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1. Introduction

In Southern dialects (including Appalachian region) and informal registers of American English, there is a ditransitive construction known as the Personal Dative Construction (henceforth, PDC) (See Christian (1991), Webelbuth & Dannenber (2006), Conroy (2007), Horn (2008), Bruening & Yamada (2012),
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Haddad (2012), Hutchinson & Armstrong (2014), Bosse (2014), Bosse (2015), Lee (2016), among others). The sentences in (1) are a few examples.

(1) a. John, killed him/*Tom a bear. (from Horn (2008))
    b. I, whittled me a stick. (from Conroy (2007))
    c. They, cut them some logs. (from Webelhuth & Dannenberg (2006))

The PDC appears to be similar to another ditransitive construction of English, the standard Double Object Construction (henceforth, DOC) in (2), because both constructions instantiate applicative constructions in that they have an extra applicative object/indirect object (AO/IO) in addition to the direct object (DO). In the PDC (1a), for example, him is the AO and a bear is the DO; in the standard DOC (2), John is the AO and a ball is the DO.

(2) I {gave/showed/sent/threw} John a ball. (DOC)

In this paper, the syntax and semantics of the PDC is examined in comparison with the standard DOC in the light of applicative theory. In particular, I critically review and evaluate two recent proposals on the syntactic architecture of applicatives based on the discussion of these two constructions: (i) Pylkkäs nen’s (2002, 2008) high/low applicative hypothesis and (ii) raising/thematic applicative hypothesis of Georgala et al. (2008) and Georgala (2012). Although Pylkkäs nen has not discussed the PDC, her applicative hypothesis has been applied in a couple of previous studies on the PDC: Hutchinson & Armstrong (2014) proposed a low applicative analysis, whereas Haddad (2011) and Bosse (2014, 2015) proposed variants of high applicative analysis. The PDC seems to exhibit both low applicative-like syntactic properties and high applicative-like semantic properties, posing a dilemma for these analyses couched in Pylkkäs nen’s system. By examining the semantics of the PDC with a lexical decomposition approach, I show that the construction actually has a meaning component that is compatible with both high and low applicative semantics. Thus, Pylkkäs nen-style applicative configuration faces problems in dealing with these contradicting properties of the PDC (and the standard DOC). In response to these challenges, I propose that an extension of Georgala-style hypothesis along with the idea of argument
sharing can account for the properties of the PDC properly.

The paper is organized as the following. In section 2, I describe and discuss the PDC in comparison with the standard DOC. In section 3, I present the gist of two variants of applicative theory, namely, Pylkkänen’s hypothesis and Georgala’s hypothesis, and introduce a dilemma in accounting for the properties of the PDC under approaches based on Pylkkänen’s hypothesis. In section 4, I carefully take a closer look at the semantics of the PDC and identify a meaning component that gives us a better handle on dealing with the dilemma, and present an analysis based on Georgala’s hypothesis and the idea of argument sharing between predicates that allow multiple thematic role assignment. In section 5, I summarize and discuss further problems that argue against Pylkkänen’s applicative configurations and show that the current approach adopting Georgala’s hypothesis can handle them. Section 6 provides concluding remarks.

2. Applicatives in English: The PDC vs. The Standard DOC

Many languages have DOCs of English-type with Goal and Theme objects. PDCs also exist cross-linguistically. Although the PDC is found only as a dialect in English, similar constructions are observed across languages as standard or dialectal varieties (French, Modern Hebrew, German, Russian, Italian, among others). Some examples are given in (3) from French, Modern Hebrew, and German (Boneh & Nash (2011), Borer & Grodzinsky (1986), and Bosse (2015), respectively).

(3) a. French:
   Jeanne s’est fumé un cigare.
   ‘Jeanne smoked her a cigar.’

b. Modern Hebrew:
   Ha-po’alim’ avdu lahem.
   ‘The workers worked them leisurely.’
c. German:
Ich trinke mir jetzt einen Kaffe.
I drink me now a coffee
'Tm gonna drink me some coffee now.'

Despite similar appearance, though, the PDC is different from the standard DOC in some respects. Firstly, the applicative object (i.e. the personal dative objects *him*, *me*, and *them* in (1a,b,c)) must be coreferential with the subject as indices in (1) indicate. This is why the PDC is also called Subject Coreferential Dative Construction in the literature.

Secondly, the applicative object must be realized as a weak pronoun, and cannot be realized as a full NP (e.g. *him* vs. *Tom* in (1a)). Although the applicative object must be in a pronominal form, it is not subject to Principle B of the binding theory. Since Conroy (2007), it has been analyzed as a SE-anaphor which co-refers with the subject (Heim & Kratzer (1998)). Subsequent works such as Hutchinson & Armstrong (2014) and Bosse (2014, 2015), among others, adopt the same analysis.

Thirdly, unlike the standard DOC that encodes *transfer of possession* meaning, the PDC is reported (i) to lack possessive semantics, and (ii) to express a special, remarkable involvement of the subject in the event or situation described in the sentence, and, crucially, (ii) the satisfaction of the actual or perceived intention, goal, or preference of the subject is highlighted by the addition of the applicative object. For example, in (1a), it is highlighted that John (=him) was satisfied through the event of (his) killing a bear, i.e. the completion/achievement of the event of John's killing a bear is the source of his satisfactive experience. The semantics of satisfactive experience is different from the benefactive interpretation associated with the recipient benefactive subtype of the standard DOCs (e.g. *John baked Mary a cake*). If a reflexive pronoun is used instead, the meaning of the PDC disappears and the sentence conveys the meaning of recipient benefactive DOCs: In (4a), for example, the subject John will bake a cake for his pleasure/satisfaction (not necessarily intending to keep it himself, i.e., he is not necessarily a benefactive recipient/possessor of the cake). That is why we can add a benefactive *for*-PP as shown in (5a). The AO, *him*, in (4a, 5a) experiences satisfaction from the event of baking a cake, but it does
not act as a recipient beneficiary. In (4b), however, the subject John will bake a cake to keep it for his own benefits, i.e. John himself is the intended benefactive recipient/possessor of the cake, so we cannot add another benefactive recipient argument for his mom in the standard DOC, as we can see in (5b).

