

Chapter 1

Ditransitive constructions with DOM-ed direct objects in Romanian

Alexandra Cornilescu

Irina Nicula

Alexandra Cornilescu
University of Bucharest

Abstract. *The paper discusses Romanian data that had gone unnoticed so far and investigates the differences of grammaticality triggered by DOM-ed DOs in ditransitive constructions, in binding configurations. Specifically, while a bare DO may bind a possessor contained in the IO, whether or not the IO is clitic doubled, a DOM-ed DO may bind into an undoubled IO, but cannot bind into an IO if the latter is clitic doubled. Grammaticality is restored if the DO is clitic doubled in its turn.*

The focus of the paper is to offer a derivational account of ditransitive constructions, which accounts for these differences. The claim is that the grammaticality contrasts mentioned above result from the different feature structure of bare DOs compared with DOM-ed ones, as well as from the fact that DOM-ed DOs and IO have common features. DOM-ed DOs interfere with IOs since both are sensitive to the Animacy Hierarchy, and include a syntactic [Person] feature in their featural make-up. The derivational valuation of this feature by both objects may create locality problems.

Keywords: *dative, DOM, ditransitive construction, functional prepositions, binding*

1 Problem and aim

In this paper, I turn to data not discussed for Romanian so far and consider the differences of grammaticality triggered by DOM-ed DOs in ditransitive constructions, in *binding* configurations.¹

Specifically², bare DOs easily bind a possessor contained in a dative IO, whether the latter is CD-ed or not, as in (??) - (??). The picture changes when the DO is DOM-ed. It is still possible for a DOM-ed DO to bind into an undoubled IO (??), but if the IO is *doubled*, the sentence is *ungrammatical* (??). While co-occurrence of the DOM-ed DO with a dative clitic, results in ungrammaticality, if the DOM-ed DO is doubled, sentences are grammatical, again irrespective of the presence/absence of the dative clitic, as in examples (??) and (??).

(1)

Romanian (CDT 2017: 162)

DP_{theme} > DP_{goal}

Banca a retrocedat multe case_i proprietarilor lor_i de drept.

bank.the has returned many houses owners.the.DAT their of right
'The bank returned the houses to their rightful owners.'

(2)

Romanian (CDT 2017a:162)

DP_{theme} > cl-DP_{goal}

Banca le_j=a retrocedat multe case_i

bank.the they.DAT=has returned many houses

proprietarilor_j lor_i de drept.

owners.the.DAT their of right

'The bank returned many houses to their rightful owners.'

(3)

¹I would like to express my gratitude for the wonderful help I got from the reviewers and the editors in finalizing the paper. Remaining errors are all mine.

²Judgments on possessor binding in Romanian ditransitive constructions and some of the examples come from an experiment described in detail in Cornilescu, Dinu & Tigău (CDT, 2017a). Unless otherwise specified, examples and acceptability judgments belong to the author.

Romanian

DOM-ed DP_{theme} > DP_{goal}

Comisia a repartizat pe mai mulți medici rezidenți

board.the has assigned DOM more many medical residents

unor foști profesori de-ai lor.

some.DAT former professors of theirs.

‘The board assigned several medical residents to some former professors of theirs.’

(4)

Romanian

*DOM-ed DP_{theme} > cl- DP_{goal}

**Comisia le-a repartizat pe mai mulți medici rezidenți*

board.the they.DAT=has assigned DOM more many medical residents

unor foști profesori de-ai lor.

some.DAT former professors of theirs

‘The board assigned several medical residents to some former professors of theirs.’

(5)

Romanian

cl- DOM-ed DP_{theme} > DP_{goal}

Comisia i-a repartizat pe mai mulți medici rezidenți

board.thethey.ACC=has assigned DOM more many medical residents

unor foști profesori de-ai lor.

some.DAT former professors of theirs.

‘The board assigned several medical residents to some former professors of theirs.’

(6)

Romanian

cl- DOM-ed DP_{theme} > cl-DP_{goal}

Comisia i=l-a repartizat pe fiecare medic rezident

board.the she.DAT=he.ACC=assigned DOM each medical resident

unei foste profesoare a lui.

some.DAT professor.F.DAT his

‘The board assigned each resident doctor to a former professor of his.’

Critical is the difference between (??) and (??), and also between (??) and (??)-(6) where the DO is doubled.

The aim of the chapter is to offer a derivational account of ditransitive constructions, which accommodates these differences. We claim that the grammaticality contrasts above result from the different feature structure of bare DOs compared with DOM-ed ones, and from the fact that DOM-ed DOs and IOs need to check the same [Person] feature against the same functional head.

2 On Romanian dative DPs

2.1 2.1. Inflectional datives and the animacy hierarchy

In Romanian nouns have *inflectional dative morphology* and, additionally, exhibit *prepositional marking*, employing the locative preposition *la* ‘at’/‘to’. An essential property of inflectional datives (=Inf-DAT) is that they are highly sensitive to the animacy hierarchy (=AH) and have a *higher cut-off point* than *la*-datives, as seen in (??).

(7)

human > animate > inanimate

(8)

Romanian

a. *Am turnat vin la musafiri/ musafirilor*

have.I poured wine at guests/ guests.the.DAT

‘I poured wine to the guests.’

b. *Am dat apa la cai/ ?cailor.*

have.I given water at horses/ horses.the.DAT

‘I poured water to the horses.’

c. *Am turnat apă la flori/ *?florilor.*

have.I poured water at flowers flowers.the. DAT

‘I poured water to the flowers.’

One theoretical difficulty that immediately arises is that of incorporating *scalar concepts* like the AH or the definiteness hierarchy (= DefH) into the discrete binary system of a minimalist grammar. **Richards2008** argues that the AH and the DefH are semantic and pragmatic in nature and should be viewed as *syntax-semantics interface phenomena*. Crucially, he proposes that nouns which are sensitive to these hierarchies should be lexically specified for a binary *grammatical* [Person] feature (Rodríguez-Mondoñedo2007 for Spanish). It is this [Person] feature which triggers the interpretation of a given NP along the two hierarchies, checking its position on the two scales. Nouns which accept the Inf-DAT enter the derivation lexically marked as [+Person]. Since this is a syntactic feature, it must be checked during the derivation.

