1. Introduction

The main purpose of this paper is to adduce further evidence against the received applicative typology established since Pylkkänen (2002/2008). In this we join authors such as Nash (2006), Georgala et al. (2008), Grashchenkov & Markman (2008), Bruening (2010) and Georgala (2010) who argue against a low applicative head merged below VP. We claim on the basis of novel data from French that non-core datives are introduced by an applicative head above VP. This move does not imply that there is only one type of applicative head. We will show in the 2nd part of the paper that French allows the attachment of applicative heads at least at two positions above the VP. Only in one of these positions, above VP but below vP, does the applicative head actually introduce a new argument. When the applicative head is projected above VP its only function is to mark the closest c-commanding argument with affectedness feature.

The paper is structured as follows. In section 2 we present Pylkkänen’s analysis and challenges to it. In section 3 we present French constructions featuring non-core datives and show that these can only be merged above VP; here we mainly discuss benefactive datives. In section 4 we turn to present an additional class of non-core datives. In section 5 we show a syntactic difference between the two classes of non-core datives. The syntactic analysis is provided in section 6. Section 7 contains some concluding remarks.

2. Arguments against a low applicative

2.1 Pylkkänen 2002/2008

The distinction between high and low applicatives (1) was established by Pylkkänen (2002/2008), following Marantz (1993), on the basis of a contrast between English and Chaga double object constructions featuring an applied, benefactive argument.

(1)  a. High applicative (Chaga)  b. Low applicative (English)

A low applicative directly relates two arguments and has directional semantics; its interpretation is akin to that of prepositions TO or FROM. Its presence in the
Boneh & Nash

structure necessarily implies transfer. This is why a stative verb is expected to be ungrammatical in English, in such a configuration:

(2) *Mary held John the bag.

A high applicative relates an argument to an event, and does not necessarily involve transfer. Thus in Chaga (and similarly in Venda, Luganda and Albanian), but not in English, a benefactive participant can be added to an unergative verb (3)-(4).

(3) English
   a. I baked a cake.
   b. I baked him a cake.
   c. I ran.
   d. *I ran him. (i.e. I ran for him)

(4) Chaga
   a. N-à-i-lyi-i-à mì-kà k-élyá
      FOC-1s-PR-eat-APPL-FV 1-wife 7-food
      ’He is eating food for his wife.’
   b. N-à-i-ziwic-i-à mì-byà.
      FOC-1s-PR-eat-APPL-FV 9 friend
      ’He is running for a friend.’ (From Bresnan & Moshi 1993: 49-50)

Pylkkänen takes these properties as diagnostics for identifying whether a language instantiates high or low applicatives: (i) Only high applicative heads can combine with stative verbs; (ii) Only high applicative heads combine with unergatives.

Although this analysis gained non-negligible popularity (e.g. McGinnis 2002, Legate 2002, Cuervo 2003 a.o) it has been challenged in two ways: with respect to the validity of the diagnostics and on theoretical grounds, where the viability of assuming a low applicative is criticized.

2.2 Challenges to the received applicative analysis

On type of criticism towards Pylkkänen’s analysis concerned the diagnostics for identifying whether a language instantiates high or low applicatives. Contrary to the clear distinction between English on the one hand and Chaga, Venda, Albanian on the other drawn by Pylkkänen, crosslinguistic survey reveals that the behaviour of non-core datives in one and the same language is generally conform with only one of Pylkkänen’s diagnostics, but not both. This has been noted for Russian, German and Italian (cf. Grashchenkov & Markman 2008, Lee-Schoenfeld 2005, Folli & Harley 2006, respectively).

More crucially, clear structural asymmetries between dative and theme arguments challenge the low applicative analysis according to which these

---

1 TRANSFER (or future having) is primordial in English double object constructions as clearly argued for by Jackendoff (1990) and Nesbit (2005). As the concept of future having is generally beneficial for the recipient, the dative argument is often considered to bear a benefactive theta-role. Yet, a benefactive argument which is not at the same time a recipient is illicit in double object constructions in English.

(i) a. John opened Mary a beer.
   b. *John opened Mary the door. (Examples from Nisbet 2005)
arguments are generated in the same minimal domain, ApplP, as the specifier and the complement of its head.

