WHY *GIVE* DOES NOT IN CORPORATE IN DENOMINAL VERBS

ADINA CAMELIA BLEOTU[1]

Abstract. This paper looks at denominal verbs which can be paraphrased by means of the verb *give*, and argues that the verb *GIVE* cannot incorporate. On the one hand, it does not represent a primitive in the lexical semantic representation of verbs, an explanation which might be a bit problematic given that other non-primitive verbs have been argued to incorporate (*HAVE, PUT*) (Hale & Keyser 2002). On the other hand, if one embraced the possibility that nouns could be incorporated into the null verb *GIVE*, this would give rise to syntactic and semantic problems, such as the formation of a verb with other case-assigning properties than the light verb it allegedly derives from, the formation of a verb with a completely different meaning from the expected one a.o. Such evidence supports the idea that paraphrases need to be clearly distinguished from the actual lexical semantic representation of denominals. The paper puts forth an account in terms of the applicative analysis proposed by MacDonald (2015), arguing that, from a syntactic point of view, the DO noun is prevented from incorporating by the IO. It also argues that there is an animacy bias at stake, and that animate objects cannot incorporate, especially if they are subjects of small clauses. Last but not least, it tentatively puts forth the idea of nominal root incorporation before the selection of arguments, suggesting that the light verb *GIVE* might actually incorporate, but, once it incorporates (thus losing one object), it can only assign (Accusative) case to its remaining object.

Keywords: denominal verbs, incorporation, applicatives.

1. AIM

The aim of this paper is to take a look at denominal verbs which can be paraphrased by means of the verb *give*, and argue that the verb *GIVE* cannot incorporate[2].

[1] University of Bucharest, cameliableotu@gmail.com.

RRL, **LXII**, *2*, p. 207–219, Bucureşti, 2017

BDD-A26035 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 00:54:09 UTC)

I bring arguments in favour of the view that incorporating a noun into the null verb *GIVE* would generate both syntactic and semantic problems, thus arguing that one needs to clearly distinguish between paraphrases, which are merely useful tools in capturing the approximate meaning of verbs, and the actual lexical semantic representation of denominals. In other words, in spite of the fact that the verb *a dărui* 'to give' in Romanian can be paraphrased as 'a da un dar cuiva', lit. 'to give a gift to somebody (DATIVE)', this does not necessarily mean that the paraphrase is the lexical semantic representation and the starting point for the formation of the denominal verb *a dărui.*

One possible solution to the problem would be to argue that the reason for the failure of incorporation is semantic in nature, namely, the verb *GIVE* is not a semantic primitive, being decomposable into other verbs (CAUSE to BE of somebody else). However, this is a slightly problematic option, given the fact that other semantically non-primitive verbs have been argued to incorporate (e.g. PUT) (Hale & Keyser 2002). Another possible solution would be to argue that the reason for this impossibility is syntactic in nature, namely, there is a syntactic constraint at stake. As shall become clear in the analysis adopted, *GIVE* enters a double object construction (DOC) and the IO prevents the DO from incorporating. In addition, an animacy bias may further explain this failure to incorporate, as [+animate] objects never incorporate (and indirect objects tend to be [+animate]). The syntactic explanation is thus further supported by semantic considerations.

In my paper, I briefly present the theory of incorporation, then I tackle the issue of paraphrases and examine various solutions to the problems encountered, opting for an account in terms of blocking of incorporation by the IO and an animacy constraint.


2. ON INCORPORATION

According to incorporation/ conflation accounts (Hale and Keyser 1998, 2000, Mateu 2000, 2002), denominal verbs are the result of incorporation (i.e. of the movement of N into V, or of the movement of N into P, and then of the whole P–N complex into V) or conflation (i.e. of the merge/ copy of the signature of N into V, or of the merge/ copy of the signature of N into P, and then of everything into V):


[2] In the paper, I will use *give* to refer to the lexical verb and *GIVE* to refer to the light verb that occurs in paraphrases. While the lexical verb has phonological content, the light verb does not.

