

## “The DP-Internal Origin of Datives”

Richard S. Kayne  
New York University

IGG49, Pavia  
February 22, 2024

### 1. Introduction.

There are two long-standing traditions concerning the dative/indirect object in English double object sentences such as:

(1) Mary gave Susan a copy of her paper.

In the 1960s, the dative was taken to originate as the object of *to* (or *for*), with that preposition subsequently being deleted, and the dative moved, by transformation, in the course of the derivation. Oehrle (1976) later argued for a non-transformational account.

The applicative approach to double object sentences associated with Pylkkänen (2008) and others since is akin to Oehrle’s in not having the arguments move (apart from *wh*-movement, etc.), though it differs from Oehrle’s in having there be a silent applicative head (which has something in common with the deleted *P* of the early transformational account).

The applicative approach in addition takes different subtypes of datives to have different heights, in a way that has something in common with Rizzi’s (1997) saying that Topic*P* is higher than Focus*P*, and with Cinque’s (1999) functional hierarchy. In Rizzi’s case, especially for Focus*P*, it’s clear that the argument that ends up in Spec,Foc*P* gets there by movement, rather than being externally merged there.

The same question of internal merge (movement) vs. external merge (‘base-generation’) arises for each of Rizzi’s other Specs, for each of Cinque’s Adv*P*s, and for each Spec,Applic*P*. For the last of these, the Oehrle - Pylkkänen tradition takes the dative in an English double object sentence not to have been moved into its canonical position.

The question of internal vs. external merge can be asked about datives more generally, including in cases where there is a visible *P*, as in most Romance, when the dative is lexical.

In this talk, I will suggest (though I won’t attempt to look at the entire range of datives) that datives are moved (internally merged) into what we think of as their canonical position. If this is correct, then the movement tradition of the 1960s will have turned out to be more on the right track (in that respect) than the applicative tradition.<sup>1</sup>

Put even more generally, the following conjecture seems plausible:

(2) All arguments invariably raise at least once, in all languages.

---

<sup>1</sup>Though note Nie (2020) on certain Spec,App*P* positions being moved into.

If (2) is correct, then we have, for datives, thinking also of Szabolcsi (1983; 1994) on possessive sentences in Hungarian and of Kayne (2004) on 'prepositions as probes':

(3) No dative argument is externally merged into its visible position.

The formulation in (3) leaves open the question of where datives originate. In what follows, I will explore the possibility that Szabolcsi's position, taken together with the 'possessor raising' tradition, can be generalized to:<sup>2</sup>

(4) All dative arguments originate DP-internally.

2. Some datives are clearly DP-internal.

One case is that of dative possessors in Hungarian. Szabolcsi argues that when the DP is definite the pre-D dative possessor, which originates as a post-D nominative possessor within DP, can remain within the DP.

A second case is that of dative possessors in various Germanic languages, e.g. in German:<sup>3</sup>

(5) dem Mann sein Buch ('the(dat.) man his book')  
which can clearly remain within DP.

A third comes from French, as in:<sup>4</sup>

(6) un ami à moi ('a friend to me')

Although this à-phrase is clearly within DP (and in this case cannot move out of DP), it nonetheless shows behavior strikingly parallel to that of ordinary sentential datives with respect to doubling and dislocation. Pronominal doubling of the non-dislocation sort is seen in both:

(7) mon ami à moi ('my friend to me')

and:

(8) Elle m'a parlé à moi. ('she me(dat.) has spoken to me')

Right-dislocation is seen in both:

(9) ses amis, à Jean ('his friends, to J')

and:

(10) Elle lui a parlé, à Jean. ('she him(dat.) has spoken, to J')

In addition, there is parallelism with respect to floating quantifiers of a certain sort:

(11) leur ami à tous ('their friend to all' = 'the friend of all of them')

(12) Elle leur a parlé à tous. ('she them(dat.) has spoken to all')

These three cases are all obviously compatible with (4). As far as (3) is concerned, Szabolcsi takes the Hungarian DP-internal possessive dative to originate in a nominative position and to then move up into a Spec,DP position where it receives dative Case. If that proposal of hers is on the right track, and if it generalizes in one way or another to German, Norwegian, and French, then the above three cases are compatible with (3), too.

3. Datives that originate within DP and then move out.

---

<sup>2</sup>If the DP hypothesis were to turn out not to be correct, 'DP-internally' could be replaced by 'NP-internally'.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Sick (2006); also Fiva (1984; 1987) on Norwegian.

<sup>4</sup>Cf. Kayne (1975, sect. 2.20).

One case comes again from Hungarian. Szabolcsi takes ordinary possessive sentences in Hungarian to involve a single DP argument of an existential verb. The possessor originates within that DP in a position that in some cases can directly show nominative (zero morphology). When the containing DP is indefinite, as it is in ordinary possessive sentences, the possessor obligatorily raises from the nominative position to a dative-assigning/licensing Spec,DP position and then obligatorily raises further, out of the DP and up into a sentential position, yielding what looks like a sentential dative.

In looking like a sentential dative, yet originating within DP, this Hungarian possessor shares a key property (despite the difference in Case) with familiar examples like subject-to-subject raising:

(13) We seem to have made a mistake.

