

# FUNCTIONS OF THE DATIVE CASE IN GERMAN SENTENCE STRUCTURE

**Inoyat Bahromovich Kholikulov**

Teacher – Assistant  
Uzbek State University of World Languages  
Tashkent, Uzbekistan

## Abstract

This article explores the functions of the dative case (N<sub>3</sub>) in German sentence structure, focusing on its role within various structural-functional sentence models. By examining models like initial, modifying, phraseological, and syntagmatic structures, the study illustrates how the dative case influences the sentence's grammatical and semantic meaning. The research highlights the nuances in obligatory and optional uses of the dative, demonstrating its role in conveying intensity, emotional effect, and syntagmatic relationships. This analysis provides insights into the broader impact of the dative case on German syntax and verb semantics.

**Keywords:** German linguistics, dative case, sentence structure, structural-functional models, syntagmatic analysis, phraseology, sentence semantics, grammatical function, German syntax

## NEMIS TILIDA GAPLAR TARKIBIDAGI DATIV KELISHIGINING VAZIFALARI

**Inoyat Bahromovich Xoliqulov**

O'qituvchi - assistent  
O'zbekiston davlat jahon tillari universiteti  
Toshkent, O'zbekiston

## Annotatsiya

Ushbu maqolada nemis tilidagi gaplar tarkibidagi Dativ kelishigining (N<sub>3</sub>) funktsiyalari o'rganilib, uning turli strukturaviy-funktsional gap modellaridagi roliga e'tibor qaratiladi. Boshlang'ich, o'zgartiruvchi, frazeologik va sintagmatik tuzilmalar kabi modellarni o'rganib chiqib, tadqiqot qo'shma gapning grammatik va semantik ma'nosiga qanday ta'sir qilishini ko'rsatadi. Tadqiqotda qo'llanishning majburiy va ixtiyoriy qo'llanilishidagi nuanslar yoritilgan, uning intensivlik, emotsional ta'sir va sintagmatik munosabatlarni ifodalashdagi roli ko'rsatilgan. Ushbu tahlil qo'shimcha ishning nemis sintaksisi va fe'l semantikasiga kengroq ta'siri haqida tushuncha beradi.

**Kalit so‘zlar:** Nemis tilshunosligi, sanamli holat, gap tuzilishi, struktur-funksional modellar, sintagmatik tahlil, frazeologiya, gap semantikasi, grammatik vazifa, nemis sintaksisi

## ФУНКЦИИ ДАТЕЛЬНОГО ПАДЕЖА В СТРУКТУРЕ НЕМЕЦКОГО ПРЕДЛОЖЕНИЯ

Иноят Бахромович Холикулов

Преподаватель – ассистент

Узбекский государственный университет мировых языков

Ташкент, Узбекистан

**Аннотация:** В данной статье исследуются функции дательного падежа (N<sub>3</sub>) в структуре немецкого предложения, уделяется внимание его роли в различных структурно-функциональных моделях предложения. Рассматривая такие модели, как инициальные, модификационные, фразеологические и синтагматические структуры, исследование иллюстрирует, как дательный падеж влияет на грамматическое и семантическое значение предложения. Исследование подчеркивает нюансы обязательного и факультативного использования дательного падежа, демонстрируя его роль в передаче интенсивности, эмоционального воздействия и синтагматических отношений. Этот анализ дает представление о более широком влиянии дательного падежа на синтаксис и семантику глагола в немецком языке.

**Ключевые слова:** Немецкая лингвистика, дательный падеж, структура предложения, структурно-функциональные модели, синтагматический анализ, фразеология, семантика предложения, грамматическая функция, немецкий синтаксис

Studying the semantics of the German verb within the framework of structural-functional sentence models, we noted the different behavior of the dative case (designated by the symbol N<sub>3</sub>) within different types of sentence models depending on their functions. Let us cite the definition of a language model given by M. M. Gukhman: “A language model is understood as a mentally created

structure reproducing in a schematized (simplified) and visual form the essential relations and connections of a language system”<sup>1</sup>.

We have established the following types of structural-functional models of sentences: 1) initial, 2) modifying, 3) contextual-terminological, 4) phraseological, 5) syntagmatic. All the listed types of sentence models require a special explanation for their understanding.

Referring once again to M. M. Gukhman's understanding of the linguistic model, we want to stress that the schematisation of the linguistic material considered in our work is that only the logico-grammatical aspect of the sentence is taken into account, which is in agreement with R. Grosse's position: “Unter dem Begriff Satztyp, für den auch die Bezeichnungen Satzmodell, Satzbauplan, Satzschema, Grundform des Satzes verwendet werden, versteht die Germanistik den Satz als grammatisches Minimum in seiner unterschiedlichen Ausstaffierung mit Wortarten und Wortformen als Hauptkonstituenten des Satzes. Dabei muss man weitgehend von der kommunikativen Leistung der konkreten einzelnen Äußerung abstrahieren.”<sup>2</sup>.

Thus, in our study, out of the seven aspects of V. G. Admoni's sentence consideration, six are irrelevant, namely: modality, completeness of the sentence (filling it with secondary members of the sentence), independence or non-self-independence of the sentence, cognitive attitude of the speaker, communicative task and, finally, the degree of emotionality of the sentence<sup>3</sup>. To these unaccounted aspects of consideration, we should add another temporal aspect.

