lengthening after –e epenthesis (Mülheim/Ruhr)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOM</th>
<th>DAT</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dax</td>
<td>da:x</td>
<td>„day“</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hof</td>
<td>ho:f</td>
<td>„yard“</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>berx</td>
<td>be:rx</td>
<td>„mountain“</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(9) Loss of coda (Northern Hessian; Southern Thuringian)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOM</th>
<th>DAT</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>doak</td>
<td>doa</td>
<td>„day“</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wäk</td>
<td>wä</td>
<td>„path“</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wald</td>
<td>wal</td>
<td>„forest“</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>land</td>
<td>lan</td>
<td>„land“</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>räiŋk</td>
<td>reŋ</td>
<td>„ring“</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(10) Strengthened dative / „Kraft-Dativ“ (Bavarian, Austrian, Franconian)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOM</th>
<th>DAT</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>beax</td>
<td>beaj / beajnan</td>
<td>„mountains“</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>haufm</td>
<td>haufman</td>
<td>„heaps“</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to:x</td>
<td>to:ŋ / to:ŋnan</td>
<td>„days“</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bex</td>
<td>bexŋ / bexŋan</td>
<td>„creeks“</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šif</td>
<td>Šifm / Šifnan</td>
<td>„ships“</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(11) Prepositionally strengthened dative

P + N/NP/DP

a. em frent “in-the friend” Alsatian
b. en de frende “in the friends”
c. i mein fo:ter “in my father” Tyrolian
d. i dr muater “in the mother”
e. i de lait “in the people”
f. i mir “in me”
g. i weim “in whom”
h. a miär     “to me”      Swiss German / Kanton Uri
i. a demm     “to this-one”

(12) Examples from Seiler (1998)
[all the verbs assign dative Case in German]

a. daß a de Roos, aba aa a de Leit nix passiert
   that to the horses but also to the people nothing happens
   (Bavarian, Traunstein)
b. du musst es deina frau vaschreibn lassn
   you must it to your wife prescribe let
   (Bavarian, Malching)
c. in di Schwainge:bm
   in the pigs give
   (Austrian, St. Georgen)
d. wo:rschinlech het er d’ Rößli [...] für vil Geld i irgendwelche ri:che Schwo:be [...] verkauft
   perhaps has he the horses for much money in some rich Germans sold
   (Swiss, Aargau)

3. No inflection - no dative!

3.1 Uninflected indefinites (cf. Gallmann, 1996; 1997)

(13) a. Genug / nichts / allerlei / etwas / wenig ist schiefgegangen
   enough / nothing / a lot / something / little has gone-wrong
   NOM
b. Wir haben genug / nichts / allerlei / etwas / wenig erlebt
   we have enough / nothing / a lot / something / little experienced
   ACC
c. *Feuchtigkeit schadet genug / nichts / allerlei / etwas / wenig
   humidity harms enough / nothing / a lot / something / little
   DAT
d. *Ich konnte mich genug / nichts / allerlei / etwas / wenig entsinnen
   I could REF enough / nothing / a lot / something / little remember
   GEN

The Swiss German correspondent of *etwas* ("something") is öppis. Notice that unlike *etwas*, it has a dative form, öppis-em, which is obligatory in the context of a dative assigning verb.

3.2 Which Case for argument clauses?

(14) a. [Daß wir verreisen wollten] hat niemanden interessiert
   that we travel-away wanted has nobody interested
   NOM
b. Wir bestritten [daß wir verreisen wollten]
   we denied that we travel-away wanted
   ACC
c. *Wir widersprachen [daß wir verreisen wollten]  
   we  objected      that we travel-away wanted

d. *Wir erwehrten uns [schon wieder verreisen zu müssen]  
   we  kept-off   REF yet   again travel   to must

CPs can be datives in languages which allow overtly Case-marking on CP, e.g. Turkish:

(15) Ahmet Ayşe-yi [PRO sinema-ya git-meğ]-e  zorla-dı
   Achmed Ayse-ACC movie-DAT go-INF -DAT force-PAST
   "Achmed forced Ayse to go to the movie"  Kornfilt (1985)

These data show that anything with nominal features can be nominative or accusative, 
but not a dative or a genitive. The latter require explicit Case morphology.