BDD-A26035 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 00:54:09 UTC)

(1) a. for a verb such as *dance*:



b. for a verb such as *shelve the books*:



These accounts rely heavily on paraphrases (hence, null/ silent items): *dance*= 'DO dance', *shelve the books*= 'PUT the books ON shelf' a.o., and establish a lexical semantic representation of the verb, constituting the starting point for incorporation. The question would be whether the paraphrase and the lexical semantic representation are the same thing or not.


3. THE ISSUE OF PARAPHRASES AND POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS

Within Hale and Keyser's (2002) theory of incorporation/conflation, one would expect the 'paraphrase' of the denominal and the denominal verb to have the same selectional requirements, and this is indeed the case. Both *put on shelves* and *shelve* require an Accusative DP object (*put the books on shelves, shelve the books*). Also, both *hit/do with hammer* and *hammer* require an Accusative DP object (*hit the table with a hammer, hammer the table*).

However, this is not always so. In my argumentation, I rely on examples from Romanian and English. In Romanian, *a înghionti* 'to nudge', for instance, has the lexical paraphrase 'a da (un) ghiont' ('to give (a) nudge'), as can be seen in (2a). If this paraphrase is considered the lexical semantic representation, the verb *GIVE* cannot incorporate, as incorporating the noun into the light verb would lead to the formation of a denominal verb assigning Dative to its indirect object (2b). Since there is no such verb, but, instead, the verb *a înghionti* requires an Accusative object, it seems to be the case that we are dealing with a clear contrast between lexical paraphrases and lexical semantic representations:


BDD-A26035 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 00:54:09 UTC)

(2) a.



(Larson 1986)

b.



Similarly, there is a difference between *a bucura* ('to make somebody happy'), requiring the Accusative 'pecineva', literally 'on somebody' (but 'pe' is actually a differential object marker) and *a da bucurie* (lit. 'to give joy'), requiring a Dative object.

Also, although the verb *to pain* requires a DP in the Accusative (*to pain somebody*), the paraphrase *to give pain* takes a Prepositional Dative (*to give pain to somebody*), which alternates with a double object construction: *to give somebody pain*. Similarly, although the verb *to gift* requires a DP in the Accusative (*to gift somebody*), the paraphrase *to give a gift* takes a PP object (*to give a gift to somebody*).

Apart from denominals which only add the regular verbal suffix (*a, -e, -i, -u*) to the nominal root they derive from, there are also unprefixed denominals such as *a mitui* 'to bribe', which can be paraphrased as *a da mită* 'to give bribe' or prefixed denominals such *a îmbrânci* 'to push', for instance, which can receive the paraphrase *a da un brânci* 'to give a push', or *a îndurera* 'to pain', which can be paraphrased as *a da durere* 'to give pain' (although other common paraphrases are 'a provoca/ a cauza durere', i.e. 'to provoke/ to cause pain')[3]. Just like the previous examples, these verbs require the Accusative, while the paraphrases seem to require the Dative: *a da un brânci cuiva* ('to give a push to somebody') vs. *a îmbrânci pe cineva* ('to push some body'), *a da durere cuiva* ('to give pain to somebody') vs. *a îndurera pe cineva* ('to pain somebody'), *a da mită cuiva* ('to give bribe to somebody') vs. *a mitui pe cineva* ('to bribe somebody'). It thus seems to be the case that *a da* ('to give') can combine both with concrete objects (such as *brânci, mită* or *ghiont*), as well as with abstract objects (such as *bucurie*), but,

[3] There is a difference between *a da durere* and *a îndurera.* While the first is generally used to refer to physical pain, the latter is used to refer to psychological pain. In this sense, *a da durere* may be argued not to be an appropriate paraphrase. In fact, there are other cases of meaning differences between the verb and the expression: *a da formă* ('to give form') vs. *a forma* ('to form'), *a da dovadă*, lit. 'to give proof' ('to be an example of') vs. *a dovedi* ('to prove'). This semantic contrast represents an additional argument for the non-identity of paraphrases with verbs and the necessity to tease apart the paraphrase from the lexical semantic representation.

