ROMANIAN DATIVE CONFIGURATIONS: DITRANSITIVE VERBS, A TENTATIVE ANALYSIS[1]

ALEXANDRA CORNILESCU[2], ANCA DINU[3], ALINA TIGĂU[4]

Abstract. This paper aims at providing a derivational account of Romanian ditransitive configurations in line with the experimental data presented in our first paper (this volume). One first attempt is directed at explaining the (relatively) free word-order manifested by the two internal arguments, as well as the symmetrical potential for anaphor and possessor binding exhibited by the direct object (DO) and the indirect object (IO). In the analysis we propose, the clitic plays no special role, in particular, it is not the head of the ApplP and consequently it does not influence the binding relations holding between the two arguments. Furthermore, evidence is provided as to the relative hierarchical order of the two internal arguments, with the DO as the higher of the two. The IO merges in a low PP position and is further attracted to a higher ApplP for reasons of case and θ-features checking. Binding and word order facts are thus derived as a consequence of the initial configuration and subsequent movement.

Secondly, we have endeavoured to account for the constraints manifested with those ditransitives where the direct object bears Differential Object Marking (DOM) and which seem acceptable only if the DO is clitic doubled. We have analyzed this restriction as a manifestation of a locality problem, in the sense that, when the DO bears DOM, it is endowed with a person feature and competes with the IO in valuing the person feature of the applicative head. Binding of the IO by the DO in this configuration is possible only if the latter is clitic doubled. Cliticization removes the DO to a higher position, allowing the IO to agree with the applicative and check its case.

Key words: Applicatives, dative, ditransitives.

1. PRELIMINARIES

This paper seeks to give an analysis of Romanian ditransitive constructions which should be in agreement with the experimental findings summarized in **Table 1** (from Cornilescu, Dinu, Tigău 2016). Reference will be made to the patterns dealt with in the experiment and to the speakers' judgments.

[1] This work was generously supported for all authors by *UEFISCDI, PNII-IDPCE-2011-3-0959.*

[2] University of Bucharest, Faculty of Foreign Languages and Literatures (FLLS), alexandracornilescu@yahoo.com.

[3] University of Bucharest, FLLS, anca_d_dinu@yahoo.com.

[4] University of Bucharest, FLLS, alina_mihaela_tigau@yahoo.com.

RRL, **LXII**, *2*, p. 179–206, Bucureşti, 2017

BDD-A26034 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 20:53:49 UTC)

2. BASIC ASSUMPTIONS OF THE ANALYSIS

The aim of this second (companion) paper on Romanian ditransitive configurations is to account for the Romanian data, as they appear in the experiment presented in the first paper. In the first place, one needs to account for the (relatively) free word-order manifested by the two internal arguments, as well as for the symmetrical potential for anaphor and possessor binding shown by the direct object (=DO) and indirect object (=IO). In the second place, one should understand why ditransitive constructions are more constrained when the DO shows differential object marking (=DOM). As discussed above, in this case, speakers accept the ditransitive construction *only if the DO is clitic doubled*. Recall that clitics are generally optional in ditransitive configurations.


The framework of the analysis is largely that of Diaconescu and Rivero (2007). We too assume that datives are uniformly licensed by Appl heads, but we will incorporate recent results regarding the classification of applicative heads.

2.1. Types of applicative heads

Pylkännen (2002, 2008) distinguishes between *high* and *low* applicative configurations. High applicatives merge above the VP/*v*P and denote a thematic relation between an individual and the *event* denoted by the verb phrase, as in the Latin Dativus Comodi/Incomodi, illustrated in (1) from Roberge and Troberg (2009).

(1) *DCIs in Latin*

a.



b. *Sol* ***omnibus*** *lucet*.
sun.Nom everybody.Dat shine.3sg
'The sun shines for everybody.'


High applicatives are analyzed in the neo-Davidsonian way, as expressing relations between events and individuals [λx.λe [Beneficiary (e,x)].

In contrast, Pylkkänen (2002, 2008) claims that *low applied* arguments, such as Datives in ditransitive configurations, bear no semantic relation to the verb; they only bear a *directional transfer of possession* relation to the *direct object*. (See also Cuervo, 2003, for Spanish and Diaconescu, 2004, for Romanian). The low applicative is the head of a small clause, introducing the non-core supplementary argument, as in (2):

BDD-A26034 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 20:53:49 UTC)

(2) a. Mary baked **him** a cake.

b.



While Pylkkänen's high applicative analysis has gone unchallenged, her low applicative analysis has sometimes been objected to, because of its problematic aspects, some of them reviewed below.

Morphological problems If head-movement involves uniform raising, Pylkännen's approach predicts a difference between the position of high vs. low applicative heads. Adhering to Baker's (1988) Mirror image principle, if head movement involves uniform raising and adjunction to the left, then high applicative morpheme should be suffixed on the verb, since the verb raises to Appl, as apparent in (1). This prediction is amply confirmed in Bantu languages, which have a rich morphological system of Appl heads. In contrast, in the configuration proposed for low applicatives, Appl should left-adjoin to the higher lexical verb ending up as a *prefix*. This prediction is disconfirmed cross linguistically, and Georgala, Paul and Whitman (2008) extensively argue that Appl morphemes *uniformly* occupy the same *suffixal* position. As shown, this generalization would be contradicted by the low Appl head in (2).

Larson's semantic problem. In Pylkkänen's view "Low applied arguments bear no semantic relation to the verb whatsoever: they bear only a transfer of possession relation to the direct object" (2008:14). Going against the most widespread bi-eventive analysis of ditransitive configurations (as in Pesetsky 1995), Pylkännen's semantics presented in (3) is mono-eventive, based on Davidsonian principles. The applied argument (*y*) is directly related to the Theme (*x*) and only the Theme is directly related to the event. The applied argument is not part of the verb's *θ*-grid.

(3) *Semantics for low applicatives* Low-APPL-TO (recipient applicative)
λxλy, λf <e <s,t>>.λe.f(e,x) & theme(e,x) & to-the-possession(x, **y**)

This type of analysis is undesirable because it may endorse unwanted inferences, as extensively shown in Larson (2010). He suggests that the root of the trouble is "exactly Pylkkänen's departure from standard neo-Davidsonian

BDD-A26034 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 20:53:49 UTC)

semantics" [2010:703] (i.e. all participants are event properties), the fact that the IO is not related to the *event* described by the verb, but is only related to *the direct argument*, in the low small clause. In other words, in Larson's view, the applied argument is *actually part of the verb's θ-grid*. It is introduced by the lexical verb itself and it composes inside the lexical VP in a syntax very much like that of Larson (1988). Under this view that Appl head is required to have the lower lexical VP as complement.