(4)  a. John’s gonna bake him a cake. (PDC)
    b. John’s gonna bake himself a cake. (DOC)

(5)  a. John’s gonna bake him a cake for his mom. (PDC)
    b. *John’s gonna bake himself a cake for his mom. (DOC)

Fourthly, the PDC is different from the standard DOC in that they do not have a prepositional variant (e.g. *John killed a bear to him. (PDC) vs. John gave a book to Mary. (DOC)). Instead, an ordinary recipient or benefactive prepositional object can be added to the PDC in addition to the AO and the DO, as shown in (6).

(6)  a. I am gonna write me a letter (to the president).
    b. John, baked him a cake (for his mom). (= (5a))

Lastly, the applicative object in the PDC contributes its meaning as something like a conventional implicature/not-at-issue content (Horn (2008), Bosse, Bruening & Yamada (2012)), unlike the applicative object in the standard DOC whose meaning contribution is truth-conditional and in at-issue tier. As such, the applicative object in the PDC cannot be questioned (e.g. *Who did John kill _ a bear? -*Him), and cannot be negated with sentential negation, e.g., the sentence ‘John didn’t kill him a bear.’ can mean (i) John didn’t kill a bear but if he had, this would have been remarkable and satisfactory for him; but not (ii) *John killed a bear but this was not remarkable and satisfactory for him. Readers interested in further differences between not-at-issue vs. at-issue semantics and their relevance to the PDC vs. the standard DOC are referred to Horn (2008), Bosse, Bruening & Yamada (2012), and Bosse (2015).
3. Previous Applicative Analyses of the PDC

3.1. Variants of Applicative Theory

Marantz (1993) described DOCS as an applicative construction in which an AO/IO is added to the argument structure of a verb. He proposed that a light verbal applicative head (Appl) is generated above lexical VP, introducing an extra applicative object. Pylkkänen (2002, 2008) later developed a more articulated typology of applicatives with high and low applicative distinction. In Pylkkänen’s classification, there are two different types of applicative heads cross-linguistically: The high applicative head (ApplH) is merged above the VP as in (7a), and the low applicative head (ApplL) is merged below the VP, as in (7b).

(7) High/Low Applicative Hypothesis (Pylkkänen (2002, 2008))
   a. High applicatives:
      \[ VoiceP \quad DP_{AGENT} \quad Voice \quad [\text{ApplH} \quad AO \quad [\text{ApplH} \quad [\text{ApplH} \quad VP \quad V(DO)]]]] \]
   b. Low applicatives:
      \[ VoiceP \quad DP_{AGENT} \quad Voice \quad [VP \quad V \quad [\text{ApplL} \quad AO \quad [\text{ApplL} \quad DO]]]] \]

The high Appl head (ApplH) in (7a) relates an applicative object (AO) to an event (realized as the VP). Its semantic denotation is given in (8a). The low Appl head (ApplL) in (7b), on the other hand, directly establishes relationship between AO and DO, and is assumed to encode the meaning of transfer-of-possession. Its semantic denotation is given in (8b).

(8) a. Semantics for high applicatives:
    \[ \lambda x. \lambda e. \text{APPL}(e, x) \]
    b. Semantics for low applicatives:
    \[ \lambda x. \lambda y. \lambda f<e,<s,t>>. \lambda e. f(e, x) & \text{theme}(e, x) & \text{to/from-the-possession}(x, y) \]

Based on the structure and semantics in (7) and (8), Pylkkänen proposed two diagnostics for identifying whether a given applicative construction is a high applicative or a low applicative. These are (i) transitivity restriction diagnostic in (9a) and stativity/verb semantics diagnostic in (9b). According to the
transitivity diagnostic, unergative verbs are not compatible with low applicatives because low applicatives are assumed to relate the AO to the DO, i.e., the presence of the DO (i.e. transitive verb) is obligatory. The stativity/verb semantics diagnostic in (9b) holds because events denoted by a static verb is not compatible with dynamic/directional meaning of transfer-of-possession (GOAL_TO/SOURCE_FROM) assumed for low applicatives.

(9) a. Transitivity diagnostic: Only high applicative heads can combine with unergative verbs.

b. Stativity/verb semantics diagnostic: Only high applicative heads can combine with static verbs.

Pylkkänen’s proposal has generated much research in the relevant area, and although this high/low applicative hypothesis has been influential as a reference point for most work on applicatives for the last decade or so (McGinnins (2002), Cuervo (2003), Doggett (2004), Lee (2004), Jeong (2007), Georgala et al. (2008), Tsai (2009), Citko (2011), Boneh & Nash (2011), Bosse et al. (2012), Bosse (2015), among others), many recent studies show that it is inadequate or insufficient to deal with diverse cross-linguistic patterns of applicative constructions. In the domain of high applicatives, it has been claimed that there are higher applicatives whose head is generated above VoiceP/vP (Tsai (2009), Kim (2011), Boneh & Nash (2011)) in addition to Pylkkänen-type high applicative phrase merged between VP and VoiceP/vP. The low applicative structure merged below the VP has also been criticized from semantic (Larson (2010)), morphological (Georgala et al. (2008), Georgala (2012)) and syntactic (Georgala et al. (2008), Boneh & Nash (2011), Georgala (2012)) perspectives.

As an alternative to Pylkkänen’s high/low applicative structure hypothesis, Georgala (2010), expanding Georgala et al. (2008), proposed a new hypothesis for applicative structures, as in (10a-b).