BDD-A26035 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 00:54:09 UTC)

although there are corresponding denominal verbs in both cases, there is a difference in the case assignment of the object by the verb and the paraphrase.

One possibility suggested by Alexandra Cornilescu is that, actually, in cases of the type *a bucura* ('to make sb happy', requiring the Accusative) versus *a da bucurie* ('to give joy', requiring the Dative), the difference in object case assignment is related to the fact that the direct object has actually incorporated. By incorporating the noun, the verb *da* has lost one of its objects (the direct object), and, hence, it can only assign Accusative to its remaining object. This would explain the difference between Accusative versus Dative marking of the object, which can be found not only in Romanian, but in other Romance languages as well (French, Italian a.o.). The fact that Accusative case is assigned to the object would be a consequence of incorporation. One problematic issue would, of course, be whether it is really nouns that are incorporated, and, if not, if it is actually nominal roots undergoing incorporation, whether N roots can receive case. If N roots cannot receive case, then the whole discussion of case assignment is superfluous. The verb would simply incorporate a nominal root and then, the resulting verb would assign case to its object. This seems to lead towards embracing the view that such denominal verbs are not the result of incorporation of the object noun into the null verb *GIVE*. The different selectional requirements of the paraphrase and the denominal (as well as the existence of a meaning difference between them in some cases) can be taken to suggest that the paraphrase is not a lexico-semantic representation or the starting point for the derivation of the denominal. There are several possible explanations for this.

(i) From a semantic point of view, null *give*, i.e. *GIVE* is not a semantic primitive, but can in its turn be decomposed as CAUSE [x to HAVE y], expressing transfer of possession. According to Levin & Rappaport Hovav (1998), the predicates used in the lexical semantic representation of verbs (states, activities, achievements, and accomplishments) are ACT/ DO, BE <STATE>, BECOME and CAUSE, but GIVE is not among them. The view that only primitive predicates can incorporate could be embraced.

One thus stumbles upon a very important issue that requires discussion: why is it that certain verbs can incorporate, while others do not? Hale & Keyser (2002) assume that verbs such as DO or PUT incorporate. However, while DO is a primitive verb, PUT is a case that requires discussion, as it could tentatively be decomposed as CAUSE [x to BE somewhere], so it would not qualify as a primitive in that sense. On the other hand, even a verb like HAVE can be decomposed into BE and a preposition of possession, if one considers that 'X has Y' means 'Y is of X'. The question of what is a primitive and what is not thus seems to be a quite delicate one. While certain verbs that may be argued not to be semantic primitives (such as DO and PUT) count as noun-incorporating (Hale & Keyser 2002), GIVE fails to be part of either group (it is neither a semantic primitive, nor noun-incorporating). Moreover, the predicate GIVE is not considered

BDD-A26035 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 00:54:09 UTC)

a predicate in the lexical semantic representation of verbs (Levin & Rappaport Hovav 1998), which distinguishes GIVE from a (non-primitive) verb such as BECOME (x [COME [TO BE y]]).

While the hypothesis that incorporation is restricted to semantic primitives may seem problematic (given, for instance, the use of BECOME in the lexical-semantic representation (Levin and Hovav 1998) and Hale and Keyser's (2002) use of PUT in their paraphrases of location verbs), the reason for the impossibility of incorporation into GIVE might be related to the type of object, more specifically:

(ii) From a syntactic viewpoint, it has been argued that the incorporated item has to be governed by the verb that incorporates it (Baker 1988).

According to Baker's (1988) condition on incorporation, incorporation is available to lexical items which, when in their un-incorporated basic positions, are governed by the host of incorporation. This basically prevents agents and adjuncts from incorporating, a view that is very problematic given the existence of instrument verbs such as *hammer*. It thus seems to be the case that either the formulation is too strong or, in fact, in the *hammer* example, the instrument is not projected as an adjunct.