---

<sup>1</sup> М. М. Гухман. О роли моделирования и общих понятиях в лингвистическом анализе. В сб. «Теоретические проблемы языкознания». М., «Наука», 1970, стр. 157.

<sup>2</sup> R. Große. Zur Problematik von Satztyp und Kernsatz in Deutschen. In: „Probleme der strukturellen Grammatik und Semantik“. Leipzig 1968, S. 21.

<sup>3</sup> Detailed information on the sentence, See: В. Г. Адмони. Типология предложения. В сб. «Исследования по общей теории грамматики». М., «Наука», 1968, стр. 233-290.

In our understanding of the sentence model, the functional unity of form and content within the sentence structure comes to the fore, hence the name of the considered sentence models – “structural-functional sentence models”.

The initial structural-functional model of a sentence is designed to reveal the nominative meaning of a verb as a representative of a certain paradigmatic lexical-semantic group of verbs. Based on this function of the initial structural-functional model of the sentence, a regularity can be deduced: any verb as a representative of a certain lexical-semantic group can have only one initial sentence model, and the same sentence model will, as a rule, be the initial one for another representative of the same paradigmatic lexical-semantic grouping. Thus, the initial sentence model for the verb *liegen* in the sentence *Das Buch liegt auf dem Tisch* is the same for the verbs *stehen*, *sitzen*, *hängen*, i.e. for verbs of oriented position in space. The sentence model  $NVP_3/4N_3^4$  can be considered as an expression of the semantic idea of the lexical-semantic group of verbs of oriented position in space.

The dative case ( $N_3$ ) can also be an obligatory part of the original sentence model for certain verbs as representatives of specific lexical-semantic groups. For example, for verbs that convey concrete objects, the dative case is a mandatory member of the sentence model, e.g. for sentences like *Ich gebe dir ein Buch*. The dative case is not always obligatory for the original sentence model of a verb, even if it appears quite often in sentences with this verb. Thus, for the lexical-semantic group of information transfer, the control of the dative case is quite typical, but, for example, in such sentences as *Ich erzähle ihm ein Märchen* the dative case can be eliminated without disturbing the correct sentence structure. Of course, in the case of *Ich erzähle ein Märchen*, it can be assumed that the addressee is established on

---

<sup>4</sup> Coding characters used in our work: N - noun (or pronoun) in nominative case as subject to: N1 - noun (or pronoun) in nominative case as part of the predicate; N2 - noun (or pronoun) in parentage; N3 - noun (or pronoun) in the dative case; N4 - noun (or pronoun) in the intive case; V - conjugable verb; A - adjective as definition; P2 - preposition requiring the genitive case; P3 - preposition requiring the dative case; P3/4 - preposition requiring the double case; Inf. - infinitive; Part. II - Participle II.

the basis of context or known from a certain situation. However, the member  $N_3$  is not part of the initial structural-functional model of the sentence *Ich erzähle ihm ein Märchen*, but is only a part of the communicative-strength model of the sentence.

By communicative-strong sentence model for a certain verb we mean the sentence that most typically reflects the denotative reality associated with this verb. It should be taken into account that a communicatively strong sentence model may include, in comparison with the original sentence model, only those additional members which will not lead to the formation of a potential second predicative centre, i.e. a communicatively strong sentence model may not include members which can be transformed into independent sentences, in other words, members of the sentence model called by Helbig as free indications (*freie Angaben*).

For the same verb there can be several communicative strong models. For example, the sentence *Ich erzähle ein Märchen* along with the sentences: *Ich erzähle ihm ein Märchen*. *Ich erzähle von einem Märchen*. *Ich erzähle ihm von einem Märchen* is communicatively strong, while the original sentence pattern for the verb *erzählen* – *Ich erzähle*. Several communicatively strong sentence patterns can be cited with the verb *schreiben*: *Ich schreibe einen Brief*. *Ich schreibe ihm einen Brief*. *Ich schreibe von einem Brief*. *Ich schreibe ihm von einem Brief* with the original sentence model being communicatively weak: *Ich schreibe*.

It should be noted that the number of communicatively strong sentence patterns is related to the semantic idea of a certain group of verbs, as the composition of communicatively strong sentence patterns reflects extra-linguistic moments. Therefore, it is easy to explain the fact that the three-fold verbs *typen*, *legen*, *stellen*, *setzen* form both the original and communicative-strong model of the sentence, because the three-valued dependencies for these verbs exhaust the dantotic information within one predication center.