We in this example looks like (and is) a matrix subject with nominative Case, yet has originated within the infinitive phrase, in a position in which Case is not otherwise licensed at all. Hungarian possessive sentences as analyzed by Szabolcsi share with such English raising sentences the basic property of having an argument occupying two distinct positions, at different points in the derivation.

Szabolcsi's proposal about Hungarian was extended in Kayne (1993) to English (and similar languages), which differ from Hungarian in having a verb *have*, whose possessor subject is nominative (apart from ECM contexts) and whose possessee object is accusative. If this extension to English and similar languages is on the right track, then in sentences like:

(14) He has two sisters.

the subject *he* has originated within the DP containing *two sisters*, in a way that recalls:

(15) (?)There exist two sisters of his.

in which *his* is clearly within the relevant DP.

We can note in passing that the Hungarian sentential possessive has a partial counterpart, though one that lacks any visible dative, in Jacalteco (Mayan), where it appears to be fully productive, and the normal way of expressing simple possession:<sup>5</sup>

(16) Ay no' hin txitam. ('exist classifier my pig' = 'I have a pig')

An obvious fact about (15) is that the argument phrase is obligatory:

(17) \*There exist(s).

very likely reflecting:

(18) Every predicate must have (at least) one argument.

Worth noting is that Szabolcsi's analysis, extended to (14), will allow (18) to also cover (setting aside VP-deletion possibilities):

(19) \*He has.

without any need for a selectional statement involving *have*.

#### 4. Some other datives.

French allows:<sup>6</sup>

(20) Je lui croyais beaucoup d'amis. ('I him/her(dat.) thought many of friends')

with an interpretation corresponding to that of:

(21) I thought (that) he/she had a lot of friends.

---

<sup>5</sup>Example from Craig (1977, 21).

<sup>6</sup>For detailed discussion, cf. Ruwet (1981).

That is, (20), which at first glance seems to have a sentential dative, in fact has a 'have'-like interpretation, with the dative seeming to correspond to the subject of 'have'.<sup>7</sup> Setting aside the 'have' vs. 'be' question, Kayne (1981) took (20) to contain a small clause, making it parallel, apart from the dative vs. accusative difference, to:

(22) Je le croyais intelligent. ('I him thought intelligent')  
which is a familiar type of small clause sentence.

Just as (22) might contain a silent BE [capitals will indicate non-pronunciation], so might (20) seem at first glance to be a good candidate for containing a silent (possessive) HAVE. Yet silent BE is more likely to be correct, as a part of (22), than possessive HAVE is to be correct as a part of (20), for the following reason. Various languages, such as Russian, can leave *be* unpronounced in matrix sentences under certain conditions (in Russian, in the present tense). Yet, no language that I know of leaves possessive *have* unpronounced in matrix sentences. If English did, it would have, alongside the past tense sentence:

(23) We had a car back then.  
the present tense sentence:

(24) \*We a car now.  
If no language has an exact counterpart of (24), with nominative subject and accusative object, together with a possessive interpretation, then postulating a silent HAVE for (20) loses some of its plausibility.

An alternative approach to (20) would take it to contain instead a silent BE, with the key idea being that the dative argument in (20) originates within the small clause and already has, within the small clause, its dative Case (whereas the accusative in (22) gets its accusative Case only in the matrix). In other words, (20) could be thought of as:

(25) je croyais [ lui(dat.) BE beaucoup d'amis ]  
in which the small clause has the form of an ordinary Hungarian possessive sentence (setting aside the question of the (non-)pronunciation of 'be'). If so, then in (20)/(25), dative *lui* may well have originated within the DP containing *beaucoup d'amis*, just as in Szabolcsi's analysis of Hungarian.

Guglielmo Cinque notes (p.c.) that this point about (20)/(25) arguably carries over to sentences like French:

(26) Je ne lui aurais pas donné 50 ans. ('I neg. him/her(dat.) would-have not given 50 years')

which has an interpretation akin to that of:

(27) I wouldn't have said/guessed that he/she was 50 years old.  
Although the verb *donner* itself in (26) seems to contribute an interpretation that we might readily call idiomatic (i.e. not entirely predictable), it is clear that, allowing for that, the interpretation of (26) is calculable from:

---

<sup>7</sup>It remains to be understood why:

i) \**Je lui croyais faim* ('I him/her(dat.) thought hunger')  
is not possible alongside:

ii) *Il a faim*. ('he has hunger')  
especially since Romanian seems to have a direct counterpart of the embedded part of (i):

iii) *Îmi este foame*. ('me(dat.) is hunger')  
as discussed in Săvescu Ciucivara (2006).

(28) ...donné [ lui(dat.) BE 50 ans ]  
in which the small clause containing dative *lui* and *50 ans* is related, abstracting away again from the 'have'/'be' question, to the French way of expressing age:

(29) Il/Elle a 50 ans. ('he/she has 50 years')  
just as the small clause in (20)/(25) is related to:

(30) Il/Elle a beaucoup d'amis. ('he/she has many of friends')  
More exactly, (26)/(28) contains a small clause of the Hungarian possessive type, with a dative possessor.

