Ditransitive Constructions with DOM Direct Objects in Romanian

1.**Background** In Rom(anian) ditransitive constructions (DC), the Goal may be an *inflectional* dative, or a PP, introduced by *la* 'at, to'. Given their syntactic similarity, we limit ourselves to inflectional datives.

Currently, the most complete available study on Rom DC is Diaconescu & Rivero (2007) (=D&R), who treat the Dative as an applied argument and offer an alternative projection account. Restricting ourselves to verbs of *giving*, the two interpretations of these verbs, caused movement and caused possession are supposed to correspond to the following configurations:

(1)   *Theme c-commands Goal*
        $[_{VoiceP} DP_{Agent} Voice[_{vP} v [_{PP} DP_{Theme} P DP_{Goal}]]]$
(2)   *Goal c-commands Theme* (clitic doubling, DOC)
        $[_{VoiceP} DP_{Agent} Voice[_{vP} v [_{ApplP} DP_{Goal} [\mathbf{cl}_{Appl}] [_{VP} V DP_{Theme}]]]]$

Representation (1) is the *caused motion structure*: the dative is a PP argument c-commanded by the Theme. Representation (2) is the *caused possession structure*, corresponding to the English DOC, as in Cuervo (2003); structure (2) represents the following properties of the DOC: The Goal is introduced by a LowAppl head, it is interpreted as a Possessor and it c-commands the Theme, determining the well-known asymmetries in Barss&Lasnik, 1987. D&R claim that these properties hold *only if the Goal is clitic doubled*. Hence the conclusion that in Rom, DOC interpretations (i.e. Goal > Theme) require CD and that Appl spells out as a *clitic*.

A closer look at the Rom binding data (Cornilescu, 2015) indicates that: a) DOC readings *do not depend on clitic doubling*. b) The two internal arguments show *symmetric c-command*. c) The analysis above is severely *incomplete*, excluding many grammatical patterns. For instance, the following acceptable example shows that an undoubled (i.e.) low dative may bind into a Theme, contrary to the prediction of (1): *Angajatorii nu au dat* **tuturor muncitorilor**$_i$ *drepturile lor$_i$ bănești,* 'The employers didn't give all the workers their due money.'

2. Problem and aim We turn to data not discussed for Roman so far and consider the grammaticality differences triggered by DOM-ed DOs. Specifically, despite (1), a DOM-ed Theme cannot bind into the lower dative Goal (3). Also, despite (2), a CD-ed Goal cannot bind into a DOM-ed Theme (4). Both (3a) and (4a) become grammatical if the Theme is CD-ed:

(3)a.   ?*DOM- DP_{theme} > DP_{goal} b. **cl**-DOM-DP_{theme} > DP $_{goal}$
(4)a.   * (cl) DP_{goal}> DOM-DP_{theme} c. * (cl) DP_{goal}> **cl**-DOM-DP_{theme}

The *aim* of the paper is to offer a derivational account of DC, which could accommodate the differences between *bare DO* and *differentially marked ones*. Grammaticality judgments for all the patterns above derive from an experiment on Romanian DC, reported in Cornilescu, e.a. Dinu, Tigău (2016).

3. **DOM in Romanian** DOM-ed object must be marked by the preposition *pe* 'on' and may be CD-ed. Only personal pronouns require both *pe*-marking and CD. *Pe*-marking is obligatory for personal pronouns and proper names, but also for *bare quantifiers* with an implicit [+person] restriction: *cine* 'who', *nimeni* 'nobody', etc. From a semantic perspective Rom presents a "two-dimensional" DOM system, i.e. DOM is sensitive to the animacy, and the definiteness, hierarchies. De Swart&de Hoop (2007) stress that it is animacy which plays the decisive role, since animacy is an *inherent* NP property, while sensitivity to definiteness may be viewed as an interpretative contextual consequence of personhood. *Pe* is an operator on NP denotations, selecting only [+person] DPs, and [*pe*-DPs]] are marked as [+*i*person]

Dative DPs An important distinction holds between inflectional and prepositional Datives. Inflectional Datives are sensitive to the animacy hierarchy and occur (only) with [+person (like)] DPs.