(10) Thematic/Raising Applicative Hypothesis (Georgala (2010))

a. Thematic applicatives (= high applicatives)

\[
[\text{VoiceP} \text{SUB} [\text{Voice} \text{Voice} [\text{ApplP} \text{AO,BEN,LOC,INST} [\text{Appl'} \text{APPl} [\text{VP} \text{V DO} ]]]]]
\]
b. Raising applicatives (replacing low applicatives)

\[
[\text{VoiceP} \text{ SUB [Voice Voice } \text{ApplP APPl [VP tO [v V DO ]]}]]
\]

\[\uparrow\text{EPP}\]

(BEN: beneficiary, LOC: locative, INST: instrumental, REC: recipient)

Thematic applicatives in (10a) and raising applicatives in (10b) correspond to high and low applicatives, respectively, but what differs is that there exists only a single ApplP. This ApplP is merged above the lexical VP, and applicative objects uniformly appear in Spec, ApplP on the surface although they start out from different positions. Thematic applicatives are basically identical with high applicatives, and an AO is merged in Spec, ApplP. But, in the case of raising applicatives (i.e. the counterpart of low applicatives), an AO is merged in Spec, VP below the ApplP first. It, then, raises to Spec,ApplP, where the Appl head functions as an expletive head, to satisfy EPP of the Appl head; The Appl head does not introduce additional arguments but just plays the role of a syntactic licensor for the applicative object. In essence, this hypothesis is a single structure/dual function analysis (for ApplP), according to Georgala, in contrast with Pylkkänen’s two structure/two function analysis.

3.2. The PDC and High/Low Applicative Hypothesis

3.2.1. Low Applicative-like Properties

Recall Pylkkänen’s transitivity and stativity/verb semantics diagnostics in (9) for identifying high/low applicatives. According to these diagnostics, the standard DOC is shown to be a low applicative, because neither unergative verbs nor static verbs can appear with an applicative object (i.e. recipient/goal/possessor), as we can see in (11a) and (11b), respectively (Pylkkänen 2008:20).

(11) Standard DOCs:

a. *I ran him.

b. *I held him the bag.

The PDC is also subject to transitivity restriction (Christian (1991), Hutchinson
& Armstrong (2014)), as shown in (12), suggesting low applicative analysis for the construction.

(12) PDCs:
   a. *Sue, ran her, all day.
   b. *John, worked him, at the shop.
   c. *I, went me, to the store.

Horn (2008, 2013) note that there are a few examples of PDCs in which unergative verbs are used. However, Hutchinson & Armstrong (2014) show that these are merely archaic uses of the construction observed in Old English (e.g. he ...gewende him. eastward to his feder ‘he went him eastward to his father’), and that they are no longer productive in Modern English. Moreover, when unergative verbs are used, locative particle or preposition must accompany them (e.g. Now I lay me down to sleep; (Why don’t you) sit you down right here; He rode him around), a kind of VP-internal additional material. Specifically, it seems that the PP in this limited range of use seems to specify a relation to an object as extended in space such as down and around), not a relation to its position (e.g., to).

Hutchinson & Armstrong (2014) also note that the PDC is in complementary distribution with the standard DOC, as we can see in (13a) and (13b). This complementary distribution suggests that applicative objects in both constructions compete for a single position. Since English DOCs are standardly analyzed as a low applicative, the PDC is suggested to be a low applicative as well. If the PDC has a high applicative configuration, the PDC’s applicative argument could appear in Spec, ApplHP, and the Goal applicative argument of the DOC could appear in Spec, ApplLP, predicting that they can co-occur, contrary to fact.  

---

1 Bosse (2014, 2015) argued that the PDC has a high applicative structure of Pylkkänen, in which the applicative phrase is merged between VoiceP and VP. Haddad (2011) proposed a higher applicative analysis, where the applicative object is merged above VoiceP. These high applicative analyses cannot capture transitivity restriction, complementary distribution between the PDC and the standard DOC. They cannot account for again-modification facts discussed below in (16) either.
(13) *PDs & DOCs (Bosse (2015), example 201c, citing Conroy (2007)):
   a. *I’m gonna write [me] [the president] a letter.
   b. *I’m gonna write [the president] [me] a letter.

Based on transitivity restriction and complementary distribution, Hutchinson & Armstrong (2014) concluded that the PDC has a low applicative structure. According to them, the relation between the AO and the DO in the PDC is that the DO "matters to" the AO because the AO is "satisfied through" the verbal event. They claim that there is no possessive semantics in the PDC. In their analysis, thus, the PDC and the DOC share the same low applicative structure but they are different in terms of the semantics of their low applicative heads. They claim that the low applicative head of the PDC encodes a satisfactive relation (i.e. Appl_{SAT}), whereas the low applicative head of the standard DOC encodes a possessive relation (i.e. Appl_{POSS}).

In addition to these syntactic facts, interpretations associated with again-modification also suggest that the PDC has a low source in structure. Beck & Johnson (2004) argued that again can detect and attach to nodes that denote sets of eventualities and presupposes that an eventuality of that type happened or obtained previously. It is well-known that two readings are available in the standard DOC, namely, (i) repetitive reading (14a) and (ii) restitutive reading (14b).

(14) John gave Mary a pen again.
   a. Repetitive reading:
      There was a prior event of giving with the theme a pen, the recipient Mary, and the agent John, which caused a possessing/having eventuality with the theme a pen and the possessor John. (i.e., again modifies over the constituent [John gave Mary a pen].)
   b. Restitutive reading:
      There was previously a possessing/having eventuality with the theme a pen and the possessor Mary, i.e., the situation in which Mary possessed a pen before (i.e. again modifies over the constituent [Mary POSSESS/HAVE a pen].)