2.2 On the internal structure of *la*-datives

The preposition *la* ‘at’/‘to’ is not only a *functional dative marker*, but it is also the core *lexical preposition* of the location and movement frames. The lexical preposition *la* assigns accusative case to its object, this accusative cannot be replaced by a dative, and, as correctly pointed out by both reviewers, accusative *la*-phrases do not co-occur with dative clitics. All movement and location verbs may combine with lexical accusative *la*-phrases, rejecting, however, dative *la*-phrases. An example is the verb *merge* ‘go’, which is compatible only with lexical *la*, but not with functional dative *la*. Substitution of the *la*-phrase with a dative DP is impossible (??), and a dative clitic is equally ungrammatical (??).

(9)

Romanian

a. *Ion a mers la Maria/ **Mariei.*

Ion has gone at Maria.ACC/ Maria.DAT

‘Ion went to Maria.’

b. **Ion îi merge (Mariei).*

Ion she.DAT=goes Maria.DAT

‘Ion is going to Mary.’

One specification is required at this point. Even for unaccusative verbs like *plăcea* ‘like’, which always select a dative Experiencer, either inflectional or prepositional, co-occurrence of a dative *la*-phrase with a clitic is possible only in the third person; in the first and in the second person, the clitic may co-occur only with an inflectional dative strong pronoun, never with a prepositional dative, as apparent in (??) below:

(10)

Romanian

a. *Cicolata le=place copiilor/ la copii.*

chocolate.the they.DAT=like.3SG children.the.DAT/ at children

‘Children like chocolate.’

b. *Ciocolata îmi=place și mie/ *și la mine.*

chocolate.the I.DAT=like.3SG also I.DAT / also at me

‘I also like chocolate.’

Verbs in the movement frame do not behave uniformly regarding the realization of their Goal argument. While some never select a dative (e.g. *merge* ‘go’), others (e.g. *ajunge* ‘arrive’ or *veni* ‘come’) may select a dative on condition that the Goal DP is [+Person]; the dative Goal is realized as a clitic, doubled by a strong pronoun or by a dative *la*-phrase, provided that the clitic is third person, as already shown in (??). Thus, in (??) the *la*-phrase is lexical; in (??), the Goal is a dative phrase realized as a clitic; the first person dative clitic can only be doubled by a dative strong pronoun, while the *la*-phrase is out (11b’). The relevant example is however (??), an attested Google example, where the Goal is a dative, and the dative clitic is doubled by a dative *la*-phrase. As the comparison of (??) and (??) shows, the *la*-phrase is interpreted as a dative only when it co-occurs with a dative clitic.

(11)

Romanian

a. *Pachetul a ajuns la mine/la Londra ieri.*

parcel.the has arrived at I.ACC/ at London yesterday

‘The parcel got to me/ to London yesterday.’

b. *Pachetul mi=a ajuns și mie ieri.*

parcel.the I.DAT= has arrived also I.DAT yesterday

b’ *Pachetul mi=a ajuns (*la mine) ieri.*

parcel.the I.DAT=has arrived (at.I.ACC) yesterday

‘The parcel got to me too yesterday’

c. *Acum le=au venit la mulți deciziile*

now they.DAT=have come at. many.ACC decisions

de recalculare a pensiilor

of recalculation pensions.the.GEN

‘Now many have got their decisions for recalculation of their pensions.’

In the rest of this section I examine the internal structure of the *la*-phrase when it is a dative, i.e. when it is clitic-doubled. As a dative-marker *la* is puzzling, since it is described as a “dative preposition”, but, as seen above in (??), it clearly assigns accusative case to its complement (??). On the other hand, *la*-phrases may take dative clitics (??), and, as well-known, clitics and their associates always agree in Case. This suggests that, as a dative marker, *la* simply assigns Case to a DP *sub-component* of the dative phrase, while the whole *la*-phrase has an *uninterpretable valued dative feature* (??), which agrees with the clitic’s Case feature. The marker *la* has become an *internal constituent* which extends the dative phrase (??), i.e. a K(ase) marker like the marker of DOM (Lopez2011). An additional role of this morpheme is that of a category shifter, which reanalyzes the PP into a KP, therefore, an extended DP.

The categorial change from P to K may be viewed as an instance of *downward re-analysis* (RobertsRoussou2003), likely to have occurred out of the need to improve the correspondence between syntactic features and their PF representation.

(12)

PP
 qp
 P DP
 [Case:____] [*u*Case:Acc]
 [Loc/Goal] ([*i*Person])
 la

(13)

KP [Case:Dat]
 qp
 K DP
 [*u*Case:Acc] [*u*Case:Acc]
 [*u*Case:Dat]
 la

In time, there gradually emerged two different changes in the function of the Locative PP in (??). One has been the extension of *la* from verbs that have Goals or Possessor-Goals in their a-structure (verbs of giving and throwing) to verbs

that select Beneficiaries (e.g. verbs of creation, like *face* ‘make, do’, *coace* ‘bake’, etc.), and even verbs that select Maleficiary or Source, i.e. the opposite of Goal, (e.g. *fura* ‘steal’). Thus the preposition *la* widens its thematic sphere, but it is partly desemanticized, since the thematic content of the *la*-phrase almost completely follows from the descriptive content of the selecting verb. Secondly, while any kind of DP may assume the Location/Goal θ -role, these extended interpretations (e.g. Beneficiary, Maleficiary) are compatible only with nouns high in the AH. As explained, such nouns grammaticalize their inherent human feature as a syntactic [Person] feature (Richards2008).