Larson (2010) thus joins the majority of analysts who proposes a bi-eventive causative analysis (*give* as 'cause to have') of ditransitive verbs, with the first eventuality causing the second, a (resultant) *state of possession*. The bi-eventive analysis is supported by the scope of adverbs like *again*, in sentences like (4), which is ambiguous between a *repetitive*(4') and a *restitutive* reading (4''). In the repetitive reading (4'), the adverb *again* scopes over the causative component, in the restitutive reading, *again* scopes over the resultant possession state.

(4) Thilo gave Satoshi the map again. (Beck and Johnson 2004:113)
(4') 'Thilo gave Satoshi the map, and that had happened before.'
(4'') 'Thilo gave Satoshi the map, and Satoshi had had the map before.'

The strength of the causation relation is sensitive to the verb class (Beaver, 2011), with some verbs expressing successful causation (*give, donate*, *grant*, etc.) and others expressing *defeasible causation* (e.g. *offer*) as shown in Martin and Schaffer (2012).

In *conclusion*, in low applicative constructions both internal arguments are part of the thematic structure of the main verb so that Appl may merely have a case-licensing role.

Hence the emergence of a cross-linguistic typology of applicative heads (Harada and Larson, 2009, Georgala 2011, Jim and Marantz, 2016), which distinguishes between *thematic* and *expletive (raising)* applicative heads, in the characteristic structures in (5), from Georgala (2011). Thematic applicatives are provided with θ-features, valued by the non-core arguments they introduce, as in (5a). They also case-license the non-core arguments they introduce. In contrast, expletive (raising) heads merely case-license an argument which is introduced by the lexical verb which also assigns it a θ-role. Thus the applicative head in (5b) merely case-licenses the IO introduced by the lexical V, attracting it to its specifier.

(5) *a.* *Thematic applicatives*
$[_{vP}$ SUBJ $[_{v'}v$ $[_{ApplP}$ IO $_{Benf/Loc/\ Instr}$... $[_{Appl'}$ Appl $[_{VP}$ V DO]]]]]
b. *Raising applicatives*
$[_{vP}$ SUBJ $[_{v'}v$ $[_{ApplP}$ IO_{rec} ... $[_{Appl'}$ Appl $[_{VP}$ t_{IOrec} V DO]]]]]

In addition, the data examined in this paper suggest that, even when an argument is introduced by a lexical verb, the Appl which case-licenses it, may also

BDD-A26034 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 20:53:49 UTC)

introduce and *check a supplementary semantic feature*, thus enriching, or even changing the thematic interpretation assigned by the verb to the applied DP.

The analysis below makes use of both expletive and thematic applicatives. Since with ditransitive verbs Datives are core arguments, as argued by Larson, Appl is mainly (sometimes, only required) for case-licensing.

2.2. On the grammar of clitics

Our assumptions on the grammar of clitics are fairly standard and do not bear on the analysis of ditransitives proper. The clitic and its double are licensed as *one event participant*, occupying an *argument position*, with the clitic as the head of a big DP, in a configuration frequently used (6), since first proposed by Uriagereka (1995, 2005).

(6) $[_{DP}\ DP_{ass}\ [cl_D]\ DP_{pro}]$

What matters is that the clitic has *active features and licensesthe associate*, whose features are *inert*, as first proposed by Kayne 2000 (among many), in his analysis of French strong pronouns. Since the double *has inert φ- features*, it cannot participate in the agreement operations in the clause. It is the clitic that integrates the associate in clause-structure by case-licensing it. Licensing takes place in an agree configuration (inside a phase, Chomsky 2001) and it involves copying the valued features of the clitic on its associate, *after* the clitic has valued *all* its features. The agreement relation is apparent in the fact that there cannot be a mismatch between the clitic and the associate with respect to φ-features and Case.

Cliticization is regarded as a *PF interface phenomenon*, so that clitics essentially have the same syntax as regular DPs. The clitic, or rather the big DP containing it, is assigned a θ-role in the a-structure of the verb. The clitic DP is left with unvalued case and person features, which are valued through the derivation. To check their unvalued person features (and perhaps other semantic features as well, as suggested in Manzini and Savoia 2002), clitics ultimately move *as phrases up to a Person* field, situated above Tense (as proposed in Bianchi, 2006 or Ciucivara, 2009 for Romanian).


As to their case feature, it has been proposed that clitics never value their case feature in merge positions (Roberts, 2010, among many), but, on the way to the Person field, they systematically pass through a structural case position, exiting the lexical *v*P, as proposed in Ciucivara (2009), a. m.

However, if clitics are regular DPs they **should check case in the same manner as regular DPs**, i.e. in AgrOP (ToP) for Acc clitics and in an ApplP for Dative clitics. Since ApplPs are *v*P internal (see (6)), it is hard to imagine that there is a need for a *v*P external KP for the clitics to check case. However, evidence that

BDD-A26034 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 20:53:49 UTC)

clitic doubled DPs do pass through a *v*P external position on the way to the T-field is compelling, both in Romanian and in other languages (see below). We will capitalize on the one feature which differentiates lexical DPs from pronouns, namely Person and propose that there is a *Person field* above the *v*P, in a periphery of the *v*P(Belletti 2005). Since Person is an agreement feature, rather than an operator feature, Spec, PersonP is an *argumental position*. The Person head[*u*P:__] is intuitively there to make sure that constituents that need to check Person in T will not be left inside the lexical phase, when the *v*P spells-out.

(8)



Strong evidence for the PersonP in (8) is supplied by binding and scope facts, which unambiguously prove that doubled qunatified DOs or IOs (unlike undoubled ones) may bind the subject (reconstructed) in Spec, *v*P and may scope *over* it, even when the subject ends up in preverbal position. This property has been widely acknowledged for doubled DOs (Dobrovie Sorin, 1994, Tigău 2010), but it extends to IOs for both binding and scope, as evidenced by the examples below (9–13).

(9) *Nici filmele lui* $_{i/j}$ *nu-i mai plac lui Ion*$_i$.
nor films.the his not-he.Dat.Cl anymore please to Ion
'Ion doesn't like his movies any more.'

(10) *Nici filmele lui*$_{*i/j}$ *nu mai plac lui Ion*$_i$.
nor films.the his not-he.Dat.Cl anymore please to Ion

(13) *Câte doi studenți i-au ajutat fiecărui profesor*.
some two students he.Dat.Cl- have helped each.Dat professor
'Each professor was helped by two students.'

Thus, in sentence (9), the possessive *lui*, contained in the preverbal subject phrase *nici filmelelui* 'nor his films' is bound by the IO *lui Ion* 'to Ion', in post-verbal position. Crucially, the IO is clitic-doubled. Sentence (10) which differs from (9) only through the absence of the Dative clitic is ungrammatical in the intended reading. Finally, in (13), the quantified IO *fiecărui profesor* 'to each professor' scopes over the preverbal subject *câte doi studenți*, 'some two students'.