Due to the fact that for some groups of verbs the initial sentence model is simultaneously a communicatively weak sentence model, as it needs to be speculated based on context or situation, it is important to be able to extract the obligatory composition of the initial sentence model. The obligatoriness of any member of the sentence model can be determined based on the matrix on the substitutability of the tested member. For example, let's check the status of the member  $N_3$  in the sentences Ich gebe ihm ein Buch and Ich erzähle ihm ein Märchen using the matrix:

Sentence Patterns	Substitute members	heute	Schnell	aus Nachlässigkeit	Ins/zum Zimmer
1) Ich gebe ihm ein Buch		-	-	-	-
2) Ich erzähle ihm ein Märchen		+	+	+	+

In the sentence Ich bringe ihm ein Buch, it is equally possible to replace the member  $N_3$  with any other represented in the matrix. This means that the following sentences are grammatically correct. Ich bringe aus Nachlässigkeit ein Buch. Ich bringe ins Zimmer ein Buch. Ich bringe heute ein Buch, Ich bringe schnell ein Buch. In turn, in sentences, Er gefällt mir. Er folgt ihr it is impossible to replace a member of  $N_3$  with any other constructive element of the sentence without violating the grammatical minimum of sentence<sup>5</sup>.

Thus, the test method for the possibility of replacing the tested member with members that are heterogeneous with it helps to establish the limits of the initial structural-functional model of the proposal and thus the involvement of each member in the grammatical minimum of the proposal.

Within the boundaries of the initial structural-functional model of the sentence, a transfer of meaning can take place, the very one about which K. Bühler

<sup>5</sup> We have used Professor R. Grosse's term. See: R. Große. Op. cit. p. 21. We have in mind, of course, the structural correctness of the sentence.

wrote as a special technique of abstraction, when some of the shades of meaning are obscured and other, more abstract ones appear instead<sup>6</sup>.

It should be noted that only unambiguous verbs with a concrete meaning cannot have a figurative meaning within the framework of the original sentence model. For example, such a meaning is absent in the verb *baumeln* in the  $NVP_3/4N_3$  sentence model, while its more abstract double – the verb *hängen* – in this same sentence model may have a transferable meaning, for example, in the *Er hängt an einem Haar*. This possibility of phraseologisation of the original sentence model is explained by the filling of the sentence model with a lexicon whose semantic features are divergent with respect to each other. Such divergence exists, for example, in the sentence *Du liegst auf meinen Produktionsmitteln*.

Contextually strong sentence patterns can also be subject to phraseologisation. Thus, we can compare the sentences *Er kam über die Brücke* and *Keine Klage kam über ihre Lippen*. In the second sentence, the semantic features of a verb are not combined in the direct with its meaning with the subject and with the member  $P_3/4N_4$ ; an image is created that serves as the basis for the transference. Such models of the sentence, which allow both direct and portable use, we call phraseolable models of the sentence.

The  $N_3$  member can also be included as an obligatory part in phraseological source sentence patterns, e.g.: *Sie folgen ihrer Pionierleiterin*. – *Sie folgen der Vorstellung*. – *Sie gab ihm ein Buch*. – *Der Vorsitzende gab ihm das Wort*.

Sometimes the  $N_3$  member serves as a signal for the value to be transferred within a given supply model. This is the case when the verb model as the core of the sentence model has a different initial sentence model. For example, there is a sentence with the verb *kommen*:  $NVN_3P_3N_3$ .... und damit können wir den Genossen nicht kommen. (H. Kant, *Die Aula*.) The presence of the  $N_3$  member indicates that the meaning of the verb *kommen* has changed in the direction of

---

<sup>6</sup> K. Bühler. *Die Sprachtheorie*. Jena 1934, S. 343–349.

acquiring the meaning of speaking, of conveying information. One could, it seems, argue that in this case we are dealing with the pressure of the structure of the sentence model<sup>7</sup>. As for the N<sub>3</sub> member, this member has very little ability to transfer a certain verb from “its” lexical-semantic group to another group. Another example can be given, namely the sentence model NVN<sub>3</sub>N<sub>4</sub> with the verb *ausrichten*: *Er richtete uns einen Gruß aus*. If we compare this sentence and the sentence with the verb *kommen*, we can first of all note that in both cases there is a transfer of meaning in the respective verbs, and in this connection, we can raise the question of the transfer of the verbs *kommen* and *ausrichten* from their “own” group to a certain lexical-semantic group of verbs. Moreover, it cannot be precisely stated that, for example, the verbs *kommen* and *ausrichten* are included in the sentence models NVN<sub>3</sub>P<sub>3</sub>N<sub>3</sub>(N<sub>4</sub>), in the group of verbs of conveying information or speaking.

Based on the role of the dative case for modifying the lexical meaning of the verb, it should be noted that the N<sub>3</sub> member is not a strong position for revealing the modified meaning of information transfer. Perhaps, this position is due to the fact that the N<sub>3</sub> member is not an obligatory member of the initial sentence model for verbs of information transfer, but is included only in the composition of the communicative-strength sentence model. In the original sentence model with the N<sub>3</sub> member, which is also a communicative-strength sentence model, the modified semantics of the “foreign” verb can be more clearly defined. This situation is observed in the sentence *Der Ball ist mir*. (H. Becker. *Stilwörterbuch*). The sentence model NVN<sub>3</sub> – is the initial and at the same time communicatively strong for verbs of belonging (*Der Ball gehört mir*).