(15) High/Low Applicative Hypothesis (repeated from (7)):
   a. High applicatives (APPL_{LOC/BEN/INST...}):
b. Low applicatives (APPL\textsubscript{POSS}):
\[
[\text{VoiceP} \text{DP}_\text{AGENT} [\text{Voice} \text{Voice} [\text{ApplP} \text{AO} [\text{ApplP} \text{ApplH} [\text{VP} \text{V (DO)\ldots}]])]])
\]
John Mary V a pen

The repetitive reading (14a) is the VoiceP reading where \textit{again} attaches at the level of VoiceP. Both high and low applicative configurations capture this reading. The low applicative structure (7b/15b) can capture the restitutive reading (14b), as it has the constituent ApplLP, which represents the meaning of possession/having eventuality ([Mary POSSESS/HAVE a pen]). The high applicative configuration in (7a/15a), however, cannot capture this reading, as there is no constituent representing [Mary POSSESS/HAVE a pen].

Consider now the again-modification fact in the PDC, given in (16), which is taken from Bosse (2014: 112-113). The following discussion is based on Bosse (2014, 2015).

(16) Yesterday, there was a window open in here. Today, they’re all closed.
I’m hot, so I’m going to open me a window again.

The sentence (16) has only one interpretation in which \textit{again} modifies VoiceP, namely, the reading where the verbal event of my opening the window happens again and experiencing this as remarkable and satisfactive for the second time as well. Crucially, the sentence (16) does not have the interpretation in which the verbal event of opening a window happens again but for a first time with the special involvement of the applicative argument \textit{me} and for the satisfaction of \textit{me}. (i.e., the sentence cannot be interpreted to mean that the window gets open for the second time but it is the first time this event is remarkable and satisfactory for me). This is the reading in which only the combination of V and DO is modified by \textit{again} (to the exclusion of the AO). The high applicative structure predicts that this reading should obtain because the VP (consisting of V & DO) is available for the attachment of \textit{again} to the exclusion of the AO in it (i.e., VP reading), contrary to fact. In low applicative structure, on the other hand, there is no constituent consisting only of V and DO where \textit{again} can be
attached. Hence, the again-modification in (16) also supports the low applicative analysis for the PDC. Bosse (2014, 2015) leave this as a problem for her high applicative analysis.

To summarize, transitivity restriction, complementary distribution between the PDC and the standard DOC, and again-modification all suggest that English PDCs instantiate low applicative structures.

### 3.2.2. High Applicative-like Properties

Although there are supporting arguments for low applicative analysis as we have seen above, the PDC exhibits high applicative-like semantic properties as well. They are related to stativity restriction and verb semantics.

First consider the stativity diagnostic in (9b). The PDC may allow static verbs, unlike the standard DOC, as we can see in (17) (Horn (2008)).

(17) PDCs:
- a. I love me (some) chowder.
- b. That house needs it a new roof.

Low applicatives are assumed to encode transfer of possession meaning (i.e. ApplPOSS), which is directional and dynamic. The stativity restriction diagnostic says that only high applicatives are compatible with static verbs since the type of event denoted by a static verb is not consistent with the theme undergoing change of possession. The use of static verbs in the PDC as in (17), thus, seems to suggest that it is a high applicative construction.

Cuervo (2003) argued that stativity is not a reliable diagnostic for distinguishing low applicatives from high applicatives on the basis of Spanish possessive applicative constructions that are compatible with stative verbs and non-transfer activity verbs. Her main claim is that a low applicative head can have different flavors and can encode not only dynamic possession (transfer of possession APPLTO/FROM) as Pylkkänen assumed, but also static possession (APPLAT). If we follow Cuervo instead of Pylkkänen, the stativity restriction per se may not be taken as a diagnostic for identifying high/low applicatives.²

² Pylkkänen (2008), as a published version of Pylkkänen (2002) without much revision, does not
But, Cuervo is also considering that entailed possession relation between two individuals (be it dynamic or stative) as an important factor in identifying a low applicative. From this semantic perspective, it appears that the PDC cannot be analyzed as a low applicative as it does not seem to denote possession. (I will come back to this point later in section 4).

To sum up, the stativity restriction/verb semantics suggests that English PDC is a high applicative construction because it does not seem to share semantic properties with Pylkkänen’s low applicatives.

### 3.2.3. Interim Summary: Dilemma

The PDC seems to have both high and low applicative properties. It seems difficult to account for English PDC applicatives using Pylkkänen-style high/low applicative structure hypothesis because of this conflicting properties. To handle this problem, Hutchinson & Armstrong (2014) claimed that the PDC instantiates a new hybrid type of low applicatives which is syntactically low but semantically high (Appl<sub>SAT</sub>), trying to make the PDC fit into Pylkkänen’s system. I propose in section 4 that the PDC actually has a meaning compatible with both high and low applicatives, and that Pylkkänen’s applicative configurations cannot account for this. It will be argued that we need to abandon Pylkkänen’s high/low applicative configurations, as it has problems with the standard DOC as well. But, before reviewing these further problems of high/low applicative hypothesis (in section 5), let’s take a closer look at the semantics of the PDC to find a clue to solve this dilemma.

### 4. Proposal

#### 4.1. Lexical Decomposition of the PDC: Getting/Acquiring & Satisfaction

Previous studies we saw above have not identified or recognized that there

---

take up and discuss stativity problem discussed by Cuervo (2003). She only mentions Cuervo’s (2003) contribution as one of the important subsequent studies carried out in response to Pylkkänen (2002) in the preface.
is a meaning component of possession in the PDC. They argue that core meaning of the PDC lies in the semantics of satisfaction for the applicative argument. However, a closer look at the semantics of the PDC with lexical decomposition reveals that the PDC actually has a meaning component which is similar and compatible with low applicative’s possession semantics that relates two individuals. Rotschy & Queller (2011) mentions that the PDC’s core semantics are a GETTING schema plus a focus on subject effect. Accepting this basic insight, I elaborate and develop the idea in applicative framework.