In any case, the condition on incorporation could be thought not to affect the verb *GIVE*, as the verb requires two arguments, both of which are governed by the verb. In what follows, I will take a look at the structure from a syntactic point of view, and see if this is indeed the case, or rather one argument blocks the incorporation of the other because of its higher positioning in the structure. As previously mentioned, another possible reason could be related to an animacy constraint on incorporation:

(iii) Only [-animate] objects can be incorporated, [+animate] objects or subjects of small clauses cannot undergo incorporation.

While leaving aside the first explanation in terms of semantic primitiveness, given its problematic nature, I focus on solutions (ii) and (iii), trying to see to what extent incorporation into GIVE is constrained by government and animacy.

4. THE SYNTAX OF *GIVE* CONSTRUCTIONS

A verb such as *give* can combine with its arguments in two ways:

(3) a. *I gave a book* (Theme) *to Mary* (Goal). – Prepositional Object Construction (POC)
b. *I gave Mary* (Goal) *a book* (Theme). – Indirect Object Construction (IOC)

The sentences in (3) exemplify the Dative Alternation:

(4) a. NP_1 V NP_2 *to* NP_3
b. NP_1 V NP_3 NP_2

BDD-A26035 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 00:54:09 UTC)

In the literature, the Dative Alternation has mainly been analyzed by resorting to two kinds of approaches:

(i) derivational approaches/transform approaches (Larson 1988, 1990)

(ii) non-derivational approaches, associated with a different meaning (Pesetsky 1995)

A fundamental issue that these approaches have tried to capture is the asymmetry between the objects:

(5) a. *I showed Mary herself.*
b. **I showed herself Mary.*

In (5), the anaphor *herself* has to be bound, the Goal has to bind the Theme, and the analysis one proposes must capture this binding phenomenon. According to the version of UTAH espoused by Larson (1990):

(6) *Relativized UTAH:*


Identical thematic relationships are represented by identical relative hierarchical relations between items at D-structure.

In other words, if the theta role of argument 1 is higher on the thematic hierarchy (AGENT> THEME> GOAL> OBLIQUE) than the theta role of argument 2, argument 1 must c-command argument 2 at D-structure. This represents an aspect which must be taken into account by whatever analysis one adopts.


From a structural point of view, the transform analysis and the non-derivational analysis propose different representations for the Dative alternation:

(i) Derivational analysis (Larson 1988, 1990)

(7) a.




b.



BDD-A26035 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 00:54:09 UTC)

(ii) Non-derivation alanalysis (Pesetsky1995)

(8)



While in the derivational analysis the IOC is derived from the DOC, in the non-derivational analysis the Goal is simply generated above the Theme, and there is an empty preposition before it. The second analysis is problematic for the UTAH, but it solves the binding requirements at S-structure, through movement. Also, it receives evidence from the existence of idioms that involve the IO, such as *send to the wolves* or *take to task*.

The non-derivational analysis is supported by Harley (1997) in the article "If you *have*, you can *give*" although, according to her, the preposition is not empty, but has a possessive meaning (P_{HAVE}). Interestingly, there are languages (such as Irish) that lack possessive *have* and, consequently, they also lack a double object construction (in other words, (3b) is not possible).

One very important question is whether there is a Dative Alternation in Romanian.

(9) a. *I-* *am* *dat* *cartea* *Mariei.*
Cl.3rd.sg.DAT have-1st sg given book-Def Mary.DAT
'I gave the book to Mary'

b. *I-* *am* *dat* *Mariei* *cartea.*
Cl.3rd.sg.DAT have-1st.sg given Mary.DAT book-Def
'I gave Mary the book'

Is it the case that (9a) is derived from (9b)? The answer is no, there is no Dative Alternation, as there is no POC. In the Accusative, although one can sometimes encounter a sentence like (10a) in informal language, DOM is preferred for [-person] (10b):

(10) a. *?Am* *dat* *cartea* *la cineva/* *la nişte copii.*
have-1st.sg given book-Def to somebody to some kids
'I gave the book to somebody/ to some children'.