First, Georgala et al. (2008) provide evidence that an adverbial modifier can intervene between the recipient and the theme in DO constructions, both in Mandarin and in English. (5) exemplifies the English data.

(5) a. I gave/threw the boys each/both a towel.
   b. ??I gave/threw the towels each/both to a boy.

(georgala et al. 2008, exx. 29)

Under the assumption that adverbial modifiers attach to VP, this is a problem to an analysis that views them as part of the same minimal constituent, namely a low ApplP.

Second, scope freezing facts in double object constructions first discussed by Aoun and Li (1993) and developed by Bruening (2001) show that there is a clear hierarchy between the objects in double object constructions, contrary to the prepositional ditransitive construction:

(6) a. Mary presented every student to a professor.  ∀ > ∃, ∃ > ∀
   b. Mary presented a professor every student.  *∀ > ∃, ∃ > ∀

According to Bruening (2001), the scope ambiguity in ditransitive constructions is only possible when the quantified DPs are part of the same domain and hence equi-distant for QR to the edge of vP. This suggests, similarly to (5), that the dative and theme argument in (6b) belong to different domains, and are hierarchically asymmetric.

Last but not least, challenges to an approach that distinguishes high and low applicatives come from languages that overtly mark applicative heads. Georgala et al. (2008), following Baker (1996), point to the fact that there is no morphological evidence for a low applicative. Applicatives affixed onto the verbal stem are high applicatives, whereas "low" applicatives always look like preposition incorporation. The following examples from Abaza cited by Georgala et al. (2008) illustrate this point:

(7) a. d-a-[ðə-dzqa]-yə-r-gəl-t’.
    A3SG.H-DIR[P1-beside]-C3SG.M-CSE-stand-DYN
    ‘He caused him/her to stand next to us.’ (O’Herin 2001: 481)
   b. [PP a-ʒəra dza]
      the-smithy 3SG.N-beside
      ‘beside the smithy’ (O’Herin 2001: 486)

3. French non-core datives

In this section, we discuss the behavior of French non-core datives, expressed either as clitics or à-PPs,² in light of Pylkkänen’s theory, and show that their

---

² Roberge & Troberg (2009) together with other authors (Rouveret & Vergnaud 1980, Rooryck 1988, Herschensohn 1992, Authier & Reed 1992, Jones 1996) claim that non-core datives surface exclusively in the form of clitics and are otherwise infelicitous as full à-PPs. They note that full à-PPs can only be encountered in the case of so-called extended datives (terminology due to Leclère 1976), where the dative is construed as a recipient (ia), or when the à-PP is in fact adnominal (ib):
semantic and syntactic properties can only be accounted for by positing a high applicative analysis.

3.1 Low applicative properties
One fact which might suggest that French instantiates low applicatives concerns obligatory transitivity, or in other words, the unavailability of non-core datives with unmodified unergative verbs:

(8) *Pierre travaille à ses parents.
    Pierre work.PRES to his parents
    Intended: ‘Pierre is working/works for (the sake of) his parents.’

To recall, low applicatives are said to relate two individuals, and as such transitivity of the verb is obligatory. High applicatives can be merged to VPs headed by unergative verbs. Moreover, it has been extensively noted in the literature on French non-core datives that although they can be introduced with a great variety of verbs (9-11), the presence of a VP internal argument is necessary (cf. Leclère 1976, Morin 1981, Rooryck 1988, Herslund 1988, Authier & Reed 1992, Lamiroy & Delbeque 1998, Roberge & Troberg 2007, Juitteau & Rezac 2007).

(9) a. Jeanne lui a marché *(sur les pieds).
    Jeanne 3S.DAT walked on the feet
    'Jeanne stepped on her/his feet (affecting her/him).'

b. Les joues lui pendent jusqu’aux genoux.
    The cheeks 3S.DAT hang till knees
    'His cheeks are hanging down to his knees (on her/him).'

c. Jeanne a peint son portail à Marie.
    Jeanne painted 3.POSS gate to Marie
    'Jeanne painted her/his gate for her/him.'

d. Jeanne lui a mangé *(son goûter).
    Jeanne 3S.DAT ate 3.POSS snack
    'Jeanne ate her/his snack.'