First, consider the PDC sentences in (18) with action verbs.

(18) a. I bought me a laptop.
    b. John sold him a dozen toothbrushes.
    c. Mary baked her a cheesecake.
    d. John played him a lullaby.
    e. I killed me a bear.
    f. I married me a pretty wife.

The verbs in (18a,b,c,d) are ditransitive verbs of acquiring/getting/obtaining or of creation (and negation of acquiring/getting/obtaining/creation\textsuperscript{3}). In these examples, the applicative objects are not possessors but a kind of acquirers though: Recall (6a) and (6b), where the genuine goal possessor to the president and beneficiary possessor for his mother can be added to the PDC (i.e. I wrote me a letter to the president/John baked him a cake for his mom. (PDC) vs. *John sent himself a letter to the president/*John baked himself a cake for his mom. (DOC)). Thus, we need to distinguish the thematic role of Acquirers from Possessors, but these two are similar in that they establish relationship between two individuals, namely, the AO and the DO. In the PDC, there is a sense of ‘AO acquires/gets/obtains DO’, and upon acquiring the DO, the AO (that corefers with the subject) becomes the experiencer of satisfaction, i.e. the eventuality of AO getting DO is the source of the AO’s satisfactive experience. In other words, applicative objects are the ones that experience satisfaction when the verbal event related to getting or creating the DO (and negation of them) is completed/achieved/culminated -- the event has to be telic/bound to be led to

\textsuperscript{3} The verb sell belongs to the verb class of negation of acquisition/getting/possession.
a satisfactive experience, i.e. some kind of resultativity (i.e., an intentional/volitional action of the subject with a result) seems to be the licensing condition for applicative objects.

In (18c), Mary herself is not an intended possessor (i.e., there is an implicit intended Possessor/Recipient). The action of baking a cheesecake culminated in the eventuality of Mary(AO)'s acquiring the cheesecake (DO) in her hand (which she may intend to give to her mom, for example). Upon acquiring this baked cheese cake the AO her experiences the sense of satisfaction. In (18d), playing a lullaby does not seem to be related to getting an object, but the event of playing a lullaby can be taken to mean creating the sound of a lullaby. It is similar to a standard DOC sentence with Possessor/Beneficiary such as 'My mom sang me a lullaby,' or 'My sister told me a scary story,' or 'My brother drew me a princess in the snow,' in which the AO/IO 'me' is not a literal recipient or possessor of a physical object, but it can be interpreted as a Recipient and Possessor/Beneficiary in an extended sense of a lullaby, of a scary story, or of a princess drawn in the snow. Going back to (18d), when the subject John creates a lullaby, he becomes a sort of acquirer/obtainer/creator of the lullaby by becoming a lullaby player, which makes him feel satisfied. Certainly, he might have played it for his baby son (as an intended recipient/beneficiary), but by playing it, he gets it to his satisfaction.

The verbs in (18e) and (18f) are not ordinary ditransitive verbs of acquisition or creation, but when these verbs appear in the PDC, we can see that the sense of acquiring/getting/obtaining arises as a constructional meaning. In (18e), the verb kill belongs to the verb class of negation of creation (or verbs of removal). When the event of killing a bear (i.e., the opposite of creation) is carried out, this causes the AO to acquire/get/obtain a killed bear, which, in turn, gives him/her a satisfactive experience. In (18f), the subject I married a pretty wife. I/me is not the possessor of a pretty wife, but by marrying her, I/me come to get/obtain/acquire her in the position of the wife, which is the source of satisfactive experience of I/me. To recap, in the case of killing (a bear) and marrying (someone) we may say that there is no direct meaning of acquiring/getting/obtaining or creating an object in their verbal meaning, but when these verbs appear in the PDC, they come to convey the (extended) sense of getting or creating that acts as the source of satisfactive experience of the
applicative object as constructional meaning. According to Horn (2008:172), the PDC is most frequent and natural with mono-syllabic “down-home” type verbs such as _buy, get, build, write, hire, cook, shoot, catch_, etc. These verbs belong to a class of verbs that can be said to have some sense of getting or creating in isolation (as a verbal meaning) and/or in the PDC (as a constructional meaning) as the verbs used in (18).

We can schematize the semantics of the PDC as in (19). Although the PDC does not appear to involve possession semantics like the standard DOC, we may say that there is a similar meaning component of GETTING/ACQUIRING and that the applicative object (which is coreferential with the subject) is the Acquirer of the DO._THEME_.

(19) The meaning of the PDC:

\[ E_1 = [e_1 \text{ CAUSE } e_2] \]
\[ (e_1 = \text{ verbal event}; e_2 = \text{ GETTING/ACQUIRING}) \]
\[ (e_1 \text{ causes } e_2, \text{ where AO/IO gets DO}) \]
\[ E_2 = e_2 \text{ CAUSE/IS SOURCE OF } e_3 \]
\[ (e_3 = \text{ satisfactive event}) \]

In the case of the standard DOC, there is a transferring event whose Recipient is the IO/AO and the Theme is the DO, and as a consequence of the transferring event, the IO/AO becomes the (intended) Possessor of the DO. In the case of the PDC, there is a verbal event (e_1); when the verbal event is completed, the AO becomes the Acquirer in the event involving the DO(e_2), and this acquisition yields satisfactive experience for the AO (e_3).