(14)

Romanian

Possessor-Goal

Mama (le)=a dat prăjituri copiilor/ la copii.

mother.the they.DAT=has given cakes children.the.DAT/ at children

‘Mother gave cakes to the children.’

(15)

Romanian

Beneficiary

Mama (le)=a copt prăjituricopiilor/ lacopii.

mother.the they.DAT=has baked cakes children.the.DAT/at children

‘Mother baked cakes for the children.’

(16)

Romanian

Maleficiary/ Source

Niște vagabonzi le-au furat copiilor/ la copii jucăriile.

some tramps they.cl.DAT-have stolen children.the.DAT/at children the toys

‘Some tramps stole the toys from the children.’

At this point, there was an imperfect match between features and their exponents, since *la* had partly lost its thematic content, and an obligatory syntactic [+Person] feature in the nominal matrix had no PF realization (?). This tension led to the re-analysis of *la* as a PF exponent of the [Person] feature of the noun.

As such *la* becomes a higher K part of the nominal expression, where K is a spell-out of [*i*Person]. Syntactically, K is a Probe that values an uninterpretable [*u*Person:___] feature of the DP through agreement (??).

(17)

KP[*i*Person, *i*φ, ±Def, *u*Case: DAT]

qp

K DP

[***i*Person**] wo

[*u*Case:___] D NP

[*u*Case: DAT] [+D [+N]

| [±Def] [*i*φ]

| [*u*φ] [***u*Person**]

la [*u*Case:Acc] [+Animate]

Compared to (??), representation in (??) is “simpler”, since the grammatical feature [*i*Person], syncretically realized by N in (??) is realized as a separate lexical item in (??).

Like Inf-DAT, *la*-DAT are sensitive to the AH, but the selectional properties of *la* are not identical to those of the dative inflection. For instance, both types of datives are compatible with names of *corporate bodies* (??), but only Inf-DAT are also felicitous with *abstract* nouns, *la*-DAT are not (??).

(18)

Romanian

(Le)=a împărțit banii la niște asociații caritabile /

(they.DAT) has handed-out money.the at some associations charitable

unor asociații caritabile.

some.DAT associations charitable

‘He handed out the money to some charities.’

(19)

Romanian

A supus proiectul *la atenția bordului/

has submitted project.the at attention board.the.GEN/

atenției bordului.

attention.the.DAT board.the.GEN

‘He submitted the project to the board’s attention.’

Conclusions so far

1. Nouns may come from the lexicon with an unvalued [*uPerson*] feature.
2. Dative *la* is a K component which spells-out an [*iPerson*] feature, historically resulting through downward re-analysis of the homonymous [Location] preposition. K selects DPs which are [*uPerson*] and values their [*uPerson*] feature.
3. A KP nominal expression is complex, since it contains a smaller DP. The K-head case-licenses the smaller DP. K also contains an *uninterpretable valued* dative feature checked during the derivation.

2.2 2.3 Why a clitic is sometimes required

In theory, like any functional head, the clitic should be a response to some internal need of the *la*-phrase. It is plausible that dative *la*, an [*iPerson*] spell-out, further eroded semantically, becoming an uninterpretable [*uPerson*], at least sometimes³. The KP continues to have all the features in (??), except that [Person] is uninterpretable (??).

(20)

KP[*uPerson*, +D, ±Def, *iφ*, *uCase*: Dat]

Given this feature structure a pronominal clitic is required to derivationally supply an [*iPerson*] feature. Clitics are known to be sensitive to features like [+D, +Def, ...] and cannot combine with nominal projections smaller than DP. They may, however, combine with projections larger than DPs, i.e. KPs, where these features are specified, since they percolate from the D-head.

Concluding, *la*+DP constituents are KPs, where K is a dative head. With verbs of movement and location including ditransitive ones, *la* + DP are also still analyzable as PPs expressing Goal/ Location.

2.4. The internal structure of the inflectional dative phrase

³An important empirical generalization (Cornilescu2017) regarding Romanian dative clitics is that they are obligatory for non-core datives, but optional for core datives. In the analysis proposed here, this means that the [Person] feature on dative KPs is uninterpretable by default and can be interpretable only for *core datives*, which have the property of being s-selected by the verb.

The analysis of [*la*_K] above suggests a parallel treatment for the dative morphology, K_{dative}, which I will also consider a Person exponent. Nouns inflected for the dative are endowed with [*u*Person___], given their sensitivity to the AH. This feature is valued KP-internally, when K_{dative} has an interpretable Person feature, i.e. K is [*i*Person, Case-Dative___]. Alternatively, if K's semantic feature is bleached, then K_{dative} is [*u*Person] and simply realizes Case. In such situations, CD is obligatory and [*u*Person] is checked KP-externally, using a clitic derivation.

Importantly, like *la*-DAT, Inf-DAT are *ambiguous between a KP and a PP categorization*. The PP analysis is, for example, required for adjectives that select Inf-DAT complements (e.g. *util* 'useful', *folositor* 'useful', *necesar* 'necessary'). Since adjectives are not case-assigners, the Dative is licensed by a null preposition which finally incorporates into the adjective.

Inside *vP*, when the Inf-DAT is CD-ed or, at least, may have been CD-ed, the Inf-DAT is analyzable as a KP. However, when doubling is impossible, the Inf-DAT *must be projected as a PP, since otherwise it cannot check either Case or Person*. One example is that of sentences containing two Inf-DAT PHRASES, of which the higher *must* be CD-ed and the lower *cannot* be CD-ed (since they compete for the same *vP* internal position at some point).

(21)

Ion și-a vândut casa unor rude/ la niște rude.

Ion he.REFL.DAT.=has sold house.the some.DAT relatives/at some relatives

'Ion sold his house to some relatives.'

Some results

1. Datives inside *vP* –whether *la*- DAT or Inf- DAT - are uniformly either KPs or PPs.

2. *La*- and K_{dative} are exponents of Person which encode sensitivity to the AH.