---

<sup>7</sup> The leading role of structure in relation to semantics was convincingly shown by Y.D. Апресян. See: Ю. Д. Апресян. Экспериментальное исследование семантики русского глагола. М., «Наука», 1967, стр. 29-32



For sentence patterns with verbs of information transfer, a strong structural position is the presence of direct speech. Thus, in combination with direct speech, as a rule, any verb can have the meaning of speaking: Er tat: Na, ja! Er machte: Ja! Ja! Er donnerte: Ja! Ja! It is not without reason that A.-L. Paju, in his work on the functions of the dative case, refers the member N<sub>3</sub> in the following examples to cases of use of the free dative, easily elided and thus not included in the structural scheme of the sentences: Er verspricht mir, es bis zum nächsten Morgen zu erledigen. Ich erzähle ihm, daß ich Schulden gemacht habe<sup>8</sup>. Thus, the participation of the N<sub>3</sub> member in the formation of modifying patterns is very limited. A much stronger position within modifying sentence patterns is occupied by prepositional groups, i.e. members of type PN. Therefore, for the sake of comparison, we will dwell a little more closely on modifying sentence patterns with a prepositional group in their composition.

Sentences like: 1) Das Pferd setzte über den Graben. 2) Er machte nach dem Süden<sup>9</sup>. 3) Er tat sie aus der Familie. Er tat die Pferde nach Paris manifest the transition of the verbs setzen, machen, tun from 'their' groups (respectively): 1) from the group of verbs of orientated movement of an object in space; 2) 3) from the group of verbs of abstract activity to lexico-semantic groups of verbs: 1) 2) – of movement. (verb-example kommen); 3) – of non-orientated movement of an object in space (verb-example bringen).

We could consider that the verbs setzen, tun, machen in the NVPN sentence model are homonyms with relation to the same verbs in the NVN<sub>4</sub>PN (for the verb setzen) and NVN<sub>4</sub> (for the verbs machen u tun) sentence models.

But we have to reject this hypothesis, because all the above-mentioned verbs are modified again only within a certain structure, namely in the communicative-strong model of the proposal for the corresponding verbs. If we put the verbs

---

<sup>8</sup> A.-L.Paju. Eine strukturelle Untersuchung der Funktionen des Dativs im Deutschen. Linguistik L. Tartu 1969, S. 106.

<sup>9</sup> Only used in spoken language

setzen, tun and machen into the initial sentence models for verbs of movement and non-oriented movement in space, it is no longer possible to register the transition of these verbs into “foreign” lexico-semantic groups, and the sentences: 1) Er setzt (the original sentence model for verbs of movement NV), 2) Er tut sie, 3) Er macht sie (the original sentence model for verbs of undirected object movement NVN<sub>4</sub>) will either be grammaticalized only in a certain context (1), or return the verb to the bosom of the “own” group. So, we are dealing with the modifying power of the sentence model. All attempts to consider the appearance of modified meanings in the verbs setzen, tun, machen outside the sentence model have been unsuccessful.

For example, we are completely in agreement with U. Wittich, who, by studying the role of prepositions in modern German<sup>10</sup>, distinguishes the function of prepositions in the proposed complement and their function in the proposed group being the circumstance. In prepositional complements, the preposition is closely related to the verb and can therefore be seen as the defining part of the compound word. U. Wittich gives an example to prove this: Er wirbt um das Mädchen – Er umwirbt das Mädchen. In circumstances, on the contrary, the preposition does not belong to the verb, but to the noun, it forms a closed group with it. U. Wittig notes that in circumstantial groups the preposition is a substitutable member, while in prepositional complements the same preposition is always used<sup>11</sup> And in our case, if we tried to consider the verbs setzen, tun, machen in combination with the corresponding prepositions as compound verbs, this attempt would fail, since the combinations of verbs with the prepositions setzen über, machen nach, tun aus are not unique. Instead of setzen über, the word combinations setzen nach, setzen auf, setzen zu, etc. can be derived, i.e. any preposition denoting the direction of motion can be substituted for the preposition über. The same can be said of the verb combinations machen nach u tun nach.

---

<sup>10</sup> U. Wittig. Untersuchung zur Präposition in der deutschen Sprache der Gegenwart unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Präpositionen *in, an, auf*. Dissertation, Berlin 1966.

<sup>11</sup> See: *ibid.* p. 48.

As for modifying models of sentences, they are communicative-strong models of sentences for corresponding semantic verb groups. For modifying the lexical value, it is also possible to use the original models of sentences. This is the case when the original supply model and the communicative-strong supply model are in agreement. For example, for verbs of orientated movement of an object in space (the verb legen), there is simultaneously an initial structural-functional sentence model and a communicative-strength sentence model in the form of NVN<sub>4</sub>PN. When the verb tun is used in this sentence model, a modification of its meaning occurs: Er tat die Sachen in den Schrank.

As our analysis has shown, the modifying power of the N<sub>3</sub> member is insignificant in comparison with the prepositional groups, despite the fact that this member, as well as the PN member, is included in the communicative-strength sentence model for a number of verb groups. Apparently, this is due to the special role of the N<sub>3</sub> member in phraseological and syntagmatic sentence models.