To sum up, although the Acquirer we define here is different from the Possessor, there seems to be a direct relation between the DO and the AO in the PDC, which is similar to low applicatives (which encode a direct relationship between two individuals). So, we can conclude that the PDC has an aspect that is similar to the standard DOC in terms of meaning. This solves a thorny problem in Hutchinson & Armstrong (2014). For them, the applicative head in the PDC has a high applicative-like relation to VP, so they had to propose a hybrid low applicative structure analysis with high applicative meaning. As mentioned before, they used the expression "MATTERS" to encode the relationship between
the AO and the DO, but it does not fit quite properly with low applicative meaning. By recognizing the semantics of acquiring/getting here, we can accommodate and capture the direct relationship between the AO and the DO.

Now consider the PDC sentences in (20) with stative verbs. Here again, the sentences (20a)-(20d) have verbs of desire and wanting. These verbs also involve the semantics of (future) getting/acquiring/obtaining (i.e. becoming to have) in addition to the subjective effect in the PDC; they mean love to get X, need to get X, want to get X. (See Harley (2004) for the account of [want DP] structures whose meaning is [want to have DP] or [want to get DP]).) The eventuality of AO's acquiring/getting the DO causes and marks the Acquirer's (i.e. AO's) satisfactive experience. Namely, they have the combination of two parts of meanings, acquiring/getting of DO & AO's satisfaction. In (20a), for example, Mary would love an event of her getting some chowder to take place, and upon acquiring it, she would be satisfied. In (20c), I want an event of me getting that stick of butter to take place, and when I get it, it will give me a satisfactive experience.

(20) a. Mary, would love her, (some) chowder.
    b. That house, needs it, a new roof.
    c. I, want me, that stick of butter.
    d. He, needs him, a little more sense.

I conclude that decomposing the semantics of the PDC reveals that the construction encodes the meaning of Acquiring/Getting that directly involves the AO and the DO. Namely, there is a direct relationship between the DO and the AO in the PDC (i.e. low applicative-like meaning). However, the PDC still has an aspect of high applicative-like meaning in which an event is related to an individual (i.e. the event encoded in VP gives satisfaction to the PD applicative object), unlike the standard DOC which only encodes the relationship between the DO and the AO in terms of possessor/possessee. To recap, although we find

---

4 An anonymous reviewer asks whether the PDC is possible with verbs like see. Horn (2008) has an example such as 'I saw/watched me some X.' According to him, when see licenses PD applicative objects, it typically alludes to the result of a conscious effort of looking. We can interpret this as the following: the verbal event of seeing causes the culmination of deliberately sought out event of AO seeing/watching DO, i.e. the event of AO's getting visual experience of DO, which, in turn, is the source of the AO's satisfaction.
that the PDC partially has a low applicative-like semantics, our dilemma still remains. This two-way semantics of the PDC cannot be captured by the low applicative configuration of Pylkkänen’s high/low applicative hypothesis. In the next subsection, I will show that a version of Georgala’s raising/thematic applicative hypothesis can accommodate this dual semantic property of the PDC.

4.2. Argument Sharing and Extension of Georgala’s Hypothesis

In this section, I will show that the newly identified semantic and syntactic properties of the PDC we discussed in sections 3 and 4.1 can be accommodated in thematic/raising hypothesis of Georgala et al. (2008) and Georgala (2012). I will first present the hypothesis using examples from the standard DOC and move onto the discussion of the PDC.

Georgala (2012) proposed the following alternative hypothesis (21) (repeated from (10)). In this hypothesis, although there are two different types of applicatives (thematic and raising), both are identical in that a single ApplP appears above the VP, i.e., there is only a single structural position for applicative heads VP-externally, unlike Pylkkänen, in which both VP-external and VP-internal positions are posited for applicative heads.

(21) Thematic/Raising Applicative Hypothesis (repeated from (10))

a. Thematic applicatives (= counterpart of high applicatives)

\[
\begin{align*}
&[\text{VoiceP} \text{ SUB } [\text{Voice} \text{ Voice } [\text{ApplP} \text{ AO}_{\text{BEN, LOC, INST}} [\text{Appl} \text{ [VP V DO]]]]]] \\
&\text{(BEN: beneficiary, LOC: locative, INST: instrumental, REC: recipient)}
\end{align*}
\]

b. Raising applicatives (= counterpart of low applicatives)

\[
\begin{align*}
&[\text{VoiceP} \text{ SUB } [\text{Voice} \text{ Voice } [\text{ApplP} \text{ AO/IO}_{\text{REC}} [\text{Appl} \text{ [VP tAO [V V DO]]]]]] \\
&\text{EPP}
\end{align*}
\]

In the case of thematic applicatives (21a), the applicative argument AO is directly introduced and merged in the specifier of ApplP. In raising applicatives (21b), on the other hand, the AO is not introduced in Spec, ApplP, but is introduced and merged in the specifier of VP. It, then, raises to Spec, ApplP. The Appl head does not introduce a new argument but simply has the role of Case licensor when the AO raises to its specifier to satisfy EPP of the Appl head;
hence it was called the expletive applicative in Georgala et al. (2008).

Georgala (2012) has a discussion of English DOCs. It is assumed that the AO/IO receives the thematic role of Recipient in lexical VP and it only gets syntactic licensing in Spec,ApplP. This assumption is a departure from Georgala et al. (2008), where it is assumed that chains may bear multiple thematic roles: the AO/IO gets the thematic role of Goal in Spec,VP and gets another thematic role of Experiencer/Affectee in Spec,ApplP. Although I do not agree with Georgala et al. (2008) about the exact thematic nature of this additional role in the standard DOC, I will assume with Georgala et al. (2008) rather than with Georgala (2012) that AO/IO receives two different thematic roles in Spec,VP and Spec, ApplP, from V and Appl, respectively: a Recipient role and a Possessor role.

