## On the relation between prepositional and applicative constructions

Several papers have recently addressed many of the issues involved in dative alternations (see Bruening, Harley & Jung). Due to the general consensus reached in the last 15 years, these papers are designed to choose among competing non derivational analyses (NDA) for applicative constructions (AC). According to H&J, their analysis is superior because it accounts not only for applicative constructions, but also for the behavior of *have*. The purpose of this talk is to shed new light on the properties of this alternation. A thoroughly analysis of the data shows that, following H&J logic and once the prepositional construction (PC) is included in the paradigm, a derivational analysis becomes the null hypothesis; otherwise, the obvious connections between PC and AC (and also *have*) would remain unexplained.

Most confusion surrounding this alternation is due to the fact that there are verbs like *give*, *show*, *lend* or *tell* that **only express cause possession**, both in the AC and in the PC. On the other hand, there are verbs ambiguous between cause possession and cause motion (*send*, *throw*, etc.), but, as observed by RH&L, O&R or Larson (2013), cause motion interpretation is restricted to the PC, a fact that has been frequently overlooked. For instance, PC fixed goal idioms (*send X to the devil*) are only available in the second class of verbs, with a cause motion reading.

Consider **adverbial modification**. NDA observe that adverbial modifiers in ACs do not modify the entire event of giving, but just a resulting state of having (1a). When we consider PCs, the same result obtains (1b). However, if we consider cause motion verbs, the result is different, in both cases what is modified is the event of sending, not the resulting state (2). These contrasts show that it is not AC/PC alternation what affects adverbial modification, but lexical properties.

| (1) | a. | Brenda gave John the car for a week    | (having, not giving, lasts a week) |
|-----|----|--|------------------------------------|
|     | b. | Brenda gave the car to John for a week | (idem)                             |
| (2) | a. | John sent the car to Mary for a week   | (iterative reading)                |
|     | b. | John sent Mary the car for a week      | (idem)                             |
|     |    |  |                                    |

Consider now **depictive predicates**. Since Williams (1980), it is assumed that depictive predicates can appear with THEMES, but not with GOALS. However, in recent years it has been observed, first, that there is a parametric difference involved (O&R, 2013): in languages like Czech depictive predicates can freely appear with GOALS, both in the AC and in the PC. On the other hand, it has been observed that under certain circumstances, depictive predicates are available in general (see H&J). Again, when they are available in the AC (3a), they are also available in the PC (3b). Note that in NDA no correlation can be established between (3a) and (3b).

(3) a. The nurse gave the patient<sub>i</sub> the medication half-asleep<sub>i</sub> (see O&R 2013)

b. The nurse gave the medication to the patient<sub>i</sub> half-asleep<sub>i</sub>

**Scope freezing** According to A&L and Bruening 2010, AC/PC alternation is subject the following scope asymmetry: in the AC the THEME does not take scope over the GOAL (4b).

| (4) a. Your brother |    | Your brother gave a bottle to every baby $\exists$ | gave a bottle to every baby $\exists > \forall, \forall > \exists$ |  |
|---------------------|----|--|--|--|
|                     | b. | Your brother gave a baby every bottle              | $\exists > \forall, *\forall > \exists$                            |  |

This asymmetry has been used as a central argument against derivational analyses. However, note that (4) does not constitute a true paradigm. In order to check such a systematic divergence, comparison must keep quantified expressions constant in the GOAL and in the THEME. As a matter of fact,

Bruening (2014) provides the examples, and examples show that AC and PC behave uniformly [examples are slightly simplified; see Bruening's (49a)-(47c)]: When the existential is in the THEME, either scope is possible, no matter whether in an AP (4a) or in a PC (5a). In contrast, if the existential is in the GOAL, it always has wide scope (4b)-(5b).

a. This lighting gives everyone a different kind of headache ∃ > ∀, ∀ > ∃
b. The bosses denied every position to some applicant or other ∃ > ∀, \*∀ > ∃

Our suspicion is that this asymmetry is related to the selectional properties of the preposition heading the PP GOAL. Whatever the explanation for this contrast is, pairs in (4)-(5) show that this issue is not related to the AC/PC alternation. As a matter of fact, the same asymmetry arises with benefactives, although they are not arguments (6).

- (6) a. preparó todas las tartas para un empleado
  - b. le preparó todas las tartas a un empleado

In contrast to the animacy restriction, **light GIVE** does not require animate possessors (7a). Since Langacker (1987), it has been assumed that this kind of constructions are confined to the AC. However, Langaker himself ends up acknowledging that the PC is "a bit less natural", and in the right context it is perfectly acceptable (7b-c). Note, again, that a NDA does not assume any relation between (7a) and (7b-c). Therefore, their meaning relation has to be stipulated.

- (7) a I gave the house a new coat of paint
  - b. I gave a new coat of paint to the *Arrow of Norwich* [A.Ransome. 1932. *Peter Duck*]
  - c. I gave a new coat of paint to our carved work, which was very bare and parched [A. Dalrimpled. 1755. *A collection of voyages*]

Similar arguments have been presented regarding the animacy constraint [RH&L], idioms [B&N, O&R, Larson], PCC/OAC [O&R] or can be construed for nominalizations, subextraction, etc. In all cases, when we consider both AC and PC, linguistic evidence clearly favors a derivational analysis because it directly explains the uniformity in their properties.

This conclusion is strengthened when we consider that some languages (Russian, some Basque dialects) express cause motion and cause possession with different prepositions in the PC. In consequence, Harley, and H&J explanation in terms of a dedicated *have* projection (=AC) cannot account for how exactly the same meaning is obtained unambiguously in the PC in these languages. We propose, following Freeze's original insights, that *have*, as in English or Spanish, corresponds to a derived construction, which in other languages (Latin) is expressed by means of a copular verb and a dative possessor (*duae filiae mihi sunt*). Therefore, have is a derived verb, a fact that can explain its peculiar syntax.

In sum, as shown by RH&L, there is no meaning difference for justifying the existence of two different mappings in the alternation PC/AC. Following Romero (1999), we argue that many of the restrictions on AC are not structural in nature, but feature dependent: they are absent in those languages (Japanese) where no agreement is involved in object shift, or, as argued for by H&J dependent on lexical properties of the objects, as in the case of depictive predicates. As a consequence, since there are neither structural or formal reasons to justify different projections, we cannot see reasons to support a non derivational analysis.