English does not allow the literal counterpart of (26):

(31) \*I wouldn't have given him/her 50 years.  
in a way that is probably related to:

(32) \*He has/is 50 years.  
which is not possible in English as an expression of age. Nor does English have a literal counterpart of (20)/(25):

(33) \*I thought/believed him a lot of friends.  
But English has something fairly close to (20)/(25) and (26)/(28), namely:

(34) John's doctors have given him only 3 months to live.  
with a sense like that of:

(35) John's doctors have said that he has only 3 months to live.  
or perhaps:

(36) John's doctors have given him to understand that he has only 3 months to live.  
In either case, the relation between *him* and *3 months to live* in (34) suggests:

(37) ...[ him BE only 3 months to live ]  
in which *him* is dative. (If (34) is similar in structure to (36), the small clause may have dative PRO rather than dative *him*.)

If (26)/(28) and (34)/(37) contain a possessive small clause with a dative possessor, then the same plausibly holds of:

(38) Ses parents voudraient lui donner une petite soeur. ('his/her parents would-like him/her(dat.) to-give a little sister')

(39) ...[ lui(dat.) BE une petite soeur ]  
in which again, following Szabolcsi, the dative possessor originates within the DP containing *une petite soeur*.

And then similarly for *give*-sentences in general, if we take them all to be thought of in a way parallel to (38)/(39). In that case, a sentence like:

(40) Mary gave him a copy of her paper.  
would be as in:

(41) ...gave [ him(dat.) BE a copy of her paper ]  
in which dative *him* originates, à la Szabolcsi, within the phrase *a copy of her paper*.

It follows, then, that in (41), at an early stage in the derivation, there must be a phrase containing both *him* and *a copy of her paper*, without containing BE. That phrase will therefore have two possessors, a conclusion made plausible by the acceptability of:

(42) That paper/painting of hers of his is now worth a fortune.

which to my ear is fine,<sup>8</sup> with *her* as ‘author’ and *his* as ‘owner’.

#### 5. The definiteness effect

Taking (38) to contain a possessive-type small clause allows (even though there is no *have/HAVE* in (38)) relating the core definiteness effect seen with respect to (38), seen in the following:<sup>9</sup>

(43) \**Ses parents voudraient lui donner la petite soeur.* (‘his/her parents would-like him/her(dat.) to-give the little sister’)

(44) \*His parents would like to give him the little sister.  
to the comparable effect seen in possessive sentences with overt *have*:

(45) Jean a une/\*la petite soeur.

(46) John has a/\*the little sister.

This definiteness effect can be lifted, unsurprisingly now in both cases, by the addition of a relative clause:

(47) John now has the little sister that he’s always wanted.

(48) John’s parents would like to give him the little sister that he’s always wanted.

#### 6. Possessor raising.

A well-known case bearing on the potential correctness of (4), repeated here:

(49) All dative arguments originate DP-internally.  
is that of possessor raising:

(50) *Une pierre lui est tombée sur la tête.* (‘a stone him/her(dat.) is fallen on the head’)

If the understood linkage between *lui* and *la tête* here is effected by internal merge, then (49) is satisfied. Well-known are the challenges that arise. One has to do with non-restrictive adjectives:

(51) \**Une pierre lui est tombée sur la très belle tête.* (‘...very beautiful...’)

A second challenge comes from facts about plurals:

(52) *Elle leur a baisé les mains/\*têtes.* (‘she them(dat.) has kissed the hands/heads’)  
that are also found in English:

(53) She kissed them on the hands/\*heads.  
which contrasts with:

(54) She kissed them on their hands/heads.

A proposal I made recently that arguably reconciles (51)-(53) with classical possessor raising for inalienables is as in the following, for the case of (53):<sup>10</sup>

(55) she kissed them on THEIR TOKENS OF the hands/\*heads  
in which *the hands/\*heads* tracks:

(56) The hands/\*heads are an important part of the human body.

From the perspective of (55), *lui* in (50) would, as expected from (49), originate with the phrase ‘TOKEN OF la tête’.

---

<sup>8</sup>More so, for reasons to be elucidated, than:

i) ?his painting of hers

ii) \*his her painting

<sup>9</sup>For a syntactic approach to this kind of definiteness effect, see Kayne (2019a).

<sup>10</sup>Cf. Kayne (2020/2021).

## 7. French causatives.

The final example of datives that I will address here is that of French causatives of the sort seen in:

(57) Jean a fait manger la tarte à Paul. ('J has made to-eat the pie to P')  
in which dative-marked *Paul* corresponds to the subject of the infinitive *manger*. We can note initially that in a number of ways, the relation between *Paul* and infinitival subject position in (57) is closer to the ECM-type than to the control type.

First, a control construction would not care about the transitivity of the embedded infinitive:

(58) \*Jean a fait manger à Paul. ('J has made eat to P')  
In the absence of a direct object of the infinitive, the embedded subject in the causative generally cannot be preceded by *à* (but see below). Ordinary cases of control act quite differently:

(59) Jean a dit à Paul de manger (une tarte). ('J has said to P to eat (a pie)')  
In this control example the presence of an embedded object is irrelevant.