Bruening (2010) proposes a similar analysis. Although he adopts a high applicative-like configuration, he also proposed an analysis where multiple thematic roles can be assigned in the standard DOCs – he argues that the DOC involves a kind of complex predicate and that Appl and V can share their arguments: Possessor and Theme for Appl, and Recipient and Theme for V. Namely, in the lexical VP, AO/IO and DO receive Recipient and Theme roles, respectively; and in ApplP, they get Possessor and Theme role again, respectively. Jeong (2007) also has a similar idea of multiple thematic role assignment for a single argument. For her, English DOC low applicatives have an object-sharing structure and the dual role is assumed for the DO; the DOC encodes the meaning of (i) transfer of DO (i.e. DO as the Theme) and (ii) the coming of DO into possession of IO/AO as a result of the transfer of DO (i.e. DO as the Possessee). Although details are different, these authors adopt a complex predicate formation analysis with argument sharing and multiple thematic role assignment. The idea of argument sharing and multiple thematic role assignment has been argued for in discussions of such constructions as serial verb constructions and resultative constructions in terms of object sharing (Jeong (2007)). Many recent analyses based on Hornstein’s (1999) proposal on movement into $\theta$-positions and Ramchand (2008), for example, also share the idea.

I believe this line of multiple thematic role approach with argument sharing between predicates is on the right track, and will assume that the DO receives the Theme role and the AO/IO receives the Recipient role in VP, as in Georgala
et al. (2008). I will, however, assume that the thematic role the AO/IO in Spec, ApplP is not Experiencer but Possessor, following Bruening (2010), as shown in (22). The AO/IO receives the DO (Theme) via a verbal event related to transferring, and as a consequence it becomes the Possessor of the DO (Theme).

(22) a. Sue gave/sent Anne a book.
    b. [VoiceP Sue [Voice' Voice [ApplP Anne [Appl' Appl [VP tAO [v give/send
       [a book]]]]]]] [EPP]

The two-way high/low applicative semantics of the PDC can also be captured with this argument sharing/multiple thematic role idea under raising applicative hypothesis. Consider (23a) and (23b). The VP encodes the meaning such that the event of *killing a bear* for the AO to get it results in the event of AO getting/acquiring the Theme. The AO *me* gets this Acquirer role in Spec, VP. This (resultative/bounded) VP, then, provides the source event for the satisfactive experience event for the AO *me*. When the AO *me* moves into Spec, ApplP for EPP (and Case), it is assigned Experiencer role by Appl. Namely, the AO has a direct relationship with the DO (Theme) in VP (i.e. relationship between two individuals); and it is also related to an event encoded in the VP (i.e. relationship between an individual and an event). The external argument *I* is merged in Spec, VoiceP and corefers with the AO.

(23) a. I killed me a bear.
    b. [VoiceP I [Voice' Voice [ApplP me [Appl' Appl [VP tAO [v kill
       [a bear]]]]]]] [EPP] [EPP]

As the AO always appears as a kind of Acquirer in the PDC, it is merged in Spec, VP. The transitivity restriction is accounted for in Georgala-type raising applicative structure. As AO/IOs in both the standard DOC and the PDC are merged in Spec, VP and move into Spec, ApplP, they cannot co-occur. There is no subevents consisting only of V and DO that can be modified by *again*. Since VP (containing both AO and DO) is the smallest <v,t> node where *again* can
be attached, *again*-modification facts can also be captured.

To conclude, all the properties we examined for the PDC can be accounted for by adopting Georgala’s raising applicative configuration with additional assumptions on argument sharing and multiple thematic role assignment. As Bruening (2010) claimed, the current discussion also shows that Pylkkänen is right about applicative semantics but that she is incorrect about the high/low structures. The standard DOC and the PDC share the same structural configuration, but they are different in terms of thematic roles involved. Applicative heads may have different semantic flavors, and applicative objects can have many different thematic roles such as Locative, Beneficiary, Instrument, Experiencer, Possessor, etc.

In the next section, we review other problems for Pylkkänen’s hypothesis on dealing with the standard DOC, which further argue against Pylkkänen’s structures and for Georgala-type structures.

---

An anonymous reviewer raises a question about why there are differences between the PDC and the standard DOC in A/A’-movement patterns if they share the same structure. A’-movement of the AO is blocked in both constructions but only the standard DOC allows A’-movement of the DO, as we can see in (i) and (ii). Lee (2016) has a semantic analysis of this pattern in terms of event structural differences. The main point is that A’-movement is subject to not only syntactic but also semantic constraints.

(i) DOCs:
   a. *Who, did Mary give t, a book?
   b. What, did Mary give John t?

(ii) PDCs:
   a. *Who, did John, kill t, a bear?
   b. *Who, did she, meet her t?

The two constructions also differ in their A-movement of the AO/IO, as shown in (iii) and (iv). In the PDC (iva), if the AO undergoes A-movement into the subject position, SE-anaphor binding condition violation is invoked, leading to ungrammaticality. In both, A-movement of DO is blocked as we can see in (iiib) and (ivb). I suggest that this is just a general locality violation. Moon (2014) proposes an alternative analysis of passivization (A-movement) in the framework of conceptual semantics and prototype theory.

(iii) DOCs:
   a. John, was given t, a book.
   b. *A book, was given John t.

(iv) PDCs:
   a. *He, was killed t, a bear (by John).
   b. *A bear, was killed him t.
5. Other Problems of Pylkkänen’s Low Applicative Configuration

In addition to the problems with the English PDC, there are other challenges against Pylkkänen’s high/low applicative hypothesis. In this section, I will introduce some arguments against her low applicative structure from the literature, summarizing discussions in Boneh & Nash (2011) and Georgala (2012), as well as present a new piece of argument from idiom patterns.