3. When K is [*i*Person], the Person feature of datives is checked KP-internally, while the Case feature is checked derivationally. The clitic is unnecessary and thus impossible.

4. When K is [*u*Person], the ultimate exponent of Person is the clitic, whose presence is mandatory.

A consequence

Given the feature structure of datives [*u/i* Person, *u* Case: Dative], the applicative verb that licenses them should be endowed with the following features:

V_{appl}[*u*Person, *u*Case:___].

3 Briefly on the syntax of Romanian DOM

3.1 3.1. Background

The obligatory marker of Romanian DOM is the space preposition *pe* ‘on’/ ‘towards’/ ‘against’, similar to Spanish *a*. Unlike *a*, however, *pe* assigns accusative case to its object. Therefore, Romanian is not among the many languages where DOM-ed DO and IOs share the same dative/oblique case, sameness of case representing an explicit connection between the two (ManziniFranco2016).

One of the reviewers stresses that DOM *pe* derives from the *directional* uses of the Old Romanian (=OR) preposition *p(r)e*, which was often used with directional/Goal verbs (e.g. *striga* ‘call’, *asculta* ‘listen to’, *întreba* ‘ask’), as well as with verbs which entailed the presence of an opponent (e.g. *lupta* ‘fight’), as in the following example:

(22)

Old Romanian (HillMardale2017: 395).

*au ascultat **pre mine***

have listened DOM me

‘they have listened to me’

Significant research on the history of DOM has demonstrated that in OR the presence of the functional preposition *p(r)e* was a means of upgrading the object, signaling a *contrastive topic* interpretation (Hill2013, Hill & Mardale, 2017). Furthermore, in OR, *p(r)e* was not restricted to animate nouns, as shown in (??) below:

(23)

Old Romanian (HillMardale2017: 396)

*și deaderă lui Iacov **pre bozii** cei striini .*

and gave DAT Jakob DOM weeds.the the foreign

‘And they gave to Jakob the foreign weeds’

In Modern Romanian (ModR), the noun classes compatible with DOM have been reduced to animate, predominantly [+human] nouns. This restriction is in line with the change in the discourse function of DOM, “from a marker of Contrastive Topic [...] to a *backgrounding device* for the [+human] noun in the discourse (Hill2013)”. Thus in ModR, the most frequent discourse role of DOM-ed

objects is that of *familiarity topic*, a role which is strengthened by the frequent association of DOM with CD (HillMardale2017).

Reinterpreting these important results in the framework of our analysis, it follows that although they do not share Case, DOM-ed DOs and IOs share other properties in Romanian, too. Thus, DOM is sensitive to the AH, which means that both DOM-ed DOs and IOs grammaticalize [Person].

Similarly, the DOM marker *pe* ‘on’/ ‘to(wards)’ can easily be analyzed as a K head (Lopez2011, HillMardale2017), a *spell-out of Person*, behaving in all respects like dative *la*, except that *pe*-phrases check an accusative feature. Tentatively, the feature structure of *pe*-KPs is as follows: [*u/i*Person, *u*Case:Acc]. When *pe* selects the [*u*Person] option, a clitic extends the KP, forming a chain that ultimately values the [*u*Person] feature.

In harmony with its familiar topic discourse role, DOM is also sensitive to the DefH (??), which arranges nominal expression by order of their referential stability. Thus, DOM is obligatory for personal pronouns and proper names, which are always referentially stable, it is felicitous but optional with definite and indefinite DPs, and it is impossible with determinerless nouns.

(24)

personal pronouns > proper names//> definite phrases > indefinite specific> indefinite non-specific > // bare plurals> bare singular.

In its turn, CD is *possible* and *optional* for all accusative KPs, while being *obligatory* only for *personal pronouns*. Finally CD is not possible for bare DOs, i.e. it operates on KPs, not DPs, presumably because only KPs are marked for [Person].

3.2 3.2. The syntax of DOM

As for the syntax of DOM, I have provisionally adapted to Romanian the analysis in Lopez2011. Lopez maintains the classical view that accusative case originates in *v*. In DOM languages there are two strategies of checking the accusative. Some objects remain *in situ* and satisfy their Case requirement by *incorporation* into the lexical verb *V*, which finally incorporates into *v*. DOM-ed objects *scramble* to the specifier of an α P located between the little *v* and the lexical VP, a position where they are directly probed by little *v*, as in (??).

(??) *v*P

ru

Su *v*'

ru
 $v \alpha P$
 ru
 αVP
 ru
 V DO

The background assumption is that the grammar operates with nominals of different sizes (??), which may have different syntactic and semantic properties.

(25)

KP > DP > // NumP > NP

In Romanian the cut-off point between objects that scramble and objects that remain *in situ* is the NumP: i.e. NumP and NPs remain *in situ*, DPs may scramble, KPs *must* scramble. On the semantic side, *in situ* objects are interpreted as *predicates*, objects that scramble are interpreted as *arguments*.

4 Dative clitics and CD-Theory

4.1 4.1. On clitics

As already shown, with CD, both dative and accusative clitics select KPs [*uPerson*], showing sensitivity to the AH. Accusative clitics also observe the DefH. For instance they exclude bare quantifiers; in contrast, dative doubling is possible for *any nominal* provided that it has an overt determiner (Cornilescu2017).

For the current analysis what matters most is that CD-ed DOs and IOs *exit the* vP , passing through a vP -periphery position which allows them to bind and outscope the subject in Spec, vP (Dobrovie Sorin1994, Tigău 2010, CDT 2017). Binding of the subject is impossible for undoubled objects. Thus in (??), the CD-ed dative *fiecărui profesor* ‘every.DATprofessor’ binds and outscopes the preverbal subject *câte doi studenți* ‘some two students’. Similarly, in (??), the post-verbal doubled DO may bind a possessive in the preverbal subject, but this is not possible for the undoubled DO.