Second, French control constructions never allow clitic climbing, whereas these causative constructions do:

- (60) Jean les a fait manger à Paul. ('J them has made eat to P')
- (61) \*Jean les veut manger. ('J them wants to-eat')
- (62) \*Jean les a dit à Paul de manger. ('J them has said to P to eat')

Third, control constructions always allow a clitic to remain on the infinitive, whereas in causatives, this is marginal at best (apart from reflexive cases), and often impossible:

- (63) \*Jean a fait les manger à Paul.
- (64) Jean veut les manger.
- (65) Jean a dit à Paul de les manger.

Fourth, control constructions normally have the controller preceding the infinitive, whereas in causatives the order is the reverse. In causatives, the order is as in (57) and (60), and not as in the following:

- (66) \*Jean a fait à Paul manger une tarte.
- (67) \*Jean les a fait à Paul manger.

This contrasts sharply with control examples:

(68) Jean a avoué à Paul avoir mangé une tarte. ('J has confessed to P to-have eaten a pie')

(69) Jean a dit à Paul de manger une tarte. ('J has said to P to eat a pie')

Finally, were (57) and (60) to be analyzed as control examples, they would violate an otherwise exceptionless generalization about French infinitival complementizers:

(70) Infinitives with true object control must have an overt prepositional complementizer.

(69) is a typical case of object control and contains the complementizer *de*. (68) has no overt complementizer, but in fact can only be interpreted as subject control. The fact that there is no complementizer in (57) and (60) indicates clearly that those causatives do not involve object control at all.

In conclusion, then, the DP following *à* in (57) and (60) is not a matrix controller.<sup>11</sup>

A different kind of consideration that favors a non-control analysis of causative sentences like (57) and (60) comes from the fact that the dative can cover a wide range of thematic relations, in a way reminiscent of ECM constructions much more than of control. A relevant set of examples is:

(71) Son dernier bouquin a fait gagner beaucoup d'argent à Jean-Jacques ('his last book has made earn a-lot of money to J-J')

(72) Tu vas faire perdre son poste à ton copain. ('you are-going to-make lose his job to your friend')

(73) Elle fera entendre raison à Jean. ('she will-make listen-to reason to J')

(74) Cela fera changer d'avis à Jean. ('that will-make change of opinion to J' = 'that will make J change his mind')

(75) Ce qui est arrivé a fait perdre de l'importance au fait que Jean aime Marie. ('that which has happened has made lose (of the) importance to-the fact that J loves M')

(76) On ne peut pas faire jouer un rôle important à tout. ('one neg can not make play a role important to everything' = 'one cannot have everything play an important role')

(77) Elle fera effleurer le filet à la balle. ('she will-make touch the net to the ball' = 'she will make the ball touch the net')

(78) Le coup de vent a fait traverser l'étang au petit voilier. ('the blast of wind has made cross the pond to-the little sailboat' = 'the blast of wind has made the little sailboat cross the pond')

(79) Cela fait préférer à Jean la syntaxe à la phonologie. ('that makes prefer to J the syntax to the phonology' = 'that makes J prefer syntax to phonology')

#### 8. Other cases of DP-internal origin

I note in passing that (49), repeated again here:

(80) All datives originate DP-internally.

bears a relation to the proposal in Kayne (2008) concerning expletives of the *there* sort, which I took to also originate DP-internally. This relation is reinforced by the fact that in some languages, such as (colloquial) Italian and many Italian dialects, one finds that their *there*-type expletive (in Italian, *ci*; in many northern dialects, *ghe*) actually appears overtly in 'have'-sentences:

(81) Gianni c'ha un libro. ('G there has a book')

Of even more direct interest to this talk is the fact that various Italian dialects, e.g. Paduan, have this same expletive in 'give'-sentences:

(82) Ghe dago un libro. ('there I-give a book' = 'I'm giving him/her/them a book')

---

<sup>11</sup>There is no overt complementizer in:

(i) Il me semble avoir compris. ('it(explet.) me seems to-have understood' = 'I seem to have understood')

(ii) Il me faut partir. ('it(explet.) me is-necessary to-leave' = 'I have to leave')

Although the controller in these two examples seems to be a dative object, these controllers are almost certainly to be analyzed as dative subjects of the sort seen prominently in Icelandic - see Fernández-Soriano (1999) and references cited there.



The proposal developed in Kayne (2008) has sentences like (82) containing a silent dative third-person pronoun that is the true argument;<sup>12</sup> the expletive *ghe* of (82) is inherited from the possessive small clause that is part of *give*-sentences, as in (40)/(41). This yields, for (82), at an intermediate stage of the derivation:<sup>13</sup>

(83) dago [ ghe HIM(dat.) BE un libro]

#### 9. Back to the DP-internal question and French causatives.

The plausibility of a DP-internal source for datives is immediate in possessor raising cases, and is strikingly supported by many examples of the following sort:

(84) John looked Bill \*(in the eye).

Taking *Bill* here to be dative (even in the absence of morphological confirmation), we can see that the very existence of this dative argument depends on the presence of a DP (here, *the eye*) that can give it a DP-internal source. As noted earlier, the same holds for simple possessive sentences:

(85) John has \*(a sister).

The possessor *John* needs a DP in which to originate, again following Szabolcsi on Hungarian and my 1993 transposition of her analysis to English. (There is no need, from this perspective, to stipulate *have* to be transitive.)