b. *A* *vorbit* *la pereți/ *pereților.*
has talked to walls/ *walls.DAT
'He talked to walls/ (walls-DAT)'

BDD-A26035 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 00:54:09 UTC)

However, this is not a case of POC, as one can clearly see there isno binding requirement:

(11) a. *I-* *am* *arătat Mariei*
Cl.3rd.sg.DAT have-1st.sg shown Mary.DAT
pe *ea* *însăşi.*
+preposition +pron-Def3rdsg. +strengthening pronoun3rdsg.
'I showed Mary herself.'

b. *I-am* *arătat pe ea*
Cl.3rd.sg.DAT have-1stsg shown prep+ pron-Def 3rdsg.
însăşi *Mariei.*
+ strengthening pronoun 3rdsg. +Mary-DAT
'I showed herself to Mary.'

This makes matters easier for Romanian, where one could easily assume either a non-derivational analysis or a derivational one. The first analysis would be less costly, from the point of view of the economy of the system, as there would be no need for movement in order to generate the basic construction. According to the first analysis, the Theme is base-generated above the Goal. In the verbs discussed (*a înghionti* 'to nudge', *a bucura* 'to make (somebody) happy', *a îndurera* 'to pain'), incorporation would result in a different case-marking of the argument of the resulting denominal verb. However, from a purely structural point of view, the Theme can undergo incorporation. While in the first analysis, it incorporates directly, in the second one, it first incorporates into P, and then the P-N complex incorporates into V. Unfortunately, these analyses fail to explain the absence of incorporation in the case of *GIVE*.

Given that one would perhaps expect some parallelism between the light verb GIVE and the lexical verb *give*, another issue requiring attention is whether there are cases where the lexical verb *give* incorporates, thus resulting in a compound. In Romanian, this is not the case, nor is it the case in English. However, in a language such as Warray, the fifth most-spoken native regional language of the Philippines, there seems to exist such a *give*-incorporation phenomenon, as can be seen in the 'give' compound *nyi-woy*. This compound is not translatable as merely *give a name,* but has to do with transferal of names, *ngirrwart*, an important feature of Warray social organization (Chappell and McGregor 1996). The fact that very few cases of *give*-incorporation seem to exist makes it debatable whether the verb *give* is actually at stake here, or perhaps one rather deals with a causation or creation meaning. This idea would also support the absence of incorporation into the light verb *GIVE.*

It would thus be the case that neither *GIVE* nor *give* can incorporate, a prediction which would thus be confirmed if one thinks of light verbs as lexical verbs deprived of certain features.

BDD-A26035 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 00:54:09 UTC)

4. NO INCORPORATION IN THE CASE OF *GIVE*. DIRECT OBJECT BLOCKING BY THE IO AND THE ANIMACY CONSTRAINT


The data seem to suggest that the PP/ IO cannot be incorporated into GIVE. The reason for this may be related to the IO being [+animate] (Animacy Constraint), and it representing the Possessor. While Themes, Instruments incorporate, it is not the case that we find denominal verbs which have incorporated Agents or Possessors. There seems to be ananimacy bias at stake, and when looking at verbs that have incorporated 'animate' entities, one notices that they are actually incorporated as manner or predicates, not as agents or possessors (see *to spy, to cook, to nurse*).