(26)

Romanian
Câte doi studenți i-au ajutat fiecărui profesor.

some two students he.DAT=have helped each.dat professor
 ‘Each professor was helped by two students.’

(27)

Romanian

a. *Muzica lor_i îi =plictisește pe mulți_{i/j}*
 music.the their they.ACC bores DOM many

‘Their own music bores many people.’

b. *Muzica lor*_{i/j} plictisește pe mulți_i*.

music.the their_j bores on many_i

‘Their music bores many people.’

The identity of the *v*P periphery projection through which clitics pass on the way to T is still under debate. Some researchers (e.g. Ciucivara2009) propose that this is a projection where clitics check Case, while others argue that it is a PersonP at the *v*P periphery (Belletti, 2004, Stegoveč, 2015), in whose specifier any [*u*Person] nominal can value this feature (??). In line with the analysis above, I have adopted the second proposal. Since Person is an agreement feature, rather than an operator one, Spec, PersonP is an *argumental position*. In conclusion, before going to the Person field above T (Ciucivara2009), the clitic phrase reaches a *Person P*, at the *v*P periphery, above the subject constituent (??).

(28)

PersonP

qp

KP Person

[*u*Pers] qp

Person *v*P

[*i*Person] e

Subject...

4.2 4.2 A suitable clitic theory: Preminger2016

Of the many available theories of CD, I have selected Preminger2016, which is theoretically more motivated and also simpler; for instance, it does not require a big DP. Rather the starting point is a standard DP/KP. In Preminger’s interpretation, CD is an instance of *long D-head movement*, as in (??). The D moves from

its DP position and adjoins to little *v*, skipping the V head (which is why this is an instance of long head movement).

(29)

*v*P
 ei
 D⁰-*v*⁰ VP
 ei
 V DP
 ei
 D⁰ NP

What is specific to the CD chain is that *both copies of D are pronounced*, the higher one is the clitic, the lower one is (part of) the associate DP. Pronunciation of two copies of a chain is allowed only if a phasal boundary is crossed (the DP boundary in (??)). The two copies are often phonologically distinct.

5 On the syntax of ditransitives

5.1 5.1 Previous results

My analysis of ditransitives assumes the syntax of DOM above. For reasons presented in detail elsewhere (CDT 2017), I have adopted a *classical derivational analysis* of the dative alternation (Harada & Larson, 2009, Ormazabal & Romero, 2017). Previous research on Romanian ditransitives (DiaconescuRivero2007), Cornilescu e.a. 2017) has brought to light several properties relevant for ditransitive binding configurations.

a. Binding evidence points to the fact that in Romanian ditransitives the internal arguments show a Theme-over-Goal structure. Thus, as sentences (??) and (??) above indicate, the bare DO can bind, not only into an undoubled dative, but also into a doubled one. A Theme-over-Goal base configuration has also been argued for other Romance languages (see, for instance, Cepeda & Cyrino (this volume) on Portuguese).

b. In ditransitive constructions, the DO and IO show *symmetric binding potential*, so that there is often an ambiguity between direct and inverse binding for the same pattern. The preferred reading is the one where the surface order corresponds to the direction of binding. For lack of space I will ignore these ambiguities in the analysis below.

c. There is no difference between the CD-ed and the clitic-less constructions, as far as c-command configurational properties are concerned (CDT 2017), i.e. the DO and the IO have symmetric binding abilities *irrespective of the presence of the clitic*.

I claim that Romanian possesses a genuine alternation between a Prepositional Dative construction, similar to the *to*-construction in English, and a pattern similar to DOC, where the dative is analyzed as a KP. In the Prepositional Dative construction, the P is *null* and has the usual role of case-licensing its KP complement. If the null P incorporates, the dative is licensed by an applicative head with the features $V_{\text{appl}} [u\text{Person}, u\text{Case:} ___]$, for reasons explained in section 2.4 above.

The *focus of the analysis that follows* is to understand why some otherwise available binding configurations become degraded when the DO is DOM-ed.

In order to bring out the contribution of DOM in ditransitive constructions, we compare derivations where the DO is a DP, not a KP, in which case it is not marked for [Person], with derivations in which the DO is DOM-ed, and has [Person] marking. The IO is also successively a PP, a KP, a cl+KP.

5.2 5.2. The DO is a DP (i.e. it is not DOM-ed)

In the *basic ditransitive configuration* the dative is a PP. This configuration, which corresponds to example (??) above *unambiguously* expresses a Theme > Goal interpretation (well-attested). The null P checks Case, and K is [*i*Person], irrespective of whether the IO is an Inf-DAT or a *la*-DAT.

(30)

VP
 ep
 DP_{theme} V'
 Case:[ACC] to
 V PP
 ei
 P KP
 [∅] [*u*Case:DAT, *i*Pers]

When null P incorporates, as in (??), $V_{\text{appl}} [u\text{Pers}, u\text{Case:} ___]$ is projected. In (??), both nominals in the domain of V_{appl} could value the Case feature of V_{appl} , but only the Goal can value its [*u*Pers $___$] feature, since the Theme is a DP not

marked for [Person]. Suppose a derivation is intended where the IO *binds* and *precedes* the DO, as in example (??) below. In this case, the DO need not move, while the IO should raise past it to Spec, Appl. This derivation is straightforward. V_{appl} is allowed to case-license the Theme first, since V_{appl} encounters the DO first, when it probes its domain. Next, adopting the locality theory in **Dogget2004** in order to maintain the standard direction of Agree, the Goal moves to an outer Spec,VP, above the Theme. In this position it can be probed by V_{appl} , which thus values its own [*uPers*] feature. At the following step, the Goal KP moves further up to Spec, V_{appl} P where it checks Case by Agree with little *v*.