4. The dative as a Kase Phrase

Datives have a strong resemblance with PPs and seem to form a natural class with them. (Cf. 
Kayne (1984: ch.9) and Emonds (1985) where the dative was seen as a hidden PP.) Witness 
the loss of Case morphology and its replacement by periphrastic forms in modern Germanic 
and Romance, e.g. Dutch (aan, van), English (to, of) and French (à, de).

Assume that the head of a dative NP/DP is actually K(ASE). For general motivation of KP: 

(16)  
    KP  
       K     DP<dat>  
       D   NP  

K is a functional head which checks/valuates D-features (or in the absence of D, N-features). 
The process of checking can be overt or covert. If it is covert, it is restricted to pure feature 
movement (Chomsky, 1995).

Feature movement gives a free ride to formal features inherent in NP/DP (=FF(DP)).

(17)  
    KP<dat>  
      K<dat>     DP<dat>  
      FF(DP)    K   D   NP
Crucially, K is identified by the overt Case feature of DP. It is the syntactic counterpart of the morphological Case feature of DP.

KP has close resemblance with PP, the difference being that P, being a semifunctional head, has a richer feature structure than K. Like K it checks the D-feature of its complement, but it has also a Case feature (e.g. <dat>).

Feature movement from DP to P will lead to checking of the Case feature and subsequent deletion (because it is already present in P). (This replaces Case assignment by P in GB-theory).

This has desirable consequences for the account of pronominal PPs. Being highly underspecified adverbs, German *da, wo* and Dutch *daar, waar, er* obviously do not qualify as NPs, and certainly have no Case (let alone dative!), but P has one. Assuming that P can check the D-feature of these pro-forms, if they raise overtly, they acquire Case rather than checking Case against P. Since they have no Case to begin with, P remains the only category with Case throughout the derivation.
If $P$ is not a Case assigner but rather is the exponent of Case itself, we expect that the uninflected indefinites shown in (13) are possible in PPs in which $P$ would assign/contain dative Case. This expectation is borne out:

(23) Otto ist mit genug / nichts / viel / allerlei / etwas / wenig zufrieden
"Otto is happy with enough/nothing/much/various/something/little content"

5. Structural and inherent Case in trees

In KP and PP, Case is implement in the (semi)functional heads $K$ and $P$ respectively. Verb-governed nominative and accusative lack such heads. They rely on functional structure that is provided by the verb. The licensing relation for accusative is agreement with the feature $<\text{AgrO}>$ which is by default associated with a transitive verb. The licensing relation for nominative is agreement with the feature $<\text{AgrS}>$ which is by default associated with finiteness. In German, both $<\text{AgrO}>$ and $<\text{AgrS}>$ are part of the verb(al complex). As such they can license the structural Cases anywhere along the verbal projection. The unmarked order NOM $<$ ACC or ACC $<$ NOM is equally available. It is a result of the argument structure of the verb and aspects of information structure that remain outside the discussion.
e.g. dass der Punk(NOM) gerne Hochzeitsfeiern(ACC) stört
    that the punk gladly marriage-ceremonies disturbs
    "that the punk likes to disturb marriage ceremonies"

Objects of V without the default accusative enter (a) by absence of AgrO or (b) by affluence of arguments. They are Case-licensed by their own functional structure (KP or PP). This meets with the suggestion that the indirect object is 'adjoined' (Vogel & Steinbach 1995; Sabel, 2002)

e.g. dass den Punk(ACC) vor allem Hochzeitsfeiern(NOM) stören
    that the punk mostly marriage-ceremonies disturb
    "that the punk is mostly annoyed by marriage ceremonies"

e.g. dass der Punk(NOM) dem Ansehen des Dorfes(DAT) schadet
    that the punk the respectability (of) the village harms
    "that the punk harms the village's respectability"
e.g. dass dem PunkDAT die Extasy-TablettenNOM schaden

"that the punk is harmed by extacy"

(28) VP

NOM V'

DAT V'

ACC V< AgrO, AgrS>

e.g. dass der PunkNOM dem TouristenDAT das DorfACC zeigt

"that the punk shows the tourist the village"

6. Predictions

6.1 Function changing operations

Function changing operations suppress the subject's theta role and affect the verb's ability of licensing an object. More concretely: They remove AgrO. It is expected that the DO (ACC) but not the IO (DAT) is affected.