In *conclusion*, before going to the Person field above T, the clitic constituent reaches a *PersonP*, above the Su DP, i.e. in the lower, *v*P periphery. Similar suggestions are found in Stegovec (2015), among others.

BDD-A26034 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 20:53:49 UTC)

3. ARGUING AGAINST THE TWO DIFFERENT PROJECTIONS ACCOUNT

The experimental data discussed in the companion paper disconfirmed the *alternative projections* account, at least in the form presented by Diaconescu and Rivero (2007) and in the works based on their study(e.g. Iorga 2014).

The following important results have been obtained in the experiment:

(i) The presence/absence of the clitic does NOT alter those properties of the construction which depend on the c-command relations between the two internal arguments, i.e. the binding and scope properties. Similar conclusions have been arrived at for other languages which exhibit CD, such as Bleam (2003), for Spanish, or Pineda (2013), for Catalan; this finding undermines the idea of the clitic as head of the Applicative projection which licenses the IO, also used in earlier studies on Romanian. Following from this, the DO and IO have symmetrical binding abilities and they bind into each other *irrespective of word order*, and of the presence/absence of the clitic. This suggests that a derivational account might be more adequate, *since it offers the possibility of reconstruction*. It is nevertheless possible that the alternative projection account could be implemented in a different form which could handle these configurational properties.

(ii) The alternative projection account, is, however, further weakened by the *semantic uniformity of alternating Dative constructions*, to which we turn in the next section. In fact, descriptive grammars of Romanian (e.g. *Gramatica limbii române*, 2005) have never spoken of two different structures for ditransitive *give*-verbs. As analyzed in the literature on Romance (and also Romanian) ditransitives, the alternating constructions are, once again, the variant with a clitic doubled IO, and the variant with a bare IO.

3.1. The semantic (non)-uniformity of the Dative alternating constructions. Sensitivity to the lexical verb

Advocates of the alternative projection account assume that there is a consistent semantic difference between the prepositional Dative and the DOC, so that the former expresses obligatory caused movement and the latter describes obligatory caused possession. This difference has been expressed in terms of a different event structure in Krifka (2004) (shown in (14)) and has alternatively been represented as a difference in the preposition that relates the two arguments (e.g. Harley and Jung, 2015 speak of a difference between P_{go}, vs. P_{have}) or a difference between the light verbs *go* vs. *cause* (as in Cuervo 2003).

(14) a. ∃e∃e'[Agent (e, Mary)∧Theme(e, book)∧Cause (e, e')∧**Move** (e') ∧Theme (e',book) ∧ Goal (e, Peter)

BDD-A26034 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 20:53:49 UTC)

b. ∃e∃s [Agent (e, Mary)∧Theme (e, book)∧ Cause (e, s)∧ Move (e') ∧ s: **Have** (Peter, book) (from Krifka 2004)

Going back to English, the main difference in the interpretation of the two constructions is that the indirect internal argument in the *to* construction (cliticless in Romance) has a salient *directional* meaning, as part of an event of movement (**Move e'** in (14a)). In contrast, the relation between the two arguments in the DOC (clitic construction in Romance) rather involves a *transfer of possession* relation, resulting in the state of having something (**Have** (Peter, book)) in (14b)).There are verbs which are "light enough" to clearly support both readings (15), but this is hardly the general case.

(15) a. *Ion i-a dat mingea Mariei*.
Ion he.cl.Dat-has given the ball Mary.Dat
'Ion gave Mary the book.'
b. 'Ion handed Mary the book.' (caused possession)
b' 'Ion threw Mary the book, (but she didn't catch it.)' (caused movement)

3.2. The domain of ditransitive constructions

Many important studies have thrown light on the fact that the domain of ditransitive verbs is uneven in at least two respects: a) the first is the thematic interpretation of the applied argument: the second is the verb's ability to support both readings, caused possession and caused movement.

3.2.1. *Thematic interpretation of the Romanian Dative in ditransitive structures*

From a thematic perspective, the Romanian Dative is compatible with a Goal/ Beneficiary/ Source (Maleficiary) interpretation. These different readings of the Dative may consequently be paraphrased using specific lexical prepositions (16).

(16) a. *Au dăruit cadouri* ***copiilor/*** ***la*** *copii*. (Goal/Possessor)
have given presents children.the.Dat at children
'They have give presents to the children.'
b. *Au pregătit cadouri* ***copiilor/*** ***pentru*** *copii*. (Beneficiary)
have prepared presents children.the.Dat for children
'They have prepared presents for the children'
c. *Au furat* ***marelui*** ***savant*** *două proiecte ştiinţifice/*
have stolen great.the.Dat scholar two projects scientific
de la *marele savant*.
from the great scientist.
'They have stolen two scientific projects from the great scientist.'

The Beneficiary preposition *pentru* 'for' and the Source Maleficiary) preposition *de la* 'from' are lexical, they introduce PPs, not DPs, and thus cannot

BDD-A26034 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 20:53:49 UTC)

be clitic doubled (17b), unlike *la* (at), which, as will be seen has dual status, as a Dative case marker in a DP constituent, or as a lexical PP, as shown in (18):

(17) a. *Le*$_i$ *-au dăruit cadouri* ***la*** *copii*$_i$.
they.cl.Dat have given presents to children
'They have given presents to the childrem

b. **Le*$_i$ *-au pregătit cadouri* ***pentru*** *copii*$_i$.
they.cl.Dat have prepared presents for children
'They have given presents to the children

(18) [$_{\mathbf{DP}}$**la** [$_{\mathrm{DP}}$ copii]] [$_{\mathbf{PP}}$ pentru/de la/ **la** [$_{\mathrm{DP}}$copii]]

While this contrast between *la vs. pentru, de la* is well known, what has not been pointed out so far is that in all its θ-roles, the inflectional Dative may alternate with *la*, especially under doubling (which, in this case disambiguates *la* towards its Dative-marker function).

(19) a. *Nişte vagabonzi le-au furat copiilor*
some tramps they.cl.Dat-have stolen children.the.Dat
nişte mere din livadă.
some apples from orchard
'Some tramps stole the children some apples from the orchard.'

b. *Nişte vagabonzi au furat nişte mere*
some tramps have stolen some apples
de la *copii din livadă*. (**Source**)
from children from orchard
'Some tramps stole the children some apples from the orchard.'

c. *Nişte vagabonzi le-au furat* ***la*** *copii*
some tramps they.cl.Dat-have stolen at children
nişte mere din livadă.
some apples from orchard
'Some tramps stole the children some apples from the orchard.'

(20) a. *Bunica le-a copt prăjituri*
grandmother they.cl.Dat-has baked cakes
nepoților.
grandchildren.the.Dat
'Grandmother baked some cakes for her grandchildren.'

b. *Bunica a copt prăjituri* ***pentru*** *nepoți*.
grandmother has baked cakes for grandchildren
'Grandmother baked some cakes for her grandchildren.'

c. *Bunica le-a copt prăjituri* ***la*** *nepoți.*
grandmother they.cl.Dat-has baked cakes at grandchildren
'Grandmother baked some cakes for her grandchildren.'