(31)

vP
 ep
 $v V_{\text{appl}}P$
 ep
 $V_{\text{appl}} VP$
 [*uPers*:__ , *uCase*:__] ep
 $DP_{\text{theme}} V'$
 Case:ACC] ei
 $V KP_{\text{goal}}$
 $P+V$ [*uCase*:DAT, *iPers*

(32)

Romanian (CD**Tb2017**: 201)

IO before DO; IO > DO

*Recepționarul arată **fiecăru**_i camera **lui**_i.*

receptionist.the showed each.DAT tourist room.the his.

‘The receptionist showed each tourist his room.’

Cliticization is unnecessary, since the Goal is s-selected, and its Person feature is interpretable. Symmetric binding is predicted to be available, since in the initial structure Theme c-commands Goal, and in the derived structure(s) Goal c-commands Theme. Next we consider (??), where a CD-ed IO binds and precedes a bare DO.

(33)

Statul le=a restituit foștilor proprietari

state.the t hey.DAT=has returned former.the.DAT owners

casele naționalizate.

houses.the nationlized

‘The state returned the nationalized houses to their former owners.’

The presence of the clitic shows that the dative KP is [*uPers*], as in (??). For the sake of simplicity I will again consider a derivation where the DO does not scramble and V_{appl} checks its Case feature through Agree. At this point, both of the Goal’s features are unchecked, and V_{appl} still has an unvalued [*uPerson*] feature.

(34)

ApplP

qp

Appl VP

[*uPers*:__] qp

[*uCase*:__] DP_{Theme} V’

z----- [*Case*:ACC] wp

V KP_{Goal} [*uPers*:__, *Case*:DAT]

The Goal moves to a position (an outer specifier of VP) where it is accessible to V_{appl} and there is Agree between V_{appl} and the dative, which now shares a [*uPerson*] feature, but *neither feature is deleted*, since both occurrences of the features are *unvalued and uninterpretable*. The two features are related by agreement and count as instances of the same feature (PesetskyTorrego2007). As in the preceding derivation, the Goal raises to Spec, Appl and checks Case with little *v*, but its [*uPerson*] feature is still unvalued. This is what *forces movement to the PersonP, at the vP-periphery*, as in (??). When all the features of the Goal have been valued, the Goal undergoes cliticization.

(35)

PersP

ei

Pers vP

[*iPers*] ri

DP_{Goal} vP

[*uPers*] ro

Su v'
 ei
 v V_{Appl}P
 ei
 DP_{Goal} V_{Appl}'
 ei
 V_{Appl} VP
 [*u*Pers]ei
 z---DP_{Goal} VP
 [*u*Pers]ei
 DP_{Theme} V
 ei
 V DP_{Goal}

CD was obligatory because the Goal's Person feature could not be checked inside vP.

5.3 5.3 When DOM-ed themes and dative goals combine

Sentences with DOM and datives create locality problems, since both objects are KPs marked for the same [*i/u* Person] feature and both may value the [*u*Person] feature of V_{appl}. The empirical facts are summed up in (??):

(36)

a) A *pe*-marked DO binds an undoubled IO without problems (sentence (??) above)

b) A *pe*-marked DO cannot bind a CD-ed IO (sentence (??) above).

c) A CD-ed *pe*-marked Object can bind an IO, irrespective of CD (sentences (??)-(6) above).

These facts follow from the analysis. A natural explanation for why a *pe*-marked object can bind an IO (= (??)) is that, in this case the IO stays low and *may be (re)analyzed as a PP*, thus not competing with the DO.

(37)

vP
 qP
 v αP

[*uCase*:__] qp
 KP_{DO} α P
iPers eo
uCase:ACC α' VP
 eo
 <KP_{DO}> V'
 eo
 V PP
 eo
 P KP_{IO}

The *pe*-marked DO in (??) scrambles, and it is only for this reason that a landing site is projected between little *v* and VP, as in Lopez's analysis. The DO is [*iPerson*] and does not need to move beyond its case checking position (Spec, α P). Let me turn to situations (37b-c) now. When the IO is CD-ed and there is DOM, the result is ungrammatical, as in sentence (??) above. A CD-ed *pe*-object restores grammaticality, as in (??) above. Since CD-ed DOM-ed objects are unproblematic, it could be suggested that sentence (??) is ungrammatical because, at the current stage in the evolution of Romanian, *pe*-DOs are well-formed only *if they are also CD-ed*. The following Google example shows however, that CD is *not obligatory* for *pe*-DOs, except for personal pronouns.

(38)

Romanian (Google)

*Zavaidoc a tocmi**t pe un asasin** care a injunghiat=o mortal*

Zavaidoc has hired DOM an assassin who has stabbed=she.ACC mortally
pe Zaraza.

DOMZaraza

'Zavaidoc hired an assassin who stabbed Zaraza to death.'

Therefore, the marginality of (??) cannot be attributed to the absence of the clitic, but to some kind of "interference" between the *pe*-DOs and CD-ed IOs. I suggest that the problem concerns the locality of Agree, interfering with the feature structure of the two objects.

Consider the following intermediate stage (??) in the derivation of sentences like (??). If the IO is CD-ed, then its Person feature is uninterpretable and the dative KP must check both Person and Case against appropriate functional heads. On the other hand the DOM-ed DO is [*iPers*] (since it does not need a clitic) and must only value its Case.

When V_{Appl} probes its c-command domain, the DOM-ed object is the first that it encounters, so V_{Appl} agrees with the *closer goal* and values its own Person and Case features and it further attracts the KP-DO to its Specifier, since, by assumption, DOM-ed DOs scramble (Lopez2011). The IO is trapped in its merge position, and cannot check Case and Person anymore, so that the derivation crashes.