(29) a. Oswald hat den Präsidenten ermordet

Oswald has the president-ACC assassinated

b. Der Präsident wurde ermordet

the president-NOM was assassinated

(30) a. Oswald hat dem Präsidenten gehuldigt

Oswald has the president-DAT given-homage

b. Dem Präsidenten/*der Präsident wurde gehuldigt

(31) a. Es ist leicht, diesen Wagen zu fahren

it is easy this car-ACC to drive

"It is easy to drive this car"
b. Dieser Wagen fährt sich leicht
   "This car drives easily"

   c. *Diesen Wagen fährt es sich leicht

(32) a. Es ist leicht, diesem Weg zu folgen
   "it is easy this path-DAT to follow"

   b. *Dieser Weg folgt sich leicht

   c. Diesem Weg folgt es sich leicht

6.2 Binding

Binding shows an asymmetry that disfavors dative arguments as potentials binders. This restriction pertains, however, only to anaphoric (A-) binding, not to variable (A’-) binding. Cf. Vogel and Steinbach (1995) among many others:

(33) a. Der Arzt1 hat den Patienten2 sich1/2 im Spiegel gezeigt
   "the doctor has the patient-DAT REF-ACC in-the mirror shown"

   b. Der Arzt1 hat dem Patienten2 sich1/*2 im Spiegel gezeigt

(34) a. Peter hat die Gäste einander vorgestellt
   "Peter has the guests-ACC each-other-DAT introduced"

   b. *Peter hat den Gästen einander vorgestellt

If the binding DP is in a KP-shell, it fails to c-command the anaphor in the same way as a DP under P fails:

(35) a. Der Ärzte1 mußten die Patienten2 erst wieder [an einander1/2] gewöhnen
   "The doctors had to get the patients slowly get acquainted with each other again"

   b. Der Ärzte1 mußten [an [die Patienten]1/2] einander1/*2 erst wieder gewöhnen

In all these cases the index is a pure book-keeping device. It has nothing to do with formal grammatical features. Quantification, negation, wh etc. are such features. As such they move to K or P and yields KPs and PPs with exactly these features. Thus, bound variable interpretations are expected:

(36) a. Der Arzt hat jedem Patienten1 seine1 Tabletten gezeigt

   b. Der Arzt hat keinem Patienten1 seine1 Tabletten gezeigt
c. Welchem Patienten\textsubscript{1} hat der Arzt seine\textsubscript{1} Tabletten gezeigt?

\textit{which patient-DAT has the doctor his pills-ACC shown}

(37) a. Der Arzt hat mit jedem Patienten\textsubscript{1} seine\textsubscript{1} Therapie besprochen

\textit{the doctor has with each patient-DAT his therapy-ACC discussed}

b. Der Arzt hat mit keinem Patienten\textsubscript{1} seine\textsubscript{1} Therapie besprochen

\textit{the doctor has with no patient-DAT his therapy-ACC discussed}

c. Mit welchem Patienten\textsubscript{1} hat der Arzt seine\textsubscript{1} Therapie besprochen?

\textit{with which patient-DAT has the doctor his therapy-ACC discussed}

6.3 Secondary predication

According to Vogel & Steinbach (1995) the subject of a secondary predicate can be a nominative or an accusative but not a dative. This follows, if the subject has to c-command the predicate (Williams, 1980; 1994).

(38) a. Hans\textsubscript{x} hat den Rektor\textsubscript{y} schon dreimal betrunken\textsubscript{x/y} getroffen

\textit{Hans-NOM has the rector-ACC already three-times drunk met}

b. Hans\textsubscript{x} ist dem Rektor\textsubscript{y} schon dreimal betrunken\textsubscript{x/*y} begegnet

\textit{Hans-NOM is the rector-DAT already three-times drunk met}

(39) Hans\textsubscript{x} hat mit dem Rektor\textsubscript{y} schon dreimal betrunken\textsubscript{x/*y} telefoniert

\textit{Hans-NOM has with the rector-DAT already three-times drunk telephoned}

(40) a. John ate the meat raw

b. *John ate at the meat raw \hspace{1cm} (Williams, 1994)