3. A derivational account of ditransitive constructions

The derivational approach requires establishing the basic structural configuration of the lexical VP, i.e. whether the initial position of the Dative is high or low. As an inherent Case phrase, the Dative should be analyzed as a PP (Woolford, 2006), a status confirmed by the hehavior of Datives inside APs or DPs, as well as the by the alternation between the Dative and the *la*-DP. The re-analysis of [PP *la*^DP] and of the Dative as DPs has probably been triggered by the emergence of clitics and CD. Given this, we analyze Dative DPs as second objects which merge in a *low position*, in a Theme-over-Goal basic configuration (5). Unlike Pylkkänen (2002) and like Larson (2010) we take *the Goal to be part of the verb's a-structure*. Appl case licenses the Dative, and, we propose, it also contributes to its θ-interpretation.

(5)   [ApplP Appl[uPerson, EPP] [VP DP$_{theme}$ [V DP$_{goal}$]

Rappaport &Levin (2008), prove that *verbs of giving*, unlike *verbs of throwing*, have *only* one event structure, representing, the *caused possession* reading, and *lack the caused movement* reading. With *give*-verbs, the Dative must be interpreted as a *Possessor*, not as a Goal, in spite of its low Goal position in (5). The problem is how to accommodate this change of θ-roles (Goal to Possessor) in the derivational approach. We argue that θ-roles, which are bundles of features (Reinhart, 2000), may be *derivationally constructed*, by the DP's interacting with functional heads like Appl, which introduce semantic features in the derivation (also Landau, 2010). This semantic enrichment may lead to the concomitant loss of features from the initially assigned role. Thus the Goal and the Possessor share a [Location] feature, (i.e. possession amounts to placement at the Possessor), but differ in terms of a [person] feature, which is unnecessary, for Goals. We propose that Appl is endowed with a strong [$u$person] feature, valued by the Goal DP. At the same time, valuation of [uPerson] entails loss of the [Path component], which typically accompanies the Goal. The loss of Path allows the interpretation of the small clause as a *state*, rather than an event, whence the caused possession interpretation. As to *free word-order*, we adopt MacDonald's (2015) suggestion, that while the Dative must raise to get the Possessor interpretation, at PF, it may be pronounced either in the higher or in the lower position, with the choice depending on discourse factors. The *symmetric binding potential* property is also predicted: Theme > Goal interpretations rely on the initial configuration, while Goal>Theme readings result from the obligatory raising of the Possessor-Goal to the Spec, ApplP position.

5. DOM-ed Objects and Locality

As mentioned, DOM is a means of upgrading a DP on the animacy/definiteness scales, treating it as a DP[$i$person]. Similarly, Dative DPs are also sensitive to animacy and are endowed with an interpretable [$i$person] feature. Sameness in marking animate DO/IO is a common situation (Spanish, Hindi, a.o.). Recall now that Appl is endowed with a [$u$person, EPP] feature itself. In the ensuing structure, there is one Probe and two potential goals, both endowed with [$i$person] features. Both objects are in a configuration of Agree with Appl, but the DO is closer, so in this configuration (6), there is Agree with the DO, with the result that the Goal is caseless and (3a) is ungrammatical. The problem disappears if the DO is doubled, since in this case the big DP exits the vP. We thus derive the contrast between the well formed **cl**-DOM-DP$_{theme}$ > DP$_{goal}$ and the ill-formed *DOM- DP$_{theme}$ > DP$_{goal}$ in (4), and likewise for the contrasts in (4).

(6)   [ApplP Appl[uPerson, EPP] [VP DP$_{theme}$[iPerson] [V' V DP$_{goal}$[iPerson]]

References: Diaconescu&Rivero 2007. An Applicative Analysis of Double Object Constructions