(39)

νP
 eo
 $\nu V_{\text{Appl}}P$
 qp
 $V_{\text{Appl}} VP$
 $uPers qp$
 $uCase:Acc KP_{\text{DO}} V'$
 $! iPers eo$
 $z \text{_____} uCase:Acc V KP_{\text{IO}}$
 $[uPers]$
 $[uCase:Dat]$

The problem disappears if the DO is CD-ed, as in sentences (??), (??) above. For simplicity's sake I will examine sentences where the CD-ed *pe*-DO binds an undoubted IO. In this case, the *pe*-DP is endowed with an uninterpretable Person feature, which will be checked in the νP periphery Person P, just as with datives.

The accusative clitic's role is syntactic: intuitively "it moves the Theme out of the Goal's way" (Anagnostopoulou2006). The DO moves to Spec, V_{Appl} , a position where it can be probed by little ν which checks its accusative Case. Next it targets the PersonP at the νP periphery, where it Agrees with the [*i*Person] head and values [*u*Person]. When all the DO's features have been checked, cliticization is mandatory. The features of V_{Appl} have not been valued yet and the IO is free to move to the outer Spec, VP, where the IO is probed by V_{appl} checking its case. The IO, whose person feature is interpretable, values the [Person] feature of V_{appl} and needs to raise no further. Resort to the Accusative clitic is a repair strategy: while the *DOM-ED DP_{theme}>cl- DP_{goal} pattern is severely degraded, the pattern cl- DOM-ED DP_{theme}>cl-DP_{goal}, which differs from the preceding only through the presence of the accusative clitic, is fully grammatical.

(40)

PersP
 ei
 Pers ν P
 [*i*Pers] ei
 KP_{theme} ν P
 [*u*Person] ei
 [ACC] DP_{Agent} ν'
 ei
 ν V_{appl}P
 [Case_] wp
 KP_{Theme} V'_{appl}
 [*u*Pers] ei
 [ACC] V_{Appl} VP
*u*Pers ei
 z_____KP_{Goal} VP
 [*i*Pers] ei
 KP_{Theme} V'
 [*u*Pers]ei
 V <KP_{Goal}>
 [*i*Pers]

6 Some theoretical implications of the analysis

Summing up the data we started with in (??) – (??) above and considering the categorial status of the arguments, as well as their (non)-clitic status, we obtain the patterns in (??).

(41)

- a. KP-DO *KP-IO/PP-IO
- b. Cl-KP KP IO
- c. Cl-KP Cl KP IO
- d. *KP-DO Cl-DP IO
- e. DP-DO (cl)-KP-IO

The critical property of the patterns is the need to check the [*u*Person] against the Appl head. Sentences of type (??), where the DO is a bare DP, which does not need to check Person, are fine irrespective of whether the IO is doubled or undoubled. In contrast, patterns (??)-(42d) contain two nominals (KPs) that check

Person, the DOM-ed direct object and the IO. These types of sentences rely on the configuration in (??), where the same Appl head should Agree with two arguments, a configuration familiar from the analysis of PCC effects (see Sheehan this volume and the references therein).

(42)

Appl [*u*Person] DOM DO [*i/u*Person] IO [*i/u*Person]

What differentiates between (??) and (??)-(42d) is that in (??)-(??), but not in (??), not only the IO, but also the DO *agrees with Appl*. Recall that according to Preminger2017, PCC effects are likely to occur whenever the relevant DO agrees with *v* or Appl. Indeed the distribution of the stars in (??)-(??) may be restated as a form of PCC, as also suggested for Spanish ditransitives with DOM, by OrmazabalRomero2013.

(43)

PCC like effects in Romanian ditransitives

In a combination of DOM-ed DO and IO, the IO can be doubled (or a clitic) only if the DO is also doubled (or a clitic).

The admissible patterns in (??)-(42d) fall in line with this generalization. Pattern (??), where neither argument is provided with a clitic would be ungrammatical if the dative had been a KP[*u*Person]. This ungrammaticality is not detected, since the dative is a second, locative argument and can be analyzed as a PP which checks the Case and Person feature of the DP, PP internally, as shown in the discussion of (??) above. Projection as a PP in (??) functions as a repair strategy. In the ungrammatical (??), the undoubled DO blocks the lower clitic-doubled dative, preventing it from checking Person (and Case) and producing a PCC-like effect. Patterns (??)-(42c) are fine since the DO and IO arguments check Person against different heads (Person P, ApplP, respectively), avoiding the problem of multiple arguments agreeing with the same head.

Finally, the data analyzed in this paper provide further evidence for Sheehan's (this volume) insight that PCC-like phenomena do not depend on (non)clitic status of the arguments, but on the emergence of a configuration of type (??). In the ungrammatical pattern (??)/(42d), the DO, in the intervener role, is not a clitic, only the IO is.

7 Conclusions

- DOM-ed DOs interfere with IOs since both are sensitive to AH, codified as [Person].
- The interaction of DOM-ed DO and IOs in Romanian is a classical locality problem based on the fact that the same applicative head matches two nominals in its c-command domain, regarding [Person]. The head agrees with the closer object, i.e. the DO. In such configurations, the IO must be a PP, i.e. it cannot be doubled.
- When the DO object is CD-ed, the IO may be a KP and accessing V_{appl} and it may even be CD-ed.