In contrast to the phraseological and syntagmatic models of sentences, in which the N<sub>3</sub> member is very widely represented (we will speak about them below), we have not recorded the N<sub>3</sub> member at all in the third type of models we have noted, namely in contextual-terminological usage. By contextual-terminological use we mean the use of sentences like: Er setzt (meaning ein Buch, eine Seite, einen Absatz). Er gibt (meaning Karten). Sie liegt (implied by tot or krank depending on the context). The meaning of the verb always depends in these sentence patterns on the context, often functionally professional, e.g. Sie (die Schicht) sperrt. Sometimes the meaning of the verb is derived from the whole situation. For example, the sentence Sie legte ab becomes intelligible only depending on what the situation is related to (the telephone or the coat rack). When considering the structure of the contextual-terminological sentence model from the point of view of the number of members, it should be noted that the number of members in this sentence model is minimal, so there is simply no room for the N<sub>3</sub>

member. In the case of a contextual-terminological sentence model, there is usually a truncation of at least one term compared to the original sentence model.

Thus, the number of members in the sentence model may be relevant for the semantics of the verb. Our consideration of structural-functional sentence models precisely takes into account the quantitative side of the filling of sentence models as well. In this respect, the main principle of the consideration is to analyse the quantitative side of the filling of sentence models from their minimum to their maximum meaningful expression. This principle of “increasing” sentence models allows us to obtain a more complete picture of the relationship between sentence structure and verb semantics in comparison with P. Grebe's method of “crossing out”.

It can be guessed that the zero filling, the “point of reference”, will be the filling of the original sentence model. As we have shown above, the depths of the original sentence model already contain the possibility of transferring the meaning of the verb, as well as using it in an abstract sense. It is possible not only to transfer the meaning of the verb, but also to “weather” its concrete lexical meaning, as it happens in analytic constructions<sup>12</sup>. We mean sentences like: Er machte einen Sprung. Er tat eine Reise. The meaning of the verb in analytic constructions is somewhat asemanticized, as a result of which the verb as part of the whole construction is transferred to another semantic group. But since this happens as part of the construction, the sentence models in which these constructions are used cannot be considered modifying, but should simply be referred to phraseological sentence models with a reduced degree of phraseological expression. The use of analytic constructions is possible for several verbs (and consequently for whole lexico-semantic groups of verbs), but only within a broader framework than the original sentence model, i.e. within the framework of a communicatively strong

---

<sup>12</sup> We use in this case the term of I.I. Chernysheva, See: И. И. Чернышева. Фразеология современного немецкого языка. М., «Высшая школа», 1970, стр. 36, 64.

sentence model. This can be observed, for example, in verbs of movement: So kamen seine Gedanken zum Ausdruck. Diese Worte kamen zum Ausdruck.

Metaphorical transfer of the meaning of the verb is also possible within the original sentence model. For example, we can compare: Meine Tochter kommt and Sein Brief kommt. Er legt das Buch auf den Tisch and Er legt viel Wert auf dieses Buch. Er setzt das Kind auf den Stuhl and Er setzt sein Leben aufs Spiel. In fact, the original sentence models for most verbs can have phraseological variants, i.e. they can be phraseologised, which is why we call such models phraseologised sentence models. Phraseologisable sentence models are a form of expressing the average degree of phraseologicity of verbs. When the number of members within the structural-functional model of the sentence increases, the degree of phraseologicity of the verb increases.

The dative case in the sentence model (member N<sub>3</sub>) can act both as a part of an analytical construction: Er gibt ihr einen Rat, and as a member of the sentence model with a figurative meaning: Er schenkt ihr seine Aufmerksamkeit. But in both cases the N<sub>3</sub> member is used within the quantitative framework of the original sentence model. When the number of members of the original sentence model is increased at the expense of the N<sub>3</sub> member, a sentence model with a slightly increased degree of phraseologicity or a sentence model with an additional grammatical meaning may appear. We will focus on the sentence models of the latter type below.

In J. Erben's grammar<sup>13</sup> a four-valent basic sentence model with linguistic manifestation is given: Er schleudert ihm den Handschuh ins Gesicht. Er stieß sich ein Loch in den Kopf. It is not clear why this sentence pattern, labelled by I. Erben № 4 is not given along with model № 2 in the linguistic interpretation: Katzen fangen Mäuse, since it is quite possible to use Er schleudert den Handschuh.

---

<sup>13</sup> J. Erben. Abriß der deutschen Grammatik. 7. Auflage. Akademie-Verlag Berlin, 1964, S. 235.

L. Weisgerber also cites an interesting use of the dative case within the sentence: *Er klopfte seinem Freund auf die Schulter*. Considering that this sentence expresses a directed action (*zugewandte Betätigung*), L. Weissgerber compares it with the expression of similar situations in English and French. Having established the complete absence of analogy in English and the partial possibility of using this model in French, L. Weisgerber argues that it expresses the basic relations of human life<sup>14</sup>. We join this opinion, since in this case there is clearly a nominative meaning without the shadow of a transfer of meaning.

In G. Glinz the member  $N_3$  appears under the name of either the magnitude of reference or the image of reference in the sentence *Du erscheinst mir*<sup>15</sup>.