On the other hand, things are decidedly less straightforward in the case of French causatives. As discussed above, there is good reason to take French causatives with a dativized embedded infinitival subject to be ECM-like, e.g. in:

(86) Son dernier bouquin a fait gagner beaucoup d'argent à Jean-Jacques. ('his last book has made earn a-lot of money to J-J')

Saying that *Jean-Jacques* in this example is an infinitival ECM-type subject leaves open, however, the question of the external merge position of this infinitival subject.

If *Jean-Jacques* here is externally merged in Spec,VP or Spec,vP or Spec,VoiceP within the infinitival embedding, then the dative-marked infinitival subject in French causatives does not originate DP-internally. There is, though, some evidence that may point in the opposite direction. To see how this might be, we need to go back to the standard generalization about French causatives:

(87) (Syntax 101) The infinitival subject in French causatives is dative iff the infinitive has a direct object.

Now the *if*-part of (87) is highly accurate, as illustrated in:

(88) \*Son dernier bouquin a fait Jean-Jacques gagner beaucoup d'argent.

(89) \*Son dernier bouquin a fait gagner Jean-Jacques beaucoup d'argent.

(90) \*Son dernier bouquin a fait gagner beaucoup d'argent Jean-Jacques.

---

<sup>12</sup>This third-person dative pronoun is seen overtly, together with the expletive, in some Sardinian, to judge by an example given by Jones (1993, 220):

(i) Narrabilis! ('tell *bi* to-them')

where *bi* is the Sardinian clitic parallel to *ghe*, and *lis* is the overt (plural) dative clitic (with the accusative unpronounced, as in some French).

<sup>13</sup>In a way that's fairly close to Sabel (2000).

When there is a direct object (here, *beaucoup d'argent*) *Jean-Jacques* cannot remain without à.<sup>14</sup>

The *only if*-part of (87) is, however, what counts for this talk. Let me give it as:

(91) (Syntax 101) The infinitival subject in French causatives is dative only if the infinitive has a direct object.

The generalization stated in (91) is not quite as accurate as it is sometimes thought to be. For example, Grevisse and Goosse (2008, sect. 903) have (from Robbe-Grillet):

(92) ...lui faire renoncer à son projet. ('him(dat.) make give-up to his project')

The verb *renoncer* has only a PP object *à son projet*, yet the infinitival subject *lui* is dative. In Kayne (1975, chap. 3, note 9), it was mentioned that for some speakers there are even cases where the first of the following, with the dative, is preferred to the second, with the accusative:

(93) Elle lui fera téléphoner à ses parents. ('she him/her will-make telephone to his/her parents')

(94) Elle le fera téléphoner à ses parents.

Morin (1980, 205) points out that examples such as (92) and (93) are for many speakers very common when the dative is an object clitic, but a little less so when the dative subject is lexical. For the latter type, he gives:

(95) On n'a pas réussi à faire parler de son voyage à Marie. ('we neg have not succeeded in making speak of her trip to M')

(96) C'est pas comme ça que tu arriveras à faire croire en Dieu à tes enfants. ('it is not like that that you will-manage to make believe in God to your children')

(97) Ils ont essayé en vain de faire tirer sur la foule à leurs soldats. ('they have tried in vain to make shoot at the crowd to their soldiers')

Of additional importance is the immediately following observation of Morin's, to the effect that although there are certain speakers who accept a dative subject even when the infinitive has no complement at all, as in his examples:

(98) On leur fera patienter. ('we them(dat.) will-make wait')

(99) Je leur ai fait recommencer. ('I them(dat.) have made re-begin')

(100) Ça lui a fait réfléchir. ('that him(dat.) has made reflect')

the speakers in question accept the dative only when it is a clitic, not when it is lexical:

(101) \*On fera patienter à nos fournisseurs. ('we will-make wait to our providers')

(102) \*On fera recommencer à Pierre. ('we will-make re-begin to P')

(103) \*Ça fera réfléchir à cette tête brûlée. ('that will-make reflect to that hothead')

The contrast between (101)-(103) and (95)-(97) is striking. For the speakers in question, in the absence of an embedded direct object, a lexical dative subject is possible when an overt PP is present, as in (95)-(97), but not when the verb has no complement at all, as in (101)-(103).

There is a clear linkage to be seen now between this contrast and (91) itself, repeated here, in its essentials:

---

<sup>14</sup>An account in terms of Case was given by Rouveret and Vergnaud (1980). If *Jean-Jacques* is replaced by a pronominal clitic, however, accusative is sometimes possible (in a way that to some extent recalls Pollock (1985) on French ECM with *croire* ('believe')) - cf. Grevisse and Goosse (2008, sect. 903).

(104) The infinitival subject in French causatives is dative only if the infinitive has a direct object.

For lexical infinitival subjects, (104) is in fact accurate for one subset of French speakers. For another subset, (104) must be relaxed to allow for the sole presence of a PP object, as in (95)-(97), but cannot be relaxed any further than that, as shown by (101)-(103).

The next question is, why should there be a subset of speakers who can relax (104) just to that extent? If for those speakers a direct object of the infinitive is not necessary in order to have a dative subject, why do they still require a PP object?