%move bib entries to localbibliography.bib

Anagnostopoulou, Elena. 2006. \textit{Clitic doubling}. In Martin Everaert

```
@article{Belletti2004,  
  author = {Belletti, Adriana},  
  journal = {\textit{Probus}},  
  number = {1},  
  pages = {1--36},  
  title = {Extended doubling and the {VP} periphery},  
  volume = {17},  
  year = {2004}  
}
```

```
@thesis{Ciucivara2009,  
  address = {New York},  
  author = {Ciucivara, Oana},  
  school = {NYU},  
  title = {\textit{A syntactic analysis of the pronoun doubling phenomenon in Romanian}},  
  year = {2009}  
}
```

```
@incollection{Cornilescu2017,  
  address = {București},  
  author = {Cornilescu, Alexandra},
```

```
booktitle = {\textit{Sintaxa} \textit{ca} \textit{mod} \textit{de} \textit{a} \textit{t}}
editor = {Adina Dragomirescu \biberror{et al}.},
pages = {131--148},
publisher = {Editura Universităţii},
title = {{Dative} clitics and obligatory clitic doubling in Romanian},
year = {2017}
}
```

```
@article{CornilescuCornilescu2017,
author = {Cornilescu, Alexandra, Anca Dinu and Alina Tigău},
journal = {Experimental data on Romanian double object constructions \textstyleS
note = {.}},
number = {2},
pages = {157--177},
sortname = {Cornilescu, Alexandra, Anca Dinu and Alina Tigau},
volume = {62},
year = {2017a}
}
```

```
@article{CornilescuCornilescu2017,
author = {Cornilescu, Alexandra, Anca Dinu and Alina Tigău},
journal = {\textstyleStrong{\textmd{\textit{Revue} \textit{Roumaine} \textit{de}
note = {.}},
number = {2},
pages = {179--206},
sortname = {Cornilescu, Alexandra, Anca Dinu and Alina Tigau},
title = {Romanian dative configurations: {{D}}itransitive verbs, a tentative ana
volume = {62},
year = {2017b}
}
```

```
@article{DiaconescuDiaconescu2007,
author = {Diaconescu, Rodica and Maria Luisa Rivero},
journal = {\textit{Probus}},
number = {2},
```

```
pages = {209--233},  
title = {An applicative analysis of double object constructions in Romanian},  
volume = {19},  
year = {2007}  
}
```

```
@book{Dobrovie-Sorin1994,  
address = {Berlin},  
author = {Dobrovie-Sorin, Carmen},  
publisher = {Mouton de Gruyter},  
title = {\textit{The} \textit{syntax} \textit{of} \textit{Romanian}},  
year = {1994}  
}
```

```
@thesis{Dogget2004,  
address = {\textit{All} \textit{things} \textit{being} \textit{unequal:} \textit{L}},  
author = {Dogget, Teal},  
school = {MIT},  
year = {2004}  
}
```

```
@incollection{HaradaHarada2009,  
address = {Cambridge, MA},  
author = {Harada, Naomi and Richard Larson},  
booktitle = {\textit{Proceedings} \textit{of} \textit{the} \textit{5th} \textit{Wo}},  
editor = {Ryosuke Shibagaki and Reiko Vermeulen},  
pages = {109--120},  
publisher = {MITWPL},  
title = {Datives in {Japanese}},  
year = {2009}  
}
```

```
@article{Hill2013,  
author = {Hill, Virginia},
```

```
journal = {\textit{Journal} \textit{of} \textit{Australian} \textit{Linguistics}}
number = {2},
pages = {140--151},
title = {The direct object marker in Romanian, a historical perspective},
volume = {33},
year = {2013}
}
```

```
@article{HillHill2017,
author = {Hill, Virginia and Alexandru Mardale},
journal = {\textit{Revue} \textit{Roumaine} \textit{de} \textit{Linguistique} \textit{et}
note = {..}},
number = {4},
pages = {393--409},
title = {On the interaction of differential object marking and clitic doubling i
volume = {62},
year = {2017}
}
```

Lopez, Luis. 2011. \textit{Indefinite} \textit{objects.} \textit{Scrambling,} \textit{et}

```
@article{ManziniRita\&LudovicoFrancoFranco2016,
author = {Manzini Rita and Ludovico Franco},
journal = {\textit{Natural} \textit{Language} \textit{and} \textit{Linguistic} \textit{Theory}}
number = {1},
pages = {197--204},
title = {Goal and {DOM} datives},
volume = {34},
year = {2016}
}
```

```
@article{OrmazabalJavier\&JuanRomeroRomero2013,
author = {Ormazabal Javier and Juan Romero},
journal = {\textit{Borealis.} \textit{An} \textit{International} \textit{Journal}
pages = {211--239},
```

```
title = {Differential Object Marking, Case and Agreement},  
volume = {2},  
year = {2013}  
}
```

```
@book{OrmazabalJavier&JuanRomeroRomero2017,  
address = {Historical changes in Basque dative alternations},  
author = {Ormazabal Javier and Juan Romero},  
note = {\textit{Glossa} 2(1). 78.},  
publisher = {evidence for a P-based (neo) derivational analysis},  
year = {2017}  
}
```

```
@incollection{PesetskyPesetsky2007,  
address = {Amsterdam},  
author = {Pesetsky, David and Esther Torrego},  
booktitle = {\textit{Phrasal} \textit{and} \textit{Clausal} \textit{Architecture:}  
editor = {SiminKarimi, Vida Samiian, WendyK. Wilkins},  
pages = {262--294},  
publisher = {John Benjamins},  
title = {The syntax of valuation and the interpretability of features},  
year = {2007}  
}
```

```
@thesis{Rodríguez-Mondoñedo2007,  
address = {Storrs, Connecticut},  
author = {Rodríguez-Mondoñedo},  
school = {University of Connecticut},  
title = {\textit{The} \textit{syntax} \textit{of} \textit{objects:} \textit{Agree},  
year = {2007}  
}
```

```
@misc{Preminger2016,  
author = {Preminger, Omer},
```

```
note = {Ms. University of Maryland.},  
title = {What the {PCC} tells us about “abstract” agreement, head movement and l  
year = {2016}  
}
```

```
@article{RichardsMark2008,  
author = {Richards Mark},  
journal = {\textit{Linguistische} \textit{Arbeitsberichte}},  
pages = {137--161},  
title = {Defective Agree, case alternation, and the prominence of person},  
volume = {86},  
year = {2008}  
}
```

Roberts Ian \& Anna \citealt{Roussou2003}. \textit{Syntactic} \textit{change}. C

Stegoveč, Adrian. 2015. It's not Case, it's person! Reassessing the PCC and clitic