(10) a. Jeanne s’est couru *(trente km).
    Jeanne 3.SE ran thirty km
    'Jeanne ran her thirty km.'

b. Jeanne s’est fumé *(un cigare).
    Jeanne 3.SE smoked a cigar

(i) a. Paul a fabriqué une table à Marie
    Paul fabricated a table to Marie
    ‘Paul made a table for Marie.’

b. Les enfants ont mangé tout le gâteau à maman
    The children ate all the cake to mom
    ‘The children ate all of mom’s cake (on her).’

We do not agree with this empirical claim. Although there does exist considerable speaker variation, there are speakers that have no trouble accepting examples with full à-PPs as non-core dative that do not fall under either of the cases in (i).
'Jeanne smoked her a cigar.'

(11) a. **Au Mont St. Michel, la mer te monte *(à une de ces vitesses).**
At Mont St. Michel the sea 2S.DAT rises at one of these speeds
‘You won’t believe how quickly the sea rises at Mont St. Michel!’

b. **Je te lui ai donné un de ces gifles!**
I 2S.DAT 3S.DAT gave one of these smacks
‘(I’m telling you) I smacked him good!’

The obligatoriness of VP internal material occurs with any type of non-core dative: benefactive (9), coreferential (cf. Horn 2008, Boneh & Nash 2010), exemplified in (10), and ethical dative (cf. Leclère 1976, Herslund 1988) exemplified in (11); and this irrespective of whether the non-core dative is related or not to the VP material in terms of transfer or possession, as will be discussed more extensively below.

Authier & Reed (1992) tried to provide an explanation to this restriction in the spirit of Burzio’s generalization: just as a the presence of the canonical external argument is conditioned by the availability of the accusative marked object, the added dative argument requires the presence of VP-internal material, which is case marked according to the authors. In this paper we will not have much to say about this restriction.3

We turn now to show that despite the requirement of the other VP-argument and the unavailability of plain unergative verbs with non-core datives, the resulting constructions can only be analyzed as involving a high applicative in French.

### 3.2 High applicative properties

We start by reviewing semantic properties of French non-core datives that set them apart from the so-called English low applicative constructions. First, as we saw in the previous section, a low applicative must encode directional meaning, and the introduced dative DP must be interpreted as a recipient. French non-core datives however have a much larger range of interpretations, in addition to (intended) recipients, non-core dative arguments can be interpreted as beneficiary, maleficiary or possessor, which is not the case in English.

(12) a. **Marie a écrit une lettre à Paul**
Marie wrote a letter to Paul
‘Marie wrote a letter to Paul.’

b. **Marie a repeint un vieux portail à ses voisins**
Marie painted an old gate to her neighbors
‘Marie painted and old gate for her neighbors.’

c. **Marie a crevé deux pneus à ses voisins**
Marie punctured two tires to her neighbors

---

3 Roberge & Troberg (2009) link the restriction on VP-internal material to the clitic form of the non-core dative in French. Under their analysis, the clitic realizes an applicative head whose specifier is not overtly realized and contains an expletive operator which then must bind a referential DP in the VP.
‘Marie punctured two tires on her neighbors.’
d. L’infirmière scolaire a coupé les ongles à tous les élèves.
=> possessor

The nurse-of-school cut the nails to all the pupils
‘The school nurse cut the pupils’ nails (on them).’

Cuervo (2003) argues for the existence of another type of low applicative: a non-
dynamic Possessive Appl (her AT), which relates the dative possessor and the
theme. However, we consider that possessive readings of datives in French are
always secondary to a benefactive reading. In other words, possession is a proper
subclass of benefactive dative constructions. A possessive reading seems the most
salient when the theme entertains a part-whole relation with the applied argument
(11a). When no part-whole relation exists between the dative and the accusative
arguments, any reading – possessive, benefactive, malefactive – is available
depending on the context (13b).

(13) a. Jeanne lui a peint les sourcils en orange.
  Jeanne 3 S.DAT painted the eyebrows orange
  'Jeanne painted her/his eyebrows orange (on/for her/him).'

b. Jeanne lui a peint le portail en orange.
  Jeanne 3 S.DAT painted the gate orange
  'Jeanne painted her/his gate orange (on/for her/him).'

Furthermore, French freely allows datives with stative verbs, which do not imply
transfer.

(14) Je lui tiens les cartables de ses enfants,
  I 3 S.DAT hold the schoolbags of her children
  pendant qu’elle fait les courses.
  while that she does the shopping
  *'I hold her the schoolbags of her children while she shops.'