6.4 Extraction

Müller (1995) observes that dative as opposed to accusative DPs do not allow extraction:

(41) a. [Über Scrambling\textsubscript{1}] habe ich einem Buch über Optionalität

\textit{about scrambling have I a book-DAT about optionality}

[einen Aufsatz t\textsubscript{1} ] hinzugefügt

\textit{an article-ACC added}

“\textit{I have added to a book about optionality an article about scrambling}”

b. *[Über Optionalität\textsubscript{2}] habe ich einen Aufsatz über Scrambling

\textit{about optionality have I an article-ACC about scrambling}

[einem Buch t\textsubscript{2} ] hinzugefügt

\textit{a book-DAT added}

“\textit{I have added an article about scrambling to a book about optionality}”
If K induces an extra functional layer for dative objects that is absent in accusative objects, the barrier effect is expected. Since in German PPs are extraction island, the close analogy between datives and PP is highly suggestive:

\[(42) \quad *[\text{Über Scrambling}], \text{ habe ich stundenlang [in einem Buch } t_1 \text{ ] herumgeblättert} \]
\[
\text{about scrambling} \quad \text{have I hours-long in a book-DAT turned-over-leaves} \\
\text{“I have for hours turned over the leaves in a book about scrambling”}
\]

**6.5 Synthetic compounds / Rektionskomposita**

In synthetic compounds the object of the verb integrates (incorporates?) into the verb, but this integration seems to be confined to direct objects which would be assigned accusative Case in syntax (cf. de Bleser & Bayer, 1985):

\[(43) \quad \text{a. Die Studentin betreut die Kinder regelmäßig} \\
\text{the student looks-after the children-ACC regularly} \]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{b. Mit Kinderbetreuen verdient man wenig} \\
\text{with child-care earns one little}
\end{align*}
\]

\[(44) \quad \text{a. Das Rote Kreuz hilft vielen Kindern} \\
\text{the red cross helps many children-DAT} \]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{b. *Mit Kindernhelfen erlangt man selten Ruhm} \\
\text{with child-help attains one rarely honor}
\end{align*}
\]

\[(45) \quad \text{ACC-taking verbs} \]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. Das Dirigentenverehren ist eine Sucht der Wiener} \\
\text{the conductor-worshipping is a mania (of) the Viennese}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{b. Das Dirigentenimitieren ist ein Spiel von Musikerkindern} \\
\text{the conductor-imitating is a game of musicians'-children}
\end{align*}
\]

\[(46) \quad \text{DAT-taking verbs} \]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. *das Dirigentenapplaudieren} \\
\text{the conductor-applauding} \\
\text{b. * das Dirigentenausweichen} \\
\text{the conductor-avoiding} \\
\text{c. *das Dirigentenbeispringen} \\
\text{the conductor-assisting} \\
\text{d. *das Dirigentengrollen} \\
\text{the conductor-grudging} \\
\text{e. *das Dirigentenfluchen} \\
\text{the conductor-cursing} \\
\text{f. *das Dirigentenhuldigen} \\
\text{the conductor-praising} \\
\text{g. *das Dirigentenlauschen} \\
\text{the conductor-listening}
\end{align*}
\]
h. *das Dirigentenfolgen
   the conductor-following
i. *das Dirigentenmißtrauen
   the conductor-mistrusting
j. *das Dirigentenwidersprechen
   the conductor-objecting

These facts are naturally explained if dative objects necessarily require a KP-shell. To the extend that phrases cannot incorporate in heads, the contrast follows.

6.6 Recoverability

There is evidence that certain zero arguments must be recovered by virtue of the functional structure that licenses Case. Since the projection of finite V embraces <AgrO> and <AgrS> but nothing like <AgrI>, we expect zero forms which recover nominatives and accusatives but no zero form which recover datives (unless certain extra devices come into play).