Comparing the sentences of J. Erben: *Er schleudert ihm den Handschuh ins Gesicht*, L. Weisgerber: *Er klopfte seinem Freund auf die Schulter* and G. Glinz: *Du erscheinst mir*, we get as if different sentence models, which are respectively coded as follows:  $NVN_3N_4P_{3/4}N_4$ ;  $NVN_3P_{3/4}N_4$ ;  $NVN_3$ . But for all these models of propositions it is characteristic that the member  $N_3$  as if he does not belong to the structural model of proposition, being in the terminology of G. Helbiga «free dative case»<sup>16</sup>. Thus, comparing the sentences *Ich halte ihm den Handschuh*. *Ich halte ihm die Treue*, he writes that the first sentence uses the “free” dative case, traditionally called the dative of belonging, which in its logico-grammatical sense fulfils rather the function of definition than of object. In this case he resorts to a transformation: *Er hält ihm den Handschuh* – *Er hält seinen Handschuh*<sup>17</sup>. G. Helbig does not indicate the difference in the expression of nominative, concrete meaning in the first case and figurative meaning in the second case.

We agree with W. Schmidt about the meaning of the  $N_3$  member in the nominative of the stem verb. W. Schmidt calls the dative accessory *Dativus*

<sup>14</sup> L. Weisgerber. *Die vier Stufen in der Erforschung der Sprachen*. Düsseldorf 1963, S. 293.

<sup>15</sup> H. Glinz. *Der deutsche Satz*. Düsseldorf 1957.

<sup>16</sup> G. Helbig, W. Schenkel. *Wörterbuch zur Valenz und Distribution deutscher Verben*. Leipzig 1969. S. 15, 28.

<sup>17</sup> See: *ibid.* p. 48.

sympatheticus and assesses its role for sentence structure as follows: „Obwohl der Dativus sympatheticus in der Fachliteratur gewöhnlich unter die Formen des freien Dativs gezählt wird, zeigen unsere (und auch die bei anderen Grammatikern angeführten) Beispiele, daß er in den meisten Fällen für den Satzsinne erforderlich ist, also eigentlich nicht von dem notwendigen Dativ zu trennen wäre“<sup>18</sup>.

Since we are considering the functions of the dative case not just in structural, but in structural-functional sentence models, let us try to consider them somewhat graded according to the increasing quantitative side of the sentence models: 1) Er scheint mir (cf.: Der Ball ist mir). 2) Ich koche dem Kind ein Ei (cf.: Ich bringe ihm den Koffer). 3) Ich wasche dem Kind die Hände (cf.: Ich halte ihm die Treue). 4) Ich klopfe ihm auf die Schulter (cf: Ich stehe ihm im Wege). 5) Ich werfe ihm den Handschuh ins Gesicht (cf., on the one hand: Ich bringe ihm den Koffer in das Zimmer, on the other hand: Er legt mir Hindernisse in den Weg).

If we analyze all the examples taken in brackets for comparison, they are sharply divided into three categories: 1) sentences in which the N<sub>3</sub> member is obligatory for the composition of the structural-functional model of the sentence: Der Ball ist mir; 2) sentences in which the N<sub>3</sub> member is an optional member: Ich bringe ihm den Koffer. Ich bringe ihm den Koffer in das Zimmer; 3) sentences in which the N<sub>3</sub> member is part of the phraseological model of the sentence, so it is obligatory: Ich halte ihm die Treue. Ich stehe ihm im Wege. Er legt mir Hindernisse in den Weg.

The sentences outside the brackets contain the N<sub>3</sub> member, which is not obligatory for the structural, but is obligatory for the structural-functional model of the sentence. Individual authors call the N<sub>3</sub> member in different ways. For example, W. Schmidt called it Dativus commodi or incommodi in the sentence Du erscheinst mir. To the same type he referred the dative case in the sentence Ich koche dem

---

<sup>18</sup> W. Schmidt. Grundfragen der deutschen Grammatik. Berlin 1966, S. 153–154.



Kind ein Ei. In the third sentence the dative case can be called *Dativus sympatheticus*. In the 4th and 5th sentences *Dativus sympatheticus* is used.

W. Schmidt notes some more cases of *Dativus iudicantis*: Die Zeit vergeht uns schnell. Der Fall ist mir völlig klar. Das ist mir zu hoch.

If we also take into account the ethical dative case (*Dativus ethicus*): Falle mir nicht, the semantic picture of the functions of the dative case appears to us as if in full<sup>19</sup>. All the above-mentioned functions of the use of the dative case are united by W. Schmidt under the general name of the dative case of interest, and the expression of this interest the author notes in one case is quite symptomatic: Es ist unverkennbar, daß der *Dativus ethicus* der Aussage einen emotionalen Charakter verleiht<sup>20</sup>.

Interesting thought A.–L. Páj that in some cases can be replaced by dative case emotively colored, for example: Falle mir nur nicht! – Falle doch nicht! Du bist mir zu schlau. – Du bist (wirklich) zu schlau. Du bist ein schöner Schwindler. – Du bist (wirklich) ein schöner Schwindler<sup>21</sup>.