These arguments can and, with many predicates, must be interpreted as
benefactive arguments. Their source should be an applicative head with more
vague semantics than that of implied transfer. This type of applicative will
introduce an extra argument which holds relation to the event, i.e. a new event
participant.

Syntactically, cases where two DPs are related across a PP are problematic for
a low applicative analysis à la Pylkkänen (cf. Landau 1999, Lee-Schoenfeld
2005):

(15) a. Marie lui a mis la main sur l’épaule (*de son frère).
  Marie 3 S.DAT put the hand on the-shoulder (of 3.POSS brother)
  'Marie put a hand on her/his shoulder (affecting her/him).'

b. Jeanne lui a vomi sur le tapis (*de sa voisine)
  Jeanne 3 S.DAT vomited on the carpet (of 3.POSS neighbor)
  'Jeanne vomited on her/his carpet (affecting her/him).'

Although the object of the preposition and the datives in the examples in (15) are
undeniably related by a possession relation, as attests the impossibility to add a
DP internal possessor, a low applicative cannot be assumed, since the preposition
would be an intervener to a strictly local relation between the two DPs. Assuming only a high applicative circumvents this problem.

Above and beyond the semantics of non-core datives, and the syntactic argument presented above, for which an analysis in terms of possessor raising can also be an option, what speaks most in favor of an analysis that does not rely on a low applicative are scope facts. These facts also show how non-core datives structurally differ from selected ones in French.

Although selected and non-core datives, as à-PPs, are superficially alike in French, scope freezing facts (15-16) and variable binding asymmetries (17-18) clearly indicate that there are structural asymmetries between them:

(15) a. Le directeur a envoyé une offre à chacun de ses clients. \( \forall > \exists, \exists > \forall \)
    b. Le directeur a envoyé à chacun de ses clients une offre. \( *\forall > \exists, \exists > \forall \)
    ‘The director sent an offer to each of his clients/to each of his clients an offer.’

(16) a. La maîtresse a corrigé un devoir à chacun de ses élèves. \( *\forall > \exists, \exists > \forall \)
    b. La maîtresse a corrigé à chacun de ses élèves un devoir. \( *\forall > \exists, \exists > \forall \)
    ‘The teacher corrected an assignment to each of her students/to each of her students an assignment.’

In the canonical word order DP-PP, scope freezing is attested only with non-core datives in (15a). In the b-examples, instantiating a scrambled word order, the narrow scope reading of the indefinite can be subsumed under information structure concerns and specificity of the “right-dislocated” direct object.\(^4\)

An additional contrast between selected and non-core datives comes from variable binding:

(17) a. La maîtresse a rendu son cartable à chaque élève.
    The teacher gave-back his schoolbag to every pupil
    b. La maîtresse a rendu chaque cartable à son propriétaire.
    The teacher gave-back every schoolbag to its owner

(18) a. Marie a peint sa maison à chaque villageois
    Mary painted his house to each dweller
    b. *Marie a peint chaque maison à son locataire.
    Mary painted every house to its tenant

The contrast in (18a-b) shows that the dative beneficiary asymmetrically c-commands the theme only in non-core dative constructions, whereas the core dative goal and the theme in (17) are not hierarchically ordered.

3.3 Summary
In this section we have established that in French there is a clear structural divide between non-core datives and selected ones, and we showed that the former are merged high. In so doing we also rejected the possibility of a low applicative on semantic grounds by showing that non-core dative constructions do not necessarily involve possession. The main interpretative effect of the non-core

\(^4\) Here the term right-dislocation is used a-theoretically, and should not be understood as the actual movement operation.
datives presented in this section has to do with bene-/malefaction. In the next section we turn to examine a type of non-core dative, uniformly shaped as a reflexive clitic, which has received little attention in the literature cited above. Its properties can be understood by positing a high applicative source, even higher than that of benefactive datives. This conclusion further confirms the unavailability of a low applicative source for any type of non-core datives in French.

4. Coreferential Dative Constructions
The class of benefactives should be further refined, as we will see in the next two sections. The refinement of the classification will eventually lead us to claim that non-core datives in French, which are never low, have two distinct sources above V. The higher of the two sources is the applicative head merged above vP and the lower is the applicative head merged below vP.