## 10. Dative Case

At this point it becomes useful to isolate two separate questions concerning French causatives (and datives more generally). One can be phrased as a slightly modified version of (80), as follows:

(105) Do all dative arguments originate DP-internally?

The other is:

(106) Where does dative Case originate?

That these are indeed to be taken separately is shown by consideration of Szabolcsi's analysis of Hungarian possessive sentences, which has dative Case assigned (to the raised possessor) in Spec,DP, i.e. above D itself, but at the same time that raised possessor originates in a Spec position below D.

In French causatives, the dative Case assigned to the embedded infinitival subject may well be assigned at the matrix level, as in Rouveret and Vergnaud (1980) and, with an ECM twist, in Kayne (2004).

An apparently simple further question is, why is dative the Case that is assigned? Relevant here is a generalization that comes to the fore if one combines the unaccusative hypothesis with the approach to unergatives found in Hale and Keyser (1993; 2002). If Hale and Keyser are on the right track, then unergatives such as *sleep* are hidden transitives, in the sense that they in fact are built from a noun *sleep* combined with a light verb that is silent in English but pronounced in Basque. Unaccusatives like *arrive* are to be analyzed, in the tradition of Perlmutter (1978; 1989) and Burzio (1986), as containing a subject that has originated in object position.

In effect, then, we have:

(107) All verbs have a direct object.

with this to be understood as saying that all verbs have, at an early stage of the derivation, an object accompanied by no adposition.<sup>15</sup>

If so, then a dative-Case-marked phrase will always be accompanied by a direct object.

On the assumption that the direct object that necessarily accompanies every dative cannot be itself, we have an account of a generalization given by Authier and Reed

---

<sup>15</sup>This is almost certainly the case for DOM sentences, too - for relevant discussion, cf. Torrego (1998) and Odria (2014).

There may well be a link here to the suggestion made in Kayne (1998) that all functional projections must have a filled Spec at some point in the derivation.

(1991, 199-200), to the effect that the 'subject' of an unaccusative cannot be dativized.<sup>16</sup>

(108) \*Ça lui a fait noircir. ('that it(dat.) has made blacken')

(109) \*Ça lui a fait arriver. ('...arrive')

As far as I know this is so even in the presence of a PP:

(110) \*On lui a fait rentrer dans sa chambre.

The dative *lui* in (108)-(110) is excluded since there is no separate direct object to accompany it, and the same is true of:

(111) \*Ça lui a fait devenir un professeur célèbre. ('that him/her has made become a professor famous')

on the assumption that *devenir* is unaccusative (as clearly indicated by its taking auxiliary 'be') and that predicate nominals do not count as direct objects.

Returning now to (92)-(100), the natural next step would be to take all these cases in which the infinitival subject is dativized without there being any visible direct object to in fact contain a silent direct object of one sort or another. For example, in (93), repeated here:

(112) Elle lui fera téléphoner à ses parents. ('she him/her will-make telephone to his/her parents')

we could have, à la Hale and Keyser, something akin to:

(113) Elle lui fera donner un coup de téléphone à ses parents. ('she him/her will-make give a telephone call to his/her parents')

On the other hand, as seen in (101)-(103) and in cases like:

(114) Elle lui fera manger \*(une tarte). ('she him/her(dat.) will-make eat a pie')

a silent object is not always available, in a way that recalls the challenging question of when, in an ergative Case language, the subject of an unergative verb can bear ergative Case.<sup>17</sup>

## 11. Sources

Putting dative Case in the background now, let us get back, for French causatives, to the question whether or not arguments marked with dative are externally merged in some DP-internal position.

As an initial example, let us take Morin's (95), repeated here:

(115) On n'a pas réussi à faire parler de son voyage à Marie. ('we neg have not succeeded in making speak of her trip to M')

Can the dative subject *Marie* have originated within the DP *son voyage*, itself the object of *de*? A possible proposal would be to take *Marie* here to originate as a double of *son*:

(116) [ [Marie] son voyage ]  
recalling German *dem Mann sein Buch* and, less directly:

---

<sup>16</sup>They note the exceptional case of *intervenir*:

i) Cela lui a fait intervenir dans la discussion. ('that him/her has made intervene in the discussion')

relevant to which is the proposal in Kayne (to appear), following which (i) would be as in:

ii) That made him make himself intervene in the discussion.

<sup>17</sup>For relevant discussion, cf. Woolford (2015).

(117) son voyage, à Marie

(118) son voyage à elle

There is admittedly a bit of tension here, given that in (115), *Marie* is also understood as the subject of the infinitive *parler*, which now appears to have no phrase externally merged as its subject. We can resolve this tension by adopting the approach to pronouns and their antecedents given in Kayne (2002), whereby doubles can move into theta-positions, in a way that recalls Hornstein (1999), but differs from him insofar as movement of a double into a theta position does not force a phrase to have more than one theta role. In (115), *Marie* will get the subject theta role of *parler*, but the possessor theta role that goes with *voyage* will be assigned, not to *Marie*, but rather to the more complex [ *Marie son* ] (or, better, [ *Marie s-* ]).