Interestingly, when the PP is [-animate], it can apparently incorporate sometimes, as in *a da în clocot*, lit.'to give in boiling', a paraphrase of *a clocoti* 'to boil', where one can detect a resultative meaning. This is not always the case, however: *a da de bucluc,* 'to give of/to trouble', meaning 'to run into trouble' does not give rise to *a bucluci*, and *a da în vileag*, lit.'to give in public', having the meaning 'to reveal in public' does not give rise to the verb *a vilegi.* It might simply be a case of lexical blocking by other items already existent in the lexicon. However, one might argue the reason for this is that *vileag* is animate. There are many other such expressions which do not give rise to verbs, although the *give* verb selects a PP that is [-animate]: *a da la iveală*, lit. 'to give to public' ('to reveal'), *a da la ziar*, lit. 'to give to newspaper'('to send to the newspaper'), *a se da în stambă/spectacol*, lit. 'to CL give in show' ('to make a fool of oneself'), *a se da de ceasul morții*, lit. 'to CL give against hour-DEF ART death-GEN' ('to try one's best'), *a da de necaz*, lit. 'to give against trouble' ('to run into trouble'), *a da îngropi*, lit. 'to give in pits' ('to behave in a very stupid manner'). While some are transitive (*a da în vileag, a da la iveală, a da la ziar*), others are intransitive (*a da în clocot, a da de necaz, a da de bucluc, a se da în stambă/ spectacol, a se da de ceasul morții*). The question would be why no incorporation occurs. While it could be argued that, in some cases,this does not happen because XPs cannot be incorporated, but only heads (*a da în mintea copiilor*, lit. 'to give in mind-DEF ART children-GEN' meaning, 'to become childish again'), in other cases, the same explanation cannot hold. One possible reason could be related to the light/heavy nature of *da*: in many of these expressions, *da* may not count as a light verb, but may be considered semantically richer (e.g. *a da la ziar*).

Nevertheless, the direct object should be able to incorporate. I argue that the failure to incorporate is it being prevented by the IO. According to MacDonald (2015), double object constructions with *give* involve an Applicative Phrase, as in Pylkkänen (2008), and the IO always has to move to its specifier, as it is the Possessor. Unlike Pylkkänen (2008), however, or Pesetsky (1995), who claim that the direct object construction and the prepositional dative construction have different underlying structures, MacDonald (2015) adopts a transform approach, according to which the DOC is derived from the PDC:

BDD-A26035 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 00:54:09 UTC)

(12)



(MacDonald 2015)

The Applicative P is a projection constructed by Pylkkänen (2008) to deal with two different types of applicative heads: (i) high applicatives, which denote a relation between an event and an individual; (ii) low applicatives, which denote a relation between two individuals.

While high applicative heads attach above the Root, low applicative heads attach below the Root. They modify the direct object and are interpreted as directional possessive relations (*I baked him a cake*= '[him[TO-THE-POSSESSION OF[cake]]]'. The English double object construction illustrates only one type of low applicative: cross-linguistically, we find not only the *to-the-possession-of* relation, but also a *from-the-possession-of* relation. (12), on the other hand, is an example of a high applicative phrase:

(13) *N-a-i-lyi-i-a m-ka k-elya*
FOC-I s-PR-eat-APPL-FY 1-wife 7-food
'He is eating food for his wife'
(Bresnan and Moshi 1993: 49–50, taken from Pylkkänen 2008)

The semantic similarity between the English and the Chaga benefactives is only apparent. In Chaga, the applicative head relates an individual to the event described by the VP, following Marantz (1993), while in English the applicative head relates an individual to the direct object (Pesetsky 1995).

Coming back to the structure in (12), the V-direct object-indirect object obtains when the IO is pronounced low, while the V-indirect object-direct object reading obtains when the IO is pronounced high.


The advantages of this analysis are that such a theory can account for the role of the weight of the IO (e.g. *He gave a black eye to the kid with the German roots*), and also for the differences between *give*-constructions, which do not allow inanimate IOs, and *throw* or *send*-constructions, which allow inanimate IOs (**He gave a book to London vs. He sent a book to London*) and which do not involve an ApplP.

