

- b. Ce voyage *(m') a enseigné la sagesse (#mais je n'ai rien appris)

This travel taught (me) wisdom (but I did not learn anything).

As observed e.g. by Nash (2006) for English, (8a) is not contradictory. Therefore, even though the 'result inference' is arguably stronger with a double-object construction than with the corresponding *to*-dative one (cf. Oehrle 1976, Larson 1988), it can still be cancelled with an agent. This, however, is impossible with a causer.

(Non-)Core internal arguments. It has remained unnoticed that the alternation between an agent (4a-8a) and a causer (4b-8b) systematically effects the VP-internal argument structure. Whereas the direct objects in (4, 5) and the indirect objects in (6-8) are optional with agents, they become obligatory with causers. If one assumes, as proposed here, that the sentence pairs in (4-8) differ in their event-complexity (the a-sentences are mono-eventive, the b-sentences are bi-eventive), one can relate this contrast to a more general difference between 'core' and 'non-core' transitive verbs (CTVs vs. NCTVs). Levin (1999) characterizes mono-eventive transitive verbs NCTVs because they quite generally allow their objects to be dropped (*John wiped (the floor)*). Bi-eventive transitive verbs are CTVs because their objects are obligatory (*John melted *(the ice)*). This difference is related to the way the object is selected. Objects of NCTVs are selected by the lexical root while objects of CTVs are arguments of the event template, specifically of the resultant state predicate.

Implementing the (non-)result readings. We assume that event structure is built in the syntax and that the above verbal roots can enter mono- or bi-eventive VPs. As a consequence, VP-internal arguments are either arguments of the verbal root or arguments of a syntactically represented result state. This state is provided either by a small clause or by a low applicative.

Verbs with accusative object (e.g. *encourager*): We take the bi-eventive use of this verb to be more basic/compositional and propose the structure of a denominal locational verb (9a, cf. Hale & Keyser 1998). The prefix '*en*' is the head of a PP-small clause; the direct object is the subject and the denominal root the complement of this small clause. The denominal root, which introduces the infinitival clause (consider *Il a le courage de le faire*), first moves to the prepositional head which then incorporates into the verbalizer. The external argument of such a structure can be either an agent or a causer. We propose that in the mono-eventive use, the complex verb 'en-courager' is reinterpreted as (or coerced into) a manner root which modifies the verbalizing head (9b, cf. Levin 1999, Embick 2005). Crucially, in this manner reading, the result component systematically drops out. This provides further support for the manner/result complementarity (Levin & Rappaport Hovav 2008, to appear).

(9) a. [_{VoiceP} agent/causer Voice [_{VP} v [_{PP} object *en* [_{DP} *courage* [à soutenir le dialogue]]]]]

b. [_{VoiceP} agent Voice [_{VP} v<*encourage*> object [à soutenir le dialogue]]]

Verbs with dative object (e.g. *offrir*): These verbs are basically double object verbs involving a low applicative phrase (10a). The verbal root provides manner information for the eventive verbal head and the result state is provided by a low applicative head with the indirect object as the specifier and the direct object as the complement. While these verbs are basically bi-eventive, they can be coerced into pure manner predicates that lack the result predication (10b). In this case, the internal arguments become arguments of the verbal root.

(10) a. [_{VoiceP} agent/causer Voice [_{VP} v<*offrir*> [_{AppIP} indirect object *Appl.* direct object]]]

b. [_{VoiceP} agent Voice [_{VP} v<*offrir*> indirect object direct object]]

Selected references

- Folli, R. and Harley, H., 2005, Flavours of v: Consuming Results in Italian and English. In *Aspectual Enquiries*.
 Nash, L. (2006). Dative Voice. Manuscript.
 Oehrle, Richard (1976) *The Grammatical Status of the English Dative Alternation*, PhD dissertation, MIT.
 Rappaport Hovav, M. and Levin, B. (1998). Building Verb Meanings. In Butt, M. and Geuder, W., eds., *The Projection of Arguments: Lexical and Compositional Factors*, CSLI.
 Levin, B. and M. Rappaport Hovav (to appear) 'Lexicalized Meaning and Manner/Result Complementarity', in B. Arsenijević, B. Gehrke, and R. Marín, eds., *Subatomic Semantics of Event Predicates*.
 Travis, L. 1985. Agents and Causes in Malagasy and Tagalog. In N. Erteschick-Shir & T.R. Rapoport (eds.), *The Syntax of Aspect*, 174-189. Oxford: Oxford University Press.