Consider our examples from the point of view of increased emotional effect. Take, for example, sentences containing the ethical dative case, which, according to W. Schmidt, is rather *Dativus commodi*: 1) Mir sollte nur einer einmal kommen. 2) Aber es kommt mir keiner ins Haus. 3) Leute im roten Rock mit blue Aufschlägen sollten ihm nie ins Haus kommen. 4) Du kommst uns schon!

By analyzing sentences used in a certain situation, we can register a certain tension in the course of action: 2) Aber es kommt mir keiner ins Haus. Das habe ich Ihnen schon hundertmal gesagt! Und wenn wir drei freie Betten haben, es kommt nicht in Frage .... (*M. Frisch*, Biedermann und die Brandstifter.) 4) „Du

---

<sup>19</sup> We deliberately do not use one of W. Schmidt's uses of the dative case, namely *Dativus auctoris*, as rarely occurring.

<sup>20</sup> W. Schmidt. Grundfragen der deutschen Grammatik. Berlin 1966, S. 154.

<sup>21</sup> A.–L. Paju. Eine strukturelle Untersuchung der Funktionen des Dativs im Deutschen. Linguistik L. Tartu 1969, S. 100-102.



kommst uns schon! Du kommst uns immer näher, unvermeidlich!“ kicherte der Kommissar und rieb sich die Hände. (*H. Fallada. Jeder stirbt für sich allein.*)

Some examples in which there is a sentence model without the N<sub>3</sub> member (sometimes it contains the genitive case of belonging), just speak of the opposite, namely of a softening of the intensity of the movement. Thus, we can compare: Dieser Sieg fiel uns nicht in den Schoß. Die vom Ritter geforderte Demut fällt nicht mühelos in den Schoß. The sentence Brenig hielt die Augen offen, denn er mochte es, wenn sich die Flocken an seinen Wimpern fest klebten, immer neue, während die alten schmolzen und in kleinen Tropfen über seine Wangen liefen. (*H. Böll, Die Waage der Baleks.*) can be compared with the sentence Ich wagte kaum zu atmen, der Schweiß lief mir übers Gesicht, ohne daß ich darauf achtete, ich frohr auf einmal. (*E. Dürrenmatt. Das Versprechen.*) and conclude that something pleasant need not necessarily be expressed through Dativus commodi. At first sight, the opposite would seem to be the case, i.e. that something unpleasant is expressed by Dativus incommodi. But if we understand the situation of the last sentence, it appears that the subject of the action, who is at the same time the object to whom the action is addressed, does not realise the unpleasant aspects of the situation in which he is placed. This is evidenced by the adjectival part of the compound sentence (ohne daß ich darauf achtete). So, there is some objective meaning of the verb, arising due to the presence of the dative case in the sentence model. We call this meaning the syntagmatic meaning of intensity of action. Thus, we refuse to understand the meaning of the dative case in the above examples as the dative case of interest and consider it more correct to call it an additional semantic aspectual meaning. Of course, this dimensional meaning is somewhere at the very beginning of the system of ways of action, it serves as a basis for the manifestation of other, more «strong» dimensional meanings, such as the one of aggressiveness or efficiency. Thus, in combination with the past tense form in the sentence Er sprang ihm auf den Rücken we are talking about the meaning of

aggressiveness, and in the sentence *Der Hund biß ihm in das Bein* – we are talking about the meaning of effectiveness.

The manifestation of the intensity of action can be different depending on the model of the sentence. But this meaning is particularly intense in the phraseological<sup>22</sup> models of sentences; it is this meaning that creates an unexpected effect of intensity and is the idiomatic basis for the existence of numerous phraseological models of sentences in different lexical-semantic groups of verbs. Moreover, for phraseological models of propositions no transformations of member N<sub>3</sub> into a possessive parental case do not exist. Let us compare the sentences: 1) *Ich muß ihnen auf die Spur kommen. (B. Uhse. Wir Söhne.)* 2) ... so sind die Gläubiger nun ihm auf alle seine Schliche gekommen (*St. Zweig. Balzac.*).

In the second sentence, the possessive genitive case is used, but it has not displaced the N<sub>3</sub> member.

As has already been noted, the meaning of intensity of action is expressed in different ways by different sentence models containing the so-called dative interest. Perhaps it is worth noting the special relationship within these sentence models of three values: nominative case (subject), verb and dative case. Neither the subject nor the indirect object specifies the person concerned. It is simply that the action of the verb coming from the subject takes the indirect object into its orbit as well, as if to spend additional energy on it. If the indirect case is expressed by the person concerned, it is only a case of borderline use, and we will focus on it. In the sentence *Ich schreibe dem Bruder einen Brief*, the sentence pattern is homonymic. The member N<sub>3</sub> (*ihm*) can be characterized as a relatively obligatory member of the communicative-strength model of the sentence, expressing the addressee, and as an optional member of the structural model of the sentence, expressing the person concerned. In this case we can always make the transformation: *Er schrieb für den Bruder einen Brief*. In fact, a third interpretation supported by the

---

<sup>22</sup> We draw the reader's attention to the fact that we are referring to phraseological, not phraseological sentence patterns like *Er folgte ihr*.

transformation is also possible: Er schrieb den Brief statt seines Bruders. When it is possible to make a transformation using the prepositional group with the preposition instead, we can already speak of the existence of some intensity increase of action expressed by the verb. This is the case in the following sentences: Er hielt ihm den Handschuh (Er hielt den Handschuh statt seiner). Er trug ihm den Koffer (Er trug den Koffer statt seiner). The cases of the use of the sentences Er kochte dem Kind ein Ei. Er wusch dem Kind die Hände are borderline, transitive, and in the second example the involvement of the indirect object in the sphere of action of the verb is more perceptible than in the first example. Of course, the intensity of action is most strongly expressed in sentence patterns such as: Er sprang ihm auf den Rücken. Er warf ihr den Handschuh ins Gesicht.