In (19) we present two examples containing the dative clitic coreferential with the subject. We will refer to these constructions as Coreferential Dative Constructions (CDC):

(19) a. Jeanne s'est couru trente km.
   Jeanne 3.SE ran thirty km
   'Jeanne ran her thirty km.'

   b. Je me suis maté un film avec ma copine.
   I 1.SE watched a movie with my girlfriend
   'I watched me a movie with my girlfriend.'

CDCs are equivalent in their truth conditions to the sentences in (20), without the reflexive SE:

(20) a. Jeanne a couru trente km.
   Jeanne ran thirty km
   'Jeanne ran thirty km.'

   b. J'ai maté un film avec ma copine.
   I watched a movie with my girlfriend
   'I watched a movie with my girlfriend.'

The interpretative difference between sentences such as in (19) and those in (20) is pragmatic. CDCs express how the subject, primarily agentive, experiences the event in question, implicating that the subject experiences enjoyment and easy-goingness. This effect depends on the volitional involvement of the agent in the event:

(21) a. Je me suis cassé quelques bagnoles de riches (que kif!)
   I 1.SE broke a few cars of rich people (what fun)
   'I went and smashed me some rich folks' cars (that was fun!)

   b. #Je me suis cassé quelques verres, sans le faire exprès…(que kif!)
   I 1.SE broke a few glasses, unintentionally (what fun)
   '#I went and smashed me some glasses, unintentionally (that was fun!)

(21a) is appropriate if uttered by a vandal, acting volitionally, contrary to (21b) where the CD is inappropriate if the breaking is carried out unwillingly.
CDCs with similar pragmatic effects are reported to exist also in spoken varieties of English (Horn 2008 and references therein).

(22) a. I love me some him. (Horn 2008, p. 176)
    b. I've married me a pretty little wife. (Horn 2008, p. 169)

Interestingly, superficially identical forms in Spanish have radically different properties. The Spanish clitic is obligatory in some contexts and is compatible with telic non-punctual VPs (Fernández Lagunilla & de Miguel 2000).

(23) a. Juan se comió la manzana / *manzanas.
    Juan 3.SE ate the apple / apples
    'Juan ate up the apple.'
    b. Juan comió *la manzana / manzanas.
    Juan ate the apple / apples
    'Juan ate the apple.'

In French, the presence or absence of the reflexive clitic does not affect grammaticality, and although there is a slight preference for indefinite objects, there are no constraints on the type of material in the VP.

(24) a. Jeanne s' est mangé la pomme / des pommes / une pomme.
    Jeanne 3.SE ate the apple / apples / an apple
    'Jeanne ate the apple / apples / an apple.'
    b. Jeanne a mangé la pomme / des pommes / une pomme.
    Jeanne ate the apple / apples / an apple
    'Jeanne ate the apple / apples / an apple.'

Beyond expressing completion of the underlying event, it has been claimed in Strauss (2003) that the Spanish constructions give rise to a pragmatic effect of expressing that the underlying event happened somewhat counter to the expectation of the speaker, if this is indeed the case, this constitutes an additional difference between these French and Spanish constructions.

5. Benefactive vs. Coreferential non-core datives

In this section we show that the superficially similar constructions in (25), involving non-core dative clitics, are syntactically and semantically distinct.

(25) a. Elle se peint son portail.
    She 3.SE paints her gate
    'She paints her gate for herself.'
    b. Elle se fume un cigare.
    She 3.SE smokes a cigar
    'She smokes her a cigar.'

While (25a) conveys that the painter is also the beneficiary of the painting event, it will be shown that (25b) cannot be so interpreted, as it does not involve a third distinct participant, co-referential with the subject DP. While the interpretative contribution of the reflexive dative in (25a) is to identify the agent as the beneficiary, the presence of the clitic in (25b) only seems to contribute to pragmatically enrich the agent with affectedness, as shown in section 4.

The structures do not only differ interpretatively, but also syntactically. One syntactic environment which clearly points to the difference between (25a) and
(25b) is embedding under causative-

faire (for more differences see Boneh and

Nash to appear)

(26) a. Elle a fait se peindre le portail à Paul.
She made 3.SE paint the gate to Paul
'She made Paul paint the gate for himself.'

b. *Elle a fait se fumer un cigare à Paul.
She made 3.SE smoke a cigar to Paul
intended: 'She made Paul smoke a cigar.'