6.6.1 Topic drop

(47) a. Ich hab' ihn schon gesehen
       I-NOM have him-ACC already seen
       "I saw him already"
   b. [ ] hab' ihn schon gesehen [ ] = NOM
   c. [ ] hab' ich schon gesehen [ ] = ACC

(48) a. Ich trage die schon
       I-NOM wear them-ACC already
       "I am wearing them already"
   b. [ ] trage die schon [ ] = NOM
   c. [ ] trage ich schon [ ] = ACC

Despite the fact that predicates like denken ("to think"), interessiert ("interested"), nachdenken ("to reflect (on)"), sich freuen ("to be happy"), sich ärgeren ("to be angry"), etc. select PPs which are headed by predictable prepositions (an, über), PP-drop leads to ungrammaticality:

(49) a. *[ ] denke ich die ganze Zeit
       think I the whole time
       [ ] = [pp an ...]
   b. *[ ] bin ich nicht interessiert
       am I not interested
       [ ] = [pp an ...]
   c. *[ ] hab' ich noch nicht nachgedacht
       have I yet not reflected-on
       [ ] = [pp über ...]
   d. *[ ] hab' ich mich gefreut
       have I REFL been-happy
       [ ] = [pp über ...]
   e. *[ ] hab' ich mich geärgert
       have I REFL been-angry
       [ ] = [pp über ...]

Exactly the same restriction holds for dative topics:

(50) a. *[ ] widerspricht ja keiner
       [ ] = DAT
(51) a. Mehr Patienten sind gekommen als behandelt werden konnten
    "More patients showed up than could be treated"

b. Mehr Patienten sind gekommen als der Arzt behandeln konnte
    "More patients showed up than the doctor could treat"

c. *Mehr Patienten sind gekommen als der Arzt Medikamente verabreichen konnte
    "More patients showed up than the doctor could give medicine to"

In spoken language (51c) can be repaired with the insertion of a dative marked pronoun, – a solution which (51a,b) would lead to straight ungrammaticality:

(52) a. *Mehr Patienten sind gekommen als behandelt werden konnten
    *Mehr Patienten sind gekommen als der Arzt behandeln konnte
    (?)Mehr Patienten sind gekommen als der Arzt Medikamente verabreichen konnte

7. Conclusion

It is an undeniable fact that Case morphology plays a key role in the syntactic organization of a Case system. Nevertheless, the syntactic Case system must be established in a way that maps onto morphological distinctions only partially. Structural/direct Cases are licensed by the verb's projection, but they may show distinctive Case morphology in addition. We have shown that – strictly speaking – this morphology must be syntactically obsolete (although it undoubtedly of great value for the processing system in languages without positional Case licensing). Lexical/inherent/oblique Cases are licensed by their own functional structure which can be identified as P or K. This has the effect that – strictly speaking – K or P cannot be lacking in these Cases. Developmental and variationist evidence supports this, as well as a large number of syntactic and morphosyntactic arguments. The delineation is fairly clean, but
there may be certain exceptions, i.e. we do find datives without overt Case morphology. Proper names in modern standard German seem to be a case in point, but see the suggestions in Bayer, Bader & Meng (2001). Others are bare nouns (mass nouns, substance nouns, abstracta) which may appear as datives but nevertheless seem to be deviant in a subtle way. I leave the judgement of the examples in the APPENDIX to the speakers with intuitions about German.
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APPENDIX: Datives without morpohological Case

(i) a. wenn Kälte ins Zimmer dringt

   if coldness into-the room moves

b. wenn du Kälte verspürst

   if you coldness feel

c. wenn du die Pflanzen Kälte aussetzt

   if you the plants coldness expose-to

(ii) a. wenn Gefahr droht

   if danger threatens
b. wenn du Gefahr witterst
   if you danger witness
   ACC

c. wenn du Gefahr trotzten musst
   if you danger brave must
   DAT

(iii) a. wenn man Bier Wein vorzieht
   if one beer wine prefers
   DAT < ACC / ?ACC < DAT

b. wenn man Bier nicht ablehnen will
   if one beer not reject wants
   ACC

c. wenn man Bier nicht widerstehen kann
   if one beer not resist can
   DAT

Do preferences in interpretation shift in (iv)?

(iv) a. Ich ziehe [Bier] [Marias Kaffee] vor
   I prefer beer Mary’s coffee

b. Ich ziehe [Marias Kaffee] [Bier] vor

Finally a real life example (poster at Konstanz University):

(v) [Politik ohne Frauen] fehlt die bessere Hälfte
    politics without women lacks the better half
    DAT