This further shows that *la* 'at' has become a Dative marker, and moreover, it shows that the interpretation of the Dative *depends on the descriptive content of the verb* (its a-structure), this descriptive content being optionally also expressed by a harmonic lexical preposition.

BDD-A26034 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 20:53:49 UTC)

3.2.2. *Ability to express both caused possession and caused movement*

We turn to the second problem; sensitivity to the two readings. Proponents of the polysemy approach argue that all verbs that accept the Dative alternation have two readings, corresponding to the event decompositions in Krifka (2004), given in (14) above. Recently, this view has been questioned for English in the important study of Rappaport and Levin (2008) (= R&L) on English Dative verbs.

R&L distinguish *two big groups of verbs* (with further subclasses), which can roughly be described as *verbs of possession (give*-verbs*)* and *verbs of movement (throw*-verbs*)*. The authors prove that *give*-verbs express *caused possession* with both the (English) PP-Dative and the DOC construction. This follows from the fact that *give* verbs *do not have a path component*, and thus do not express movement in any sense (even a metaphorical one), even if one of their arguments, the TO-Dative suggests a Goal interpretation. *Give*-verbs simply express 'caused possession', their Dative actually being a Possessor, in both of their syntactic alternatives. In other words, the Possessor interpretation of the Goal is obligatory, if the event is not successful. Following R&L, the same point has been made for English in a series of studies, such as MacDonald (2015), Ormazabal and Romero (2012).*Give*-verbs express only the caused possession reading and lack the caused motion reading; they have a *single event schema* (14b, above).

In contrast, *throw*-type verbs support both readings. They have a path component in their lexical make-up, which means that their Prepositional Dative is a genuine Goal. The caused possession reading, signaled by the DOC in English, occurs when there is an inference of successful transfer, so that the Goal becomes a Possessor-Goal.

This distinction carries over to Romanian. In Romanian, too, both *give*-verbs and *throw*-verbs are well-represented. Romanian *give*-verbs fall into several subclasses, according to classifications found in Tigău (2010, 2013), as well as in Iorga (2014).

(22) *Give* verbs:
a. Verbs that inherently signify acts of giving: *a da/dărui* 'give', *dona*'donate', *înmâna* 'hand in', *înapoia/retroceda* 'return', etc.
b. Verbs of future having *a oferi* 'offer'. *a acorda* 'grant', *a decerna* 'award', *a promite/a făgădui* 'promise', *a jura* 'to swear', etc.
c. Verbs of communication: *aspune/a zice* 'say', *a cere* 'request, ask', *a arăta* 'show', *a indica* 'indicate', *a semnala* 'signal', *a demonstra* 'demonstrate', etc.
With verbs in these subclasses, the Dative is interpreted as a *Goal-Possessor.*
Verbs with Beneficiary and Source Datives, also include several subclasses:
a. *Build/create* verbs : *a construi/clădi* 'build', *a aranja* 'arrange', *a croşeta/a împleti* 'knit', *a clădi/a dura/a înălța/a zidi/a face* 'build'.
b. *Prepare*-verbs : *a pregăti/a prepara* 'prepare', *a găti* 'cook', *a coace* 'bake', etc.
c. *Get*-verbs : *a cumpăra* 'buy', *a găsi* 'find', *a obține/a procura* 'obtain', etc.
d. *Steal*-verbs : *a fura* 'steal', *a răpi* 'abduct', *a subtiliza/a şterpeli* 'filch', etc.

BDD-A26034 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 20:53:49 UTC)

It can be shown that in Romanian too, *give*-verbs have only one event structure, representing the caused possession interpretation. Recall that in the classical analysis of Romance the alternating constructions corresponding to the two event structures are the clitic doubled Dative and the bare Dative construction. In Romanian, too, *give*-verbs allow only the obligatory caused possession reading, regardless of the order of the arguments, and regardless of the presence of the clitic. Caused (absence of) possession obtains for all thematic interpretations: Possessor-Goal in (23), Beneficiary in (24) and Source (Maleficiary) in (25). This shows that *give*-verbs have only one event schema, just as in English.

(23) *(Le-)a* *dăruit* *mărţişoare* *tuturor fetelor*
(they.cl.Dat)-has.he given valentines all.Dat girls.the.Dat
(# dar ele nu au mărţişoare)
'He has given them valentines, (#but they do not have valentines)'.

(24) *(Le-)a* *cumpărat* *mărţişoare* *tuturor fetelor*
(they.cl.Dat)-has.he bought valentines all.Dat girls.the.Dat
(# dar ele nu au mărţişoare)
'He has bought them valentines, (#but they do not have valentines)'.

(25) *(Le)-au* *confiscat* *turiştilor* *toate* *ţigările.*
(they.cl.Dat)-have.they confiscated tourists.the.Dat all cigarettes.the
(# dar ei au ţigări)
'They have confiscated the tourists all cigarettes (#but they have cigarettes)'

As examples (23)–(25) prove, with all *give*-verbs, an actual/potential /future state of (lack of) possession is entailed and this meaning component *cannot be cancelled*. This means that with *give*-verbs the Dative is ultimately interpreted as a Possessor. However, one should not assume that a 'successful transfer inference' is automatically present with *all give*-verbs. Rather, some verbs (e.g. *promise*) imply future possession, and with others (e.g. *offer*), the successful transfer inference is defeasible.

On the strength of these examples, it may safely be concluded that generically-called *give*-verbs do not have the caused movement interpretation either in the Clitic Doubled, or in the Bare Dative construction. Moreover, in all the examples above, the Possessor reading obtains irrespective of the Dative clitic, which is optional. The Possessor reading *does not correlate with the presence of the clitic* as assumed in the alternative projection analysis of Romanian ditransitive constructions (Diaconescu and Rivero 2007, Tigau 2010, Iorga 2014), but obtains in bare Dative constructions as well.

BDD-A26034 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 20:53:49 UTC)

3.2.3. *Semantic properties of throw-verbs*

Let us turn to verbs of throwing, subclassified into verbs of sending and verbs of throwing proper:

(26) *Throw*-verbs
a.Verbs of throwing(Goal OR Possessor): *a arunca* 'throw', *a (a)zvârli*'fling', etc.
b. Verb of sending (Goal OR Possessor): *a trimite* 'send', *a expedia* 'mail', etc.

According the R&L, verbs of sending and throwing indeed have the two distinct interpretations of caused movement and caused possession, but it is not the case that the choice between movement and possession would depend on the presence/absence of the clitic, even if, with these verbs the possessor reading is likely to be favoured by the clitic.