That the dative (lexical) subject in French causatives should be in a possessive relation with an object of the infinitive makes immediate sense for a number of our earlier examples, starting with:

(119) Tu vas faire perdre son poste à ton copain. ('you are-going to-make lose his job to your friend')

in which, as in (115), there is an overt possessive *son* within the infinitival object. But even when there is no overt possessive, as in:

(120) Cela fera changer d'avis à Jean. ('that will-make change of opinion to J' = 'that will make J change his mind')

there is plausibly a silent one, given the closeness between the following two:

(121) John frequently changes opinions.

(122) John frequently changes his mind.

In other words, *avis* in (120) can be taken to have a silent counterpart of the *son* of (119), with *Jean* in (120) then starting out as the double of that silent SON.

And similarly for:

(123) Ce qui est arrivé a fait perdre de l'importance au fait que Jean aime Marie. ('that which has happened has made lose (of the) importance to-the fact that J loves M')

thinking of the closeness between the two versions in:

(124) The fact that John loves Mary has over time lost (its) importance.

The same arguably holds for:

(125) On ne peut pas faire jouer un rôle important à tout. ('one neg can not make play a role important to everything' = 'one cannot have everything play an important role')

thinking of:

(126) Everything has (its) importance.

as well as for:

(127) Elle fera effleurer le filet à la balle. ('she will-make touch the net to the ball' = 'she will make the ball touch the net')

thinking of:

(128) The ball touched the/?its net.

and for:

(129) Le coup de vent a fait traverser l'étang au petit voilier. ('the blast of wind has made cross the pond to-the little sailboat' = 'the blast of wind has made the little sailboat cross the pond')

given:

(130) The little sailboat crossed the/its pond.  
and even for:

(131) Cela fait préférer à Jean la syntaxe à la phonologie. ('thatkc makes prefer to J the syntax to the phonology' = 'that makes J prefer syntax to phonology')  
against the background of:

(132) John prefers (his) syntax to phonology.

## 12. Clitics.

Consider this example:

(133) Ils ont fait manger les légumes à l'enfant. ('they have made to-eat the vegetables to the-child')

In the spirit of the preceding section, we can analyze this kind of example in terms of a silent possessor contained with *les légumes* of which 'the child' will be the double:

(134) ...à l'enfant SES les légumes...

where SES (perhaps better as just S-) is the silent possessor and *l'enfant* the double. Now in (133) the infinitival object *les légumes* can be replaced by a pronominal object clitic *les* ('them'):

(135) Ils les ont fait manger à l'enfant.

The analysis illustrated in (134) will generalize to (135) if, much as in Postal (1966), (135) contains a silent counterpart of *légumes* (as well as a silent possessor):<sup>18</sup>

(136) ils les S(ES) LEGUMES ont fait manger à l'enfant.

## 13 Conclusion.

To say that all dative arguments originate DP-internally is appreciably less implausible than it might sound.

## References:

- Authier, J.-M. and L. Reed (1991) "Ergative Predicates and Dative Cliticization in French Causatives," *Linguistic Inquiry*, 22, 197-205.
- Burzio, L. (1986) *Italian Syntax. A Government-Binding Approach*, Reidel, Dordrecht.
- Cinque, G. (1999) *Adverbs and Functional Heads. A Cross-Linguistic Perspective*, Oxford University Press, New York.
- Craig, C.G. (1977) *The Structure of Jacaltec*, University of Texas Press, Austin.
- Fernández-Soriano, O. (1999) "Two Types of Impersonal Sentences in Spanish: Locative and Dative Subjects," *Syntax*, 2, 101-140.
- Fiva, T. (1984) "NP-Internal Chains in Norwegian," *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax*, 14.
- Fiva, T. (1987) *Possessor Chains in Norwegian*, Novus Forlag, Oslo.
- Grevisse, M. and A. Goosse (2008) *Le Bon Usage* (14th edition), De Boeck Duculot, Brussels.
- Hale, K. and S.J. Keyser (1993) "On Argument Structure and the Lexical Expression of Syntactic Relations," in K. Hale and S.J. Keyser (eds.) *The View from Building 20. Essays in Linguistics in Honor of Sylvain Bromberger*, The MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., 53-109.

---

<sup>18</sup>The exact position of LEGUMES might not be the one given.