(27) a. Elle a fait peindre le portail à Paul.
She made paint the gate to Paul
'She made Paul paint the gate.'

b. Elle a fait fumer un cigare à Paul.
She made smoke a cigar to Paul
'She made Paul smoke a cigar.'

The causee can be co-referential with a benefactive SE in a faire-causative (26a) but not with an affected agent SE (26b). (27a) and (27b) give the parallel constructions without SE.

Interestingly, (26b) can be 'saved' if the causee is realized either as a clitic or a dislocated wh-phrase:

(28) a. Elle lui a fait se fumer un cigare.
She 3.SG.DAT made 3.SE smoke a cigar
'She made him smoke a cigar.'

b. Elle a fait se fumer un cigare à qui?
She made 3.SE smoke a cigar to who?
'Who did she make smoke a cigar?'

c. A qui elle a fait se fumer un cigare?
To who she made 3.SE smoke a cigar?
'Who did she make smoke a cigar?'

Here is another such pair:

(29) a. Elle a fait repasser sa chemise à Paul.
She made iron 3.POSS shirt to Paul
'She made Paul iron his shirt.'

b. Elle a fait se repasser sa chemise à Paul.
She made 3.SE iron 3.POSS shirt to Paul
'She made Paul iron his shirt for himself.'

(30) a. Ça a fait mater des films débiles à mes voisins.
This made watch movies dumb to my neighbors
'This made my neighbors watch dumb movies.'

b. *Ça a fait se mater des films débiles à mes voisins.
This made 3.SE watch movies dumb to my neighbors
intended: 'This made my neighbors watch dumb movies.'

c. Ça leur a fait se mater des films débiles.
This them made 3.SE watch movies dumb
'This made them watch dumb movies.'
(29b) shows that there is no problem in embedding a sentence containing a reflexive benefactive dative under causative-faire, contrary to (30b), which shows that a construction containing a coreferential dative cannot be. The a-examples are comparison cases where no reflexive pronoun is present. Finally, (30c) shows that it is only possible to embed a coreferential dative under a causative-faire if the causee is spelled-out in a displaced position, outside the embedded constituent.

In the next section we present an analysis of these facts which is based on the existence of different sites for an applicative head that licenses the non-core dative.

6. Syntactic analysis

In this section, we propose a syntactic analysis for the differences between Coreferential Datives (CDs) and Benefactive Datives (BDs) described in the previous section. We will claim that the set of data concerning embedding under causative-faire suggests that CDs and BDs are hierarchically distinct: the CD attaches above $v_P$ while BD is attached below, between $VP$ and $v_P$.

6.1 The syntactic difference between BDs and CDs

CDs are necessarily SE configurations, while BDs can contain either SE-marked predicates or referentially disjoint dative DPs or clitics. We view the clitic SE as a defective realization of an argument-introducing head (Labelle 2008, Embick 2004). An argument-introducing head $v$ or Appl is spelled out as SE when it lacks the specifier occupied by a referential argument.5 Put differently, referentially independent arguments cannot be introduced by a head spelled out as SE.

Compare now the structure proposed in (31) for Coreferential Dative constructions, where Appl is attached above $v$, to the one proposed for the Benefactive Dative constructions in (32), where Appl is attached between $v$ and $V$. When Appl is merged within the thematic domain $vP$, an extra event argument is added to the thematic information carried by the verb semantics. If Appl is realized as SE the introduced argument must be interpreted as anaphoric (i.e. lacking independent reference) and as affected. The highest argument $DP_{AGENT}$ is co-indexed with it and the missing argument is interpreted as an affected benefactee, coreferent with the agent. Additionally, we contend that Appl above $vP$ may only be realized as SE: the non-thematic environment in which Appl finds itself prohibits adding new event arguments.

(31)  
\[
\begin{array}{c}
TP \\
\text{DP}_1 \\
T \quad \text{ApplP}
\end{array}
\]

''Elle se fume une cigarette''

'She smokes her a cigarette.'