(27) a. *Am aruncat* *mingea de pe balcon* *unui băiețel* *de pe stradă*,
have.I thrown the ball on my balcony a.Dat little.boy of on street
'I threw the ball on my balcony to a little boy in the street,
b. *dar n-a prins-o*. (Goal)
'but he didn't catch it.'
b'. *și a fugit cu ea*. (Possessor/Goal)
'and he ran away with it.'

(28) a *I-am aruncat* *mingea unui băiețel* *de pe stradă*,
he.cl.Dat have. I thrown the ball a.Dat little.boy of on street
b. dar n-a prins-o. (Goal)
'but he didn't catch it.'
b'. *și a fugit cu ea*. (Possessor/Goal)
'and he ran away with it.

Both the clitic-less and the clitic doubled variant of the verb *a arunca* 'throw' allow both the caused movement and the caused possession interpretation.

3.2.4. *Other differences*

Give verbs and *throw*-verbs exhibit many other differences, which strengthen the view that only the *throw*-class may convey the caused movement reading. R&L propose a series of tests which distinguish between the two verb-classes, many of which carry over to Romanian. Essentially, the tests show that only *throw*-verbs have properties which prove the existence of a Path component, an obligatory *conceptual* component in events of movement.

One test is that of the (im)possibility of *where*-questions referring to the Path component, whose answer should be the Goal phrase. Such questions are well formed only with *throw*-verbs. *Give*-verbs, which have only the caused possession reading, do not allow such *where* questions (29a', b'). This property is possibly

BDD-A26034 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 20:53:49 UTC)

related to the fact that *give*-verbs only take [Person] indirect objects, and people can hardly be interpreted as paths. With *throw*-verbs, Dative answers to *where*-questions are felicitous especially when they are PPs (30a), and/or when the Dative is clitic-doubled (30).

(29) a. *Au dăruit hainele săracilor/la săraci.*
have.they presented clothes.the poor.the.Dat/ at poor.
'They gave the clothes to the poor.'

a' **Unde au dăruit hainele acelea ? /*La săraci.*
where have.they presented clothes.the those /to poor
'Where did they present those clothes ?'/To the poor.

b. *I-a înapoiat/oferit banii lui Petru.*
he.cl.Dat has retruned/offered money.the Dat Peter
'He returned/offered the money to Peter.'

b' **Unde a înapoiat/ a oferit banii ?*
where has returned has offered money.the
'Where did he return the money?'(in the intended interpretation)

(30) a. *Unde ai aruncat/pasat mingea ? / La portar.*
where have.you thrown passed ball.the at goalkeeper
'Where did you throw the ball? /To the goalkeeper.'

a'. *I-am aruncat-o/pasat-o portarului.*
he.cl.Dat have thrown-it.cl.Acc goalkeeper.the.Dat
'I threw it to the goalkeeper'.

b. *Unde ai trimis bicicleta* ?
where have.you sent bicycle.the
'Where did you send the bicycle?'

b'. **Lui Ion/ I- am trimis-o lui Ion.*
Ion.Dat he.cl.Dat have.I sent-it.cl.Acc Dat Ion
'To Ion.' / 'I sent it to Ion.'

Remark: The verb *a da* 'give' is an exception, allowing both caused possession and caused movement readings (see (15) above). As a result, it allows *where* questions, whose answer is an argumental Dative:

(31) a. *Unde ai dat banii, la şcoală sau la spital* ?
where have.you given money.the at school or at hospital?
'To whom did you give the money, to the school or to the hospital?'

a'. *I-am dat la nişte fundaţii/ unor fundaţii caritabile.*
It.cl.Acc have.I given at some charities some.Dat charities.
'I gave it to some charities.'

Throw-verbs may license the caused possession and the caused movement meaning in the same sentence. In this case, the Dative realizes the thematically higher role, the Possessor, not the Goal, which is realized as a PP, as shown by agreement with the clitic. The clitic in (32a, b) agrees with the Dative which is the

BDD-A26034 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 20:53:49 UTC)

closest complement to the clitic. Agreement of the clitic with the more remote Goal PP is excluded (32c). The existence of two distinct constituents realizing the Possessor and the Goal confirms the view that *throw*-verbs have two event structures.

(32) a. *Vecinii* ***i**-au* *trimis* *o telegramă*
neighbors.the she.cl.Dat-have sent a cable
Mariei ***la părinți***.
Mary.Dat at parents
'The neighbors sent a cable to Mary, to her parents'.

b. *Vecinii* ***le**-au* *trimis* *o telegramă*
neighbors.the they.cl.Dat-have sent a cable
părinților ***la Maria***.
parents.the.Dat to Mary
'The neighbors sent a cable to the parents to Mary's.'

c. **Vecinii* ***le**-au* *trimis* *o telegramă*
neighbors.the they.cl.Dat-have sent a cable
Mariei ***la părinți /*** ****părinților***.
Mary.Dat at parents parents.Dat
'The neighbors sent a cable to the parents to Mary's place.'

Throw-verbs, which may encode a Path component, may introduce it with a variety of alternating directional/locative prepositions, while *give*-verbs do not share this property, and may occur with just one lexical preposition (see section (3.2.1) above).

(33) a. *Fred a* *aruncat/ zvârlit/* *DAT* *mingea*
'Fred has thrown flung GIVEN ball.the
dincolo de gard/ în spatele *copacului.*
over of fence behind tree.the'

b. *Fred a dăruit/* *promis* *haine* *la săraci /*(în)spre săraci*.
Fred has given promised clothes to poor towards poor.

It has also been noticed that *give*-verbs simply imply 'caused possession', they may, but do not need to express, any *transfer of possession* simply because, in many cases, the Agent subject is not really in possession of any object. Thus, in (34) the court of law does not possess visiting rights that it could further transfer to someone else.

(34) *Tribunalul* *i-a acordat* *drepturi de vizitare a copilului*.
the court-of-law he.cl.dat –has granted rights of visiting of child.the.Gen
'The court of law has granted him visiting rights.'

BDD-A26034 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 20:53:49 UTC)

The examination of Romanian ditransitive constructions, with respect to verb classes and the distribution of the two readings of ditransitives, leads to the following *conclusions*:

1. *Give*-verbs have only one event structure, underlying the caused possession reading.

2. *Throw*-verbs have two event structures, corresponding to the caused-possession and the caused movement interpretations.

3. The two readings of *throw*-verbs, in Dative sentences, in no way depend on the presence/ absence of the clitic.

4. The synonymy of the Dative clitic construction with the cliticless construction[1] is expected under a derivational approach to ditransitive, but less plausible under the alternative projection approach. Therefore, the analysis had better be derivational.

4. A DERIVATIONAL ANALYSIS OF ROMANIAN DITRANSITIVE CONFIGURATIONS

4.1. Goals of the analysis

In this section we propose an analysis which is meant to have a better empirical coverage with respect to some of the phenomena discussed in this article and in the companion paper, which are mentioned below.