- Hale, K. and S.J. Keyser (2002) *Prolegomenon to a Theory of Argument Structure*, The MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Hornstein, N. (1999) "Movement and Control," *Linguistic Inquiry*, 30, 69-96.
- Jones, M. A. (1993) *Sardinian Syntax*, Routledge, London.
- Kayne, R.S. (1975) *French Syntax. The Transformational Cycle*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Kayne, R.S. (1981) "Unambiguous Paths," in R. May and J. Koster (eds.) *Levels of Syntactic Representation*, Foris, Dordrecht, 143-183 (reprinted in Kayne (1984)).
- Kayne, R.S. (1984) *Connectedness and Binary Branching*, Foris, Dordrecht.
- Kayne, R.S. (1993) "Toward a Modular Theory of Auxiliary Selection," *Studia Linguistica*, 47, 3-31 (reprinted in Kayne (2000)).
- Kayne, R.S. (1998) "A Note on Prepositions and Complementizers", paper contributed to the *Chomsky Virtual Celebration* (<http://mitpress.mit.edu/celebration>) (revised version in Kayne (2000, chap. 15)).
- Kayne, R.S. (2000) *Parameters and Universals*, Oxford University Press, New York.
- Kayne, R.S. (2002) "Pronouns and Their Antecedents" in S. Epstein and D. Seely (eds.), *Derivation and Explanation in the Minimalist Program*, Blackwell, Malden, Mass., 133-166 (reprinted in Kayne (2005)).
- Kayne, R.S. (2004) "Prepositions as Probes", in A. Belletti (ed.), *Structures and Beyond*, Oxford University Press, New York, 192-212 (reprinted in Kayne (2005)).
- Kayne, R.S. (2005) *Movement and Silence*, Oxford University Press, New York.
- Kayne, R.S. (2008) "Expletives, Datives, and the Tension between Morphology and Syntax" in T. Biberauer (ed.) *The Limits of Syntactic Variation*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam, 175-217 (reprinted in Kayne (2010)).
- Kayne, R.S. (2010) *Comparisons and Contrasts*, Oxford University Press, New York.
- Kayne, R.S. (2019a) "The Unicity of *There* and the Definiteness Effect", in E. Gonçalves (ed.) *Existential Constructions in Focus*, Editora da Universidade Federal da Bahia, Brazil
- Kayne, R.S. (2019b) *Questions of Syntax*, Oxford University Press, New York.
- Kayne, R.S. (2020/2021) "A Note on the Tension between Silent Elements and Lexical Ambiguity, with Special Reference to Inalienable Possession", *Arborescences*, 10, 103-112 (lingbuzz/004894, Nov. 2019).
- Kayne, R.S. (to appear) "On Certain Aspects of the Interaction between Cartography and Silent Elements" (lingbuzz/006289, Oct. 2021).
- Kayne, R.S. and J.-Y. Pollock (to appear) "Toward an Analysis of French Hyper-Complex Inversion", in L. Brugè, A. Cardinaletti, G. Giusti, N. Munaro and C. Poletto (eds.) *Functional Heads*, Oxford University Press, New York.
- Morin, Y.-C. (1980) "Les bases syntaxiques des règles de projection sémantique: l'interprétation des constructions en *faire*," *Linguisticae Investigationes*, 4, 203-212.
- Nie, Y. (2020) *Licensing arguments*, PhD dissertation, New York University.
- Odria, A. (2014) "Differential Object Marking and the nature of dative Case in Basque varieties," *Linguistic Variation*, 14, 289-317.
- Oehrle, R. (1976) *The Grammatical Status of the English Dative Alternation*, Doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.
- Perlmutter, D.M. (1978) "Impersonal Passives and the Unaccusative Hypothesis," Proceedings of the Fourth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society, UCLA.

- Perlmutter, D.M. (1989) "Multiattachment and the Unaccusative Hypothesis: The Perfect Auxiliary in Italian," *Probus*, 1, 63-119.
- Pollock, J.-Y. (1985) "On Case and the Syntax of Infinitives in French," in J. Guéron, H.-G. Obenauer and J.-Y. Pollock (eds.) *Grammatical Representation*, Foris, Dordrecht, 293-326.
- Postal, P.M. (1966) "On So-Called 'Pronouns' in English," in F.P. Dineen, edl, *Report of the Seventeenth Annual Roundtable Meeting on Linguistics and Language Studies*, Georgetown University Press, Washington, D.C., 177-206 (reprinted in Reibel, D.A. and S.A. Schane, eds., *Modern Studies in English* (1969), Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey).
- Pylkänninen, L. (2008) *Introducing arguments*, The MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Rizzi, L. (1997) "The fine structure of the left periphery," in L. Haegeman (ed.) *Elements of Grammar. Handbook of Generative Syntax*, Kluwer, Dordrecht, 281-337.
- Rouveret, A. and J.-R. Vergnaud (1980) "Specifying Reference to the Subject: French Causatives and Conditions on Representations," *Linguistic Inquiry* 11, 97-202.
- Ruwet, N. (1981) "The "Epistemic Dative" Construction in French and Its Relevance to Some Current Problems in Generative Grammar," in W. Klein and W. Levelt (eds.) *Crossing The Boundaries In Linguistics. Studies Presented to Manfred Bierwisch*, D. Reidel, Dordrecht, Holland, 23-50.
- Sabel, J. (2000) "Expletives as Features", in R. Billerey et al. (eds.) *WCCFL 19 Proceedings*, Cascadilla Press, Somerville, MA, 411-424.
- Săvescu Ciucivara, O. (2006) "Hungry Experiencers," ms., New York University.
- Sick, B. (2006) *Der Dativ ist dem Genitiv sein Tod*, Kiepenheuer & Witsch, Köln.
- Szabolcsi, A. (1983) "The Possessor that Ran Away from Home," *The Linguistic Review*, 3, 89-102.
- Szabolcsi, A. (1994) "The Noun Phrase," in F. Kiefer and K. E. Kiss (eds.) *Syntax and Semantics 27. The Syntactic Structure of Hungarian*, Academic Press, San Diego, 179-274.
- Torrego, E. (1998) *The Dependencies of Objects*, The MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Woolford, E. (2015) "Ergativity and Transitivity," *Linguistic Inquiry*, 46, 489-531.