What is interesting is the relatedness of all members of the sentence models even when expressing nominative, non-transitive meaning within the NVN<sub>3</sub>P<sub>3/4</sub>N<sub>4</sub> sentence models. We compare this sentence model by the P<sub>3/4</sub>N<sub>3</sub> term substitutability check matrix with the NVN<sub>4</sub>P<sub>3/4</sub>N<sub>4</sub> sentence model:

Sentence Patterns	Substitute members	Heute	Lange	ruhig	aus Nachlässigkeit
3) Ich schlage ihm <i>auf die Schulter</i>		-	-	-	-
4) Ich schlage ihn <i>auf die Schulter</i>		+	+	+	+

From the comparison, it is seen that the first model has an idiomatic structure, not capable of truncation. This stability of the structure of the proposal model and the resulting grammatical, syntagmatic value of the intensity of action are widely used as a basis for the formation of phraseological models of proposals. But since phraseological models of sentences arise from models of sentences with

a specific meaning, showing yet additional grammatical meaning, the model of sentences is: 1) Die ihm unter die Augen kamen; 2) Wie Euch immer mehr der Zorn kommt und die Wut; 3) ... mit Euern Zechinen ist mir das Glück gekommen show the average level of phraseology. Thus, the member  $N_3$  in these phraseological models of sentences does not fall within the  $m+n$  calculation formula, which serves to establish an increased degree of phraseology arising on a structural basis. As an example, the sentence Er steht bei ihm tief in der Kreide. The quantitative limits of the original (and simultaneously communicative-strong) model of the  $NVP_{3/4}N_3$  proposal for two members (D and  $P_3N_3$ ) are exceeded.

Summing up the functioning of dative case, it should be noted that its most «strong» positions are manifested in syntagmatic<sup>23</sup> models of sentences and in the phraseological models of proposals formed on their basis. Of course, it is possible to use a dative case in the phraseological models of propositions formed on the basis of structural idiomatic, for example, in the proposal models  $NesVN_3$  and  $NesVN_3N/PN$ : Es schwindelt mir. Es fehlt mir Geduld (an Geduld), but the use of such drugs is rare.

## USED LITERATURE

1. Адмони В. Г.. Типология предложения. В сб. «Исследования по общей теории грамматики». М., «Наука», 1968, стр. 233-290.
2. Апресян Ю. Д. Экспериментальное исследование семантики русского глагола. М., «Наука», 1967, стр. 29-32
3. Гухман М. М. О роли моделирования и общих понятиях в лингвистическом анализе. В сб. «Теоретические проблемы языкознания». М., «Наука», 1970, стр. 157.
4. Чернышева И. И. Фразеология современного немецкого языка. М., «Высшая школа», 1970, стр. 36, 64.
5. Bühler K. Die Sprachtheorie. Jena 1934, S. 343–349.

---

<sup>23</sup> For more details on syntagmatic models of sentences, see: E. S. Rachmankulowa. Strukturelle Untersuchungen zum deutschen Verb im Satzmodell. In: „Probleme der Sprachwissenschaft“. Beiträge zur Linguistik. The Hague. Paris 1971, S. 385-390.

6. Große R. Zur Problematik von Satztyp und Kernsatz in Deutschen. In: „Probleme der strukturellen Grammatik und Semantik“. Leipzig 1968, S. 21.
7. Erben J. Abriß der deutschen Grammatik. 7. Auflage. Akademie-Verlag Berlin, 1964, S. 235.
8. Glinz H. Der deutsche Satz. Düsseldorf 1957.
9. Helbig G., Schenkel W. Wörterbuch zur Valenz und Distribution deutscher Verben. Leipzig 1969. S. 15, 28.
10. Schmidt W. Grundfragen der deutschen Grammatik. Berlin 1966, S. 153–154.
11. Paju A.-L. Eine strukturelle Untersuchung der Funktionen des Dativs im Deutschen. Linguistik L. Tartu 1969, S. 100-102, 106.
12. Rachmankulowa E. S. Strukturelle Untersuchungen zum deutschen Verb im Satzmodell. In: „Probleme der Sprachwissenschaft“. Beiträge zur Linguistik. The Hague. Paris 1971, S. 385-390.
13. Wittig U. Untersuchung zur Präposition in der deutschen Sprache der Gegenwart unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Präpositionen *in*, *an*, *auf*. Dissertation, Berlin 1966.
14. Weisgerber L. Die vier Stufen in der Erforschung der Sprachen. Düsseldorf 1963, S. 293.