4.2. The basic structural configuration of Romanian ditransitives

The derivational approach requires establishing the *basic structural* configuration of the lexical VP in ditransitive constructions, i.e. whether the basic structure is a Theme-above-Dative-Goal configuration or a Dative-Goal-over-Theme-one. Both proposals have been made in the literature, each claiming to represent a universal underlying structure. Deciding between them in particular cases should be an empirical matter, rather than an article of faith. In solving this problem for Romanian, it is desirable to clarify the categorial status of the Dative constituent as a PP or a DP, and secondly, the case-theoretic properties of the Romanian Dative as a structural or a non-structural case. Evidence will be presented that the Dative is non-structural in Romanian and that it can be analyzed as a DP or a PP even inside the *v*P.

4.2.1. *The Dative is a non-structural Case*


In determining the Case theoretic status of the Dative, we have found it useful to resort to Woolford's (2006) theory. Woolford (2006) distinguishes not

BDD-A26034 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 20:53:49 UTC)

only between structural and non-structural Case, but also between lexical and inherent Case, as varieties of non-structural Case (35) which differ in terms of their assigners. Lexical Case is valued by *lexical verbs* (V) or by *prepositions* (P). Inherent Case is tied to *little v* or to *other light verbs*, such as Appl, as summed up in (35).

(35) *Woolford's Proposals*

a.



b. *Lexical and inherent Case-licensing* (Woolford 2006: 125)
   a. Lexical heads (e.g. V, P) license idiosyncratic lexical Case
   b. Little/light *v* heads license inherent Case

In terms of this classification, the Romanian Dative comes out as *uniformly non-structural Case*, exhibiting the following properties, which are considered to be characteristic of non-structural Case.

Firstly, the Dative shows *case Preservation under A-movement* (e.g. passive). If the case of an argument is preserved under A-movement, that argument has non-structural case. Here are examples that show that the Dative is preserved under passivization in Romanian.

(36) a. *Moş Crăciun le-a dat cadourile copiilor.*
Santa Clause they.cl.Dat has given presents.the children.the.Dat
'Santa Clause gave the presents to the children.'

b. *Cadourile le-au fost date copiilor.*
presents.the.Nom they.cl.Dat were given children.the.Dat
'The presents were given to the children.'

c. *Copiilor le-au fost date cadourile.*
children.the.Dat they.cl.Dat were given presents.the
'The presents were given to the children.'

Thus in (36c) where the Dative occurs in the subject position of the passive sentence, it continues to show its inflectional Dative morphology.

Another diagnostic test involves *nominative objects*, which are possible only when the subject has non-structural Dative case, in fact.

(37) *Copiilor le place înghețata.*
children.Dat.Pl they.cl.Dat like.3.P.Sg icecream.Nom.Sg
'Children like icecream.'

BDD-A26034 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 20:53:49 UTC)

In (37), the verb agrees with the singular Nominative subject, *înghețata* 'icecream', rather than with the Dative quirky subject. As shown elsewhere (Cornilescu 2015), Romanian has a well-represented core class of Dative-Nominative construction.

A third, criterial attribute of non-structural cases is that they are licensed in connection with θ- marking. As already detailed above, the Dative is linked to several related θ-roles.

In *conclusion*, the Dative is a *non-structural Case* in Romanian. It is, however, not homogeneous (i.e. it may be lexical or inherent), and it is instructive to compare the Dative as a subcategorized constituent in APs and DPs, with the Dative inside the VP.

4.2.2. *On the categorial status of the Dative*: *PP or DP?*

As discussed above, Romanian Datives are morphologically realized either inflectionally or prepositionally by the P *la* 'to, at'. *La+ DP* phrases are considered Datives only when doubling by Dative clitics is possible. Since Dative clitics generally double DPs (not PPs) in Romance, phrases headed by *la* which may be doubled by Dative clitics are analyzed as DPs (with the P functioning as a case-marker), while synonymous phrases which cannot be clitic doubled are analyzed as PPs (see (17) and (18) above)). Also, ApplP license DPs, not PPs.

The categorial status of the *la*^DP is ambiguous.If there are two *la*^DPs with a potential Goal interpretation in a sentence, either of them (usually the closer to the verb) can be interpreted as a DP argument of the *throw*-verb and can be doubled as a result (38a, b).The second *la*-phrase is an adjunct. Unlike *la*-phrases, inflectional Datives are always arguments. So,if one of the potential Goal phrases is an inflectional Dative, it must be the argument which can be doubled by the clitic. Thus, in (38c) the inflectional Dative blocks doubling of the *la*+phrase, i.e. forces the interpretation of the *la*+DP as a PP adjunct.

(38) a. *Maria le-a trimis o telegramă la părinți la o vecină.*
Mary them.cl.Dat-has sent a telegram at parents at a neighbour.
'Mary sent her parents a telegram to a neighbour's house.'

b. *Maria i-a trimis o telegramă la o vecină la părinți.*
Mary her.cl.Dat-has sent a telegram at a neighbour at parents.
'Mary sent the telegram to a neighbour at her parents' house.'

c. *Maria le-a trimis o telegramă părinților la o vecină.*
Mary them.cl.Dat-has sent a telegram parents.Dat at a neighbour.

d. **Maria i-a trimis o telegramă părinților la o vecină.*
Mary her.cl.Dat-has sent a telegram parents.Dat at a neihgbour

BDD-A26034 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 20:53:49 UTC)

The examples in (38) suggest that there is a unique ApplP inside the *v*P, so that in the ungrammatical (38d), if Appl licenses the DP[la+ vecină], the inflectional Dative remains caseless, and cannot be interpreted as an adjunct.

Exceptionally, a Romanian sentence may contain two (argumental Datives), a high Possessive Dative (in the sense of Pylkkänen 2002) and a low Goal Dative, as in (39).

(39) a. *Ion şi-a* *vândut* *casa* *unor* *rude/*
John refl.dat-has sold house.the some.dat relatives
la nişte rude.
at some relatives
'John sold his house to some relatives.'

b. *Ion le-a* *vândut* *casa* *lui* *unor* *rude/*
John them.cl.dat-has sold house his some.dat relatives
la nişte rude.
at some relatives
'John sold his house to some relatives.'