It can also account for the failure of the null verb GIVE to incorporate if one assumes such an underlying structure, as the IO intervenes between the v and the DO. Moreover, it can neatly account for the data in Romanian as well, i.e. for the


BDD-A26035 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 00:54:09 UTC)

failure of the noun to incorporate into the light verb and give rise to a verb that selects the Accusative, rather than the Dative:

(14)



(15)



A possible alternative is to argue that, in cases where the lexical semantic representation of a verb makes use of the verb *GIVE*, the light verb *GIVE* simply combines with a nominal root[4], which it incorporates, and it is only the resulting verb that combines with an argument and has case-assigning ability. In other words, light verb GIVE is not a verb selecting two arguments, as the lexical verb *give*. Rather, only in combining with a nominal root does it result in a full lexical verb, which can only assign the Accusative case to its object:

5. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the verb *GIVE* is not part of the lexical semantic structure of denominal verbs, and this strengthens the need for a clear distinction between lexical semantic structure and paraphrases. In the paper, I have adopted a syntactic analysis of *GIVE* constructions (MacDonald 2015) which further supports the empirical data at stake, namely, the absence of incorporation. I have also suggested

[4] The idea that the formation of words (denominals included) is from roots is embraced by several linguists (Arad 2003, Embick & Marantz 2008, Levinson 2007, Panagiotidis 2014). Evidence comes from data in Hebrew (Arad 2003), where roots can be clearly isolated, and from pseudo-resultatives (Levinson 2007). For instance, in *He sliced the bread thin*, *thin* modifies the slices being cut, not the bread, which suggests the existence of a nominal root. Furthermore, the necessity of having a categorized root rather than an uncategorized one is theoretically grounded in the necessity to be read by the interfaces, in other words, uncategorized roots are not legible PF objects. Empirically, this claim also receives evidence from the non-compositional interpretation of words derived from roots (*revolution-revolve*, or *synteleia* ('end of the world') – *syntelo* ('contribute')) (Panagiotidis 2014), which is also the case with some Romanian examples discussed in this paper (*a da formă* 'to give form' vs. *a forma* 'to form').

BDD-A26035 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 00:54:09 UTC)

nominal root incorporation before the selection of argument(s) could be an alternative solution for case-assigning and meaning problems.

Acknowledgments
I am deeply indebted to Prof. Alexandra Cornilescu, who gave me valuable suggestions to better my work.

REFERENCES

Arad, M., 2003, "Locality constraints on the interpretation of roots: The case of Hebrew denominal verbs", *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 21, 737–778.
Baker, M., 1988, *Incorporation: a Theory of Grammatical Function Changing*, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press.
Chappell, H., W. McGregor (eds), 1996, *The grammar of inalienability: a typological perspective on body part terms and the part-whole relation*, Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter.
Embick, D., A. Marantz, 2008, "Architecture and blocking", *Linguistic Inquiry*, 39, 1–53.
Hale, K., S. J. Keyser, 2002, *Prolegomenon to a Theory of Argument Structure*, Cambridge, MIT.
Harley, H., 1997, "If you Have, you can Give", paper presented at West Coast Conference of Formal Linguistics 15. Harley, Heidi. 2000. Possession and the double object.
Larson, R. K., 1988, "On the double object construction", *Linguistic Inquiry*, 19, 335–391.
Larson, R. K., 1990, "Double Objects Revisited: Reply to Jackendoff", *Linguistic Inquiry*, 21, 4, 589–632.
Levin, B., M. Rappaport Hovav, 1995, *Un accusativity: At the Syntax-Lexical Semantic Interface*, Cambridge, MIT Press.
Levinson, L., 2007, *The roots of verbs*. Doctoral Dissertation, New York University.
MacDonald, J. E., 2015, "A Movement Analysis of Some Double Object Constructions", *Proceedings of the 32nd West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*. Available online: http://publish.illinois.edu/jonmacd/files/2013/01/A-movement-analysis-of-some-double-object-constructions-MacDonald.pdf
Panagiotidis, P., 2014, "A minimalist approach to roots", in: P. Kosta, S. L. Franks, T. Radeva-Bork, L. Schürcks (eds), *Minimalism and Beyond: Radicalizing the interfaces,* Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 287–303.
Pesetsky, D., 1995, *Zero Syntax: Experiencers and Cascades*, Cambridge, The MIT Press.
Pylkkänen, L., 2008, *Introducing Arguments*, Cambridge, MIT Press.

Electronic Resources: https://dexonline.ro/

BDD-A26035 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 00:54:09 UTC)

BDD-A26035 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 00:54:09 UTC)