Firstly, Larson (2010:702) shows that Pylkkänen’s low applicative structure allows incorrect inference from (24a) to (24b) as the structure disconnect and uncouple the AO/IO from the event structure of the verb and the AO/IO Mary bears no relation to the event of writing (i.e., in Pylkkänen’s structure the AO/IO is related to the DO alone through Appl head which encodes transfer of possession). Larson (2010:702) says, "John’s writing a letter, and that letter’s coming into Mary’s possession, does not entail that John wrote the letter to Mary."

(24) a. John wrote a letter and Bill gave Mary that letter.
   b. John wrote Mary that letter.

Secondly, Georgala et al. (2008) mention languages with overt applicative morphology such as Abaza. Under head movement approach to morphology, Pylkkänen’s structures predict that overt applicative heads are realized as verbal suffixes in (VP-external) high applicatives and as prefixes in low applicatives; but, cross-linguistically, although high applicative heads in suffix positions are robustly attested, there are no clear candidates for an overt low applicative head either in situ or as a prefix (Georgala 2012:3). In other words, there is no morphological evidence for a low applicative head that is merged below VP.

Thirdly, Pylkkänen (2002, 2008), Georgala et al. (2008), and Paul & Whitman (2010) show that an adverbial modifiers like each and both can intervene the IO/AO and the DO in English DOCs.

(25) a. I gave/threw the boys each/both a towel.
   b. ?? I gave/threw the towels each/both to a boy.
If adverbial modifiers are assumed to attach to VP, it is problematic for Pylkkänen’s low applicative structure in (7b/15b), as the AO/IO and the DO are taken to be part of the same minimal constituent ApplLP generated below VP.

Lastly, Boneh & Nash (2011) present scope freezing effects in English DOCs as a further argument against Pylkkänen’s low applicative structure (Aoun & Li (1993), Bruening (2001)).

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

According to Bruening, prepositional datives in (26a) show scope ambiguity because the DO and to-IO appear in the same minimal domain, namely as a complement and a specifier of the same projection, VP. They are equidistant for QR to the edge of VoiceP (or vP). In contrast, DOCs in (26b) show scope freezing effects, suggesting that the AO/IO is in a higher projection than the DO. In Pylkkänen’s low applicative structure in (7b/15b), however, both the AO/IO and the DO belong to the same minimal domain as a specifier and a complement of ApplLP, respectively. Hence, scope ambiguity is expected, contrary to fact.

In addition to these previously noted problems, ditransitive idiom patterns also show that Pylkkänen’s low applicative configuration is not adequate. It is well-known that there is only one ditransitive idiom pattern involving double object frame, as in (27a), which involves V and DO. Ditransitive idiom pattern consisting of V and IO (27b) does not exist in English. Bruening (2010) proposes the Principle of Idiomatic Interpretation as in (28).

(27) a. Verb IO DO  
    (e.g. give NP the creeps, give NP the sack, give NP a piece of one’s mind, promise NP the moon...)
    b. Verb IO DO (nonexistent)

(28) The Principle of Idiomatic Interpretation (Bruening (2010: 532))  
X and Y may be interpreted idiomatically only if X selects Y.  

The high applicative structure in (7a/15a) has a VP constituent consisting of V and DO (selected by V), which can represent the available idiom pattern in
(27a); however, the low applicative structure in (7b/15b) cannot capture ditransitive idiom patterns, as V and DO do not form an immediate constituent in which V selects DO to the exclusion of AO/IO. Although English DOCs are low applicatives according to Pylkkänen’s typology, this ditransitive idiom pattern cannot be captured in her low applicative configuration.

All these syntactic, morphological, and semantic facts converge in challenging Pylkkänen’s low applicative structure, suggesting that it is in need of revision. As we saw in 4.2 for the PDC, Georgala’s raising applicative configuration can capture low applicative properties such as transitivity restriction, complementary distribution between the DOC and the PDC, and again-modification facts. As the thematic applicative configuration is the same as the high applicative configuration, high applicative properties can also be captured. In addition, the other challenges we have just seen can also be handled: as for the semantic inference problem Larson pointed out, the AO is related to V by being its specifier. So, the incorrect semantic inference problem does not arise. As for the intervention of modifiers between the AO and the DO that Georgala et al. discussed, because the AO has to move to Spec, ApplP, VP-attachment of adverbials in between can be captured. The scope rigidity problem Boneh & Nash pointed out can be explained because the AO has to be positioned in a higher projection than the DO after raising into Spec, ApplP. Finally, the ditransitive idiom pattern can also be accounted for in Georgala’s raising applicative configuration because there is a constituent consisting of V and DO (i.e. V'), but V and IO/AO alone do not form such a constituent.

6. Conclusion

Over the last decade or so, Pylkkänen’s high/low applicative hypothesis has been very influential for works on applicatives and other related areas of research. This paper examined syntactic and semantic properties of the PDC (an applicative construction) and dealt with dilemmas the construction poses for the high/low applicative hypothesis of Pylkkänen’s. Hutchinson & Armstrong (2014) argued that the PDC has low-applicative syntax and high applicative meaning, but the present paper showed, by adopting a lexical decomposition approach,
that the PDC has both high and low applicative semantics as well; specifically that the PDC has semantics of getting that relates two individuals and semantics of satisfactive experience of the applicative object. Pylkkänen’s low applicative structure cannot accommodate these semantic aspects of the PDC properly. Pylkkänen’s structure also has problems in dealing with various aspects of the standard DOC. The present paper, thus, proposed abandoning Pylkkänen’s applicative configurations and adopting Georgala’s.

To conclude, an empirical investigation of the syntax and semantics of the PDC opens a way for us to make a theoretical choice over variants of applicative theory: Georgala-style applicative hypothesis (with a single applicative phrase above VP and not below VP) can capture all the properties of the PDC and the standard DOC when we also adopt multiple thematic role assignment hypothesis with argument sharing between predicates. I conclude that Georgala’s hypothesis fares better than Pylkkänen’s hypothesis in dealing with applicative constructions of English.
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