Consider the higher Possessive Dative first.It *must* be realized as a clitic and has no Prep alternative. The Possessive Dative can, nevertheless, alternate with a Possessive pronoun inside the DO DP, as in (39b). Moreover, since this Possessive Dative is a non-core argument of the verb (under any analysis (e.g. Landau (1999), Schoenfeld (2006)), it must be case (and perhaps also θ)-licensed by the ApplP in whose specifier it sits. Since the unique Appl licenses the Possessive Dative, the Goal Dative cannot Agree with it any more. Notice now that the Goal Dative may be inflectional or prepositional but, crucially, it cannot be clitic doubled. As stated, under the assumption that there is only one Appl per *v*P, the Goal phrases in (39a) cannot be licensed by Appl, since Appl licenses the Possessive Dative phrase. This is not problematic for the Prepositional Dative, which may be analyzed as a PP. Since the Inflectional Dative is also grammatical in (39a) and it is not case licensed by Appl, this Dative must also be (re)analyzed as a PP, with a null P which assigns it case by incorporating into the Verb (as also proposed by Diaconescu and Rivero (2007) for cliticless Dative constructions). Since PPs merge lower than DPs, and Datives can be PPs, it follows that at merge they occupy the position of the English prepositional Dative (Theme over Goal), rather than the position of the Dative in DOC (Goal-over Theme).Thus, not only *la*+DP is either a DP or a PP, but *the inflectional Dative is also a PP* in configurations where doubling by the clitic is impossible.

Interestingly, when one looks beyond the *v*P at the distribution of the inflectional Dative inside APs and DPs, the view that the inflectional Dative itself *has dual status* and should be analyzed either as a PP or a DP is further strengthened. Let us consider the distribution of inflectional Datives inside APs.

BDD-A26034 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 20:53:49 UTC)

There is a large class of adjectives (e.g. *util* 'useful', *folositor* 'useful', *necesar* 'necessary' etc.) which c-select either inflectional Datives or PPs, headed by *lexical prepositions* (e.g. *pentru* 'for' in the examples below). Since adjectives are not case-assigners, one plausible analysis is to assume that the Dative phrase is case-licensed by a null preposition which incorporates into the lexical head. In such cases, the status of the Dative phrase is that of a PP.

(40) a. *un produs* [$_{AP}$ *util/ necesar* ***tututror gospodinelor***]
'a product useful/necessary all.dat housewives.the.dat'
b. *produs util/ necesar* ***pentru toate gospodinele***
'a product useful/necessary for all housewives'

At the same time, virtually all the adjectives that subcategorize Datives may alternatively realize the Dative inside the *v*P; notice the alternation in (41a,b,c). In such instances, the Dative may be clitic doubled (41b, c) and freely moves to the periphery of the sentence (41c). Given what has been said so far, in examples like (41b, c), the Dative must be a DP and it qualifies as an applied argument.

(41) a. *Produsul era* [$_{AP}$ *util/necesar* *tuturor gospodinelor*]
product.the was useful/necessary all.Dat housewives.the.Dat
b. *Produsul* *le* *era util/necesar*
product.the they.cl.Dat was useful/necessary
tuturor gospodinelor.
all.Dat housewives.the.Dat'
c. ***Tuturor gospodinelor,*** *produsul* ***le***
all.Dat housewives.the.Dat product.the they.cl.Dat
era util/ necesar.
was useful/necessary.
'The product was useful/necessaryto all the housewives.'

If this analysis is heading in the right direction, adjectives which select Datives may project them as PPs (with a null incorporating preposition) or as DPs. In the first case, the PP Dative stays inside the AP, in the second case the Dative is forced to move into the *v*P, where it is case-licensed by an Appl head.


In Woolford's terms (35), the PP-Dative is assigned *lexical* Case, the DP-dative is assigned *inherent* Case. This array of data has an important consequence: specifically, the parallelism between *la*^DP and the Dative phrase is complete. Both must be analyzed as DPs when they may or must be clitic doubled. Both also have PP uses. If Romanian Datives may be viewed as PPs, then a natural option is to project them as the *lower object of ditransitive configurations*, a view which we adopt in the analysis below.

BDD-A26034 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 20:53:49 UTC)

4.2.3. *The Theme over Goal configuration*


In line with the discussion above, we adopt the hypothesis that the Dative is a *second object*, which merges in a low position, in the configuration Theme over Goalin (42). We take this to be the basic ditransitive configuration. The same basic configuration is proposed for French, by Boneh and Nash (2012).

(42) *Basic small clause configuration*



In this configuration, the Applicative head is required at least as a Case assigner, and, probably, also with a θ-related function. In agreement with Georgala (2011) and related work, Appl takes the lexical VP as its complement.

(43)



Next, we turn to the properties, i.e. feature structure of Appl in the ditransitive configuration. In this discussion, we propose to start from the following generalizations based on the discussion in sections 4.2.1–4.2.2 above.

a) A DP Dative requires the presence of Appl to case license it, a PP dative does not.

b) In ditransitive constructions, the Dative is part of the a-structure of ditransitive verbs and it is θ-marked by the lexical verb (even if its interpretation may be sharpened derivationally).

c) Along the derivation, the thematic interpretation of the Dative may be "sharpened"; for instance, with *give*-verbs, the Dative is Possessor Goal, not a genuine Goal (see 3.2.4 above).It is thus necessary to specify the semantic features which Appl may introduce when it is not merely an Expletive Appl.

4.3. More on θ-role assignment, and event structure

The analysis of English Datives has clearly shown that, at least with *send*-verbs, the Prepositional Dative has a genuine Goal interpretation, while in the DOC of the same verbs, the Dative is interpreted as a Possessor(-Goal). This θ-role alternation

BDD-A26034 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 20:53:49 UTC)

is in line with the two event decompositions assigned to *send*-verbs (14).On the other hand, with *give*-verb, which always express caused possession, the Possessor interpretation is obligatory, even if the Dative is Prepositional. The alternative projection account has no difficulty in accommodating the different roles of the IO: it is read as a Goal in the caused movement structure and as a Possessor in the caused possession structure, and the difference follows from the properties of the different argument-introducing heads, such as, for instance P_{go} and P_{have} in Harley and Jung (2015).

The derivational account appears more problematic in this respect. It is not immediately clear in the derivational approach how to accommodate this change of θ-roles of the same DP. One possibility, recently suggested for English in MacDonald (2015), is to bluntly give up the θ-Criterion and allow the same DP to bear more than one θ-role (see also, Ramchand 2008). In MacDonald's words "These facts can be easily accounted for by dropping the θ-Criterion, a fairly standard minimalist move. If we do this, we allow the IO to get a θ-role as the complement of P and in Spec, ApplP both. [2015:280]."

b) A second possibility is to capitalize on the fact that θ-roles are interpreted at LF, at the end of the derivation, as well as on the fact that θ-roles are *bundles of semantic features*, rather than atomic concepts, as shown in Reinhart, 2000. Under these assumptions, it is entirely plausible to assume that some functional head may introduce a semantic feature, enriching the θ-interpretation of the DP that it Agrees with. This enrichment may lead to the concomitant loss of some of the features of the basic role, which may be incompatible with the newly introduced feature. The latter is an obligatory feature, since it is made explicit by the functional head. Thus, initially assigned θ-roles may be derivationally "sharpened", some of the initial potential entailments may be cancelled, while others are explicitly introduced through the agreement relations. This "constructional" view of θ-interpretation explains why there are constraints on which roles can be derivationally acquired, since there must be compatibility between the role assigned at merge and the one which is derivationally acquired. One does not, for instance, find a Source derivationally turning into a Goal.