5 Labelle (2008) presents an analysis of SE according to which an argument introducing head (in her terms, Voice) is spelled as SE when it selects a VP complement with an unsaturated (non-projected) argument. In her account, Voice$_{SE}$ itself does project a referential argument in its specifier which is coindexed with the open slot in VP.
6.2 Embedding under causative-*faire*

We propose the following explanation to the hitherto unnoticed contrast in embeddability under causative-*faire*. It is a well-known fact that in *faire-à* constructions the causative *faire* and the embedded verb form a tight syntactic unit and internal arguments of the embedded verb must precede the embedded agent, marked with dative case:

(33) Isa a fait fumer une cigarette à Béa.
    ‘Isa made smoke a cigarette to Béa.’

(34) *Isa a fait fumer (à) Béa une cigarette.
    ‘Isa made Béa smoke a cigarette.’

Following Burzio (1986) and Kayne (2004), we assume an analysis according to which causative-*faire* construction involve VP-preposing. The embedded agent stays in situ, in the left-hand SpecvP position. Moving VP (the verb and its internal arguments) to the left of vP is a necessary step for the subsequent *faire*-VP reanalysis. The vP layer is stranded behind, with the embedded agent in its specifier. It is in this base position that the embedded agent gets its dative case from the reanalyzed *faire*-VP complex. Notice that the case of the embedded agent is conditioned by the nature of the embedded predicate: agents of embedded intransitive verbs are assigned accusative case, agents of embedded transitive verbs are marked with dative case. This case choice clearly depends on the global number of arguments present in the sentence as the result of *faire*-VP reanalysis.
The main reason for assuming such an analysis and not adopting an alternative analysis of the type proposed by Guasti (1996), whereby the embedded agent is positioned in some right hand specifier of the embedded clause where it is marked with dative case, is the grammaticality of (35).

(35) Marie a fait décrire chaque livre à son auteur.
Marie made describe every book to its author

Under an analysis where the embedded agent alone is found a high right-hand specifier, the pronominal son in à son auteur could not have been bound by the quantified embedded object, contrary to fact. The fact that the embedded object can bind into the embedded agent suggests that the former is hierarchically higher or at least at the same level, as the latter.

In this light, let us consider again (26a) and its structure in (36). First, the VP is preposed to the left of vP, then the clitic SE cliticizes (moves by head-movement) to the preposed V. This derivation yields a configuration in which SE is hierarchically higher than the DPAGENT. Yet, the structure is licit since the c-command relation AGENT-BENEFACTIVE has been established prior to movement and can be therefore reconstructed.

(36) Elle a fait se peindre le portail à Paul.
'She made Paul paint the gate for himself.'

In CDCs, the embedded VP moves to the left of ApplP (to be linearly adjacent to faire) and the head of Appl SE cliticizes to the fronted VP. If the embedded DPAGENT stays in situ as in (37), the right c-command relation between SE and the embedded agent cannot be established at any level of representation. This situation can be salvaged if the embedded agent moves to the higher clause headed by faire either as a clitic lui or as a wh-constituent. This derivation is illustrated by the tree in (38), resulting in constructions (27), where the embedded agent comes to c-command SE subsequent to movement.
7. Concluding remarks on affectedness.

In this paper we have argued on the basis of French data that there exists a structural distinction between selected and non-core datives and that the latter are merged hierarchically higher than the former.

We continued in showing that in French non-core datives, introduced by applicative heads, may attach at two different positions above the VP. If the Appl head attaches above V but below v, in the thematic domain, a new event participant is added. However, if the Appl head is attached above v it is necessarily realized as se. The non-thematic environment in which the Appl head is merged prohibits the introduction of new event arguments, whence its deficient realization. We have shown that in this case the interpretative contribution of the applicative head is to endow an existing c-commanding argument with affectedness. Affectedness is an intrinsic feature of applicative heads no matter where they are projected – non-core arguments introduced via Appl differ from
synonymous PPs (e.g. for-PPs) in that only the former are interpreted as affected (Kayne 1975, Larson 1990).

Our conclusions, if on the right track, lead us to make the following suggestion about applicative heads: their intrinsic interpretative property is to endow arguments with affectedness. Whether or not they introduce a new event participant, which will be the one bearing the affectedness feature, depends on their merge locus in the clausal syntactic hierarchy. It has always been a challenge to understand where this ‘affectedness’ flavour came from and whether there could be a possible link between the presence of this feature and the properties of Appl. We believe that Coreferential Dative constructions are precisely a syntactic environment where affectedness can be teased apart from argument introduction.
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