Consider the change from an initially assigned Goal to a derivationally assigned Possessor. The assignment of Goal is motivated by the lexical semantics of the verb (its θ-grid). Let us assume that Goal introduces the features [Location, Path], where Path signals a movement component. There is no specification for [Person] in this description of Goal, hence Goals may or may not be persons. Let us assume that the Appl head above the small clause in (43), which case-licenses the Dative, also introduces an uninterpretable [*u*Person] feature. In this case, only a Dative which is inherently marked as [*i*Person] may agree with Appl. After Agreement of Appl with The Dative, the [Person] feature becomes an obligatory part of the Dative's θ features, i.e. [Location, Path, Person]. The features [Location, Person] are sufficient to define the Possessor role, since possession amounts to

BDD-A26034 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 20:53:49 UTC)


"placement, (or location) at some person" (Lyons, 1968, Freeze 1992). Thus, the Goal and the Possessor share a [Location] feature, but differ in terms of the [Person] feature, which is unnecessary, and perhaps also "unnatural" for Goals. Remember that from a cognitive perspective, in a "trajectory-landmark" configuration, the landmark is a fixed reference object, a property that persons certainly do not have. Hence, the introduction of the obligatory [Person] feature triggers the loss of the Path feature. The θ-interpretation of the constituent that agrees with Appl is [Location, Person], i.e. a Possessor role. There is one more consequence. The loss of [Path] allows **the interpretation of the small clause as a state**, rather than an event, whence the caused possession interpretation. This compositional view on how the second role is acquired is in line with Pesetsky's (1995) remark that "the IO in DOC is compatible with a subset of the interpretations of the IO in Prepositional Dative Constructions" (Pesetsky 1995:141).

If this analysis is correct, one may claim that with ditransitive *give*-verbs, Appl is a *thematic* rather than expletive head and the semantic feature which it introduces is [*u*Person]. The feature is strong (EPP).This feature is singled out in the featural make-up of the lexical Dative and it is also part of the feature matrix of the Dative clitic.

4.4. The derived structure

Let us consider the complete analysis of *give*-verbs now, based on agreement of the Dative with Appl, as in (44). The derivation of (44) from (43) is a standard equidistance derivation. First, V must raise (adjoin) to Appl, on its way to the little *v*. Consequently, both the Theme and the Goal are in the domain of $[V+Appl]_{Appl}$, and this allows the Goal to raise to Spec, ApplP to value its Case feature and erase the [*u*Person] feature of Appl. As a consequence of its obligatory [*i*Person] feature, the Goal acquires a Possessor interpretation as explained above.

(44)



As to *free word-order*, since the interpretation of the Dative is always that of Poss-Goal, movement of the Goal to Spec Appl and Person checking are *obligatory*. We adopt, however, MacDonald's (2015) suggestion, that while the

BDD-A26034 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 20:53:49 UTC)

Dative must raise to get the Possessor interpretation at LF, at PF it may be pronounced either in the higher or in the lower position. The choice will depend on the relative heaviness of the Dative, on the placement of focus, on idiomatic structures with rigid word order etc., as shown in Bruening 2010a, b for English). On the reasonable assumption that at least inside one phase, all the members of a chain share their interpretation, it follows that both the lower and the higher copy are interpreted as Possessor, i.e. this is the only interpretation available with these verbs.

The analysis of *throw*- verbs raises no special problems. When they express caused movement, the Dative is a genuine Goal (part of the a-structure of the verb), case-licensed by an expletive Appl head, merely endowed with a Case feature. When they express caused possession, they have the same analysis as *give*-verbs.

5. ACCOUNTING FOR THE BINDING FACTS UNDER A DERIVATIONAL ACCOUNT

5.1. Some binding configurations

On the basis of the basic configuration on (43) and the derived structure in (44), it is easy to account for the symmetric binding potential of the two objects.

It is important that the basic configurations in (43)–(44) are arrived at on the basis of facts *completely unrelated to Binding*. The derivational analysis based on (43)–(44) actually *predicts symmetric binding abilities*, since in the basic configuration (43) the Theme c-commands the Goal, while in the derived structure (44) the Goal c-commands the Theme. The structure in (45) thus derives binding dependencies, where a possessor contained in one object is bound by a quantifier in the other object. Such dependencies where found to be grammatical in the experiment.

(45) a. DO > IO
Banca a retrocedat ***multe case$_i$*** *foştilor*
bank.the has returned many houses former.the.Dat
lor$_i$ *proprietari.*
their owners
'The bank has returned the houses to their former owners.'


b. IO> DO
Recepționerul arătă ***fiecărui turist$_i$*** *camera* ***lui$_i$,***
receptionist.the showed each.Dat tourist rooms.the his
'The receptionist showed each tourist his room.'

Consider now the case when one of the objects is headed by a clitic. Following Stegovec (2015), we will assume that the clitic's [Person] feature is inherently *uninterpretable* and it is ultimately checked in T. This is sufficient to

BDD-A26034 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 20:53:49 UTC)

attract the clitic headed DP to the Appl head, where it values its Case feature. Since Appl has an uninterpretable Person feature too, the clitic headed DP, will need to raise further to the PersonP above the *v*P, as explained above in (10)-(14), section 2.2. Here the Person feature is valued for all the members of the chain (the clitic, Appl), as sketched in (46), omitting irrelevant details.

(46)



A higher position of the Possessor-Goal does not modify its binding position with respect to the Theme, but it does introduce the possibility of the Goal-IO binding into the subject, already illustrated above in (10)–(14).

Hence, we get the following binding possibilities, both found to be grammatical in the experiment:

(47) cl-IO > DO

Angajatorii	*nu* ***le****-au*		*dat*	*încă*	*tuturor*
employers.the	not they.Dat.cl have		given	yet	all.Dat
muncitorilor $_i$	*drepturile*	***lor*** $_i$	*băneşti*.		
workers.the.Dat	rights.the	their	monetary		

'Employers have not given all the workers their money rights yet.'

(48) DO > cl-IO

Statul	*a*	*trebuit*	*să*	*le*	*retrocedeze*	***multei case***
State.the	has	had	to	them.cl.Dat	return	many houses
proprietarilor	***lor*** $_i$	*de dinainte*		*de război*.		
owners.the.Dat	their	of before		of war		

'The state had to return to the owners many of their houses from before the war.'

BDD-A26034 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 20:53:49 UTC)

In *conclusion*, a derivational approach is flexible enough to accommodate the symmetric binding potential of the Theme and the Goal in Romanian, at least for sentences that do not show differential object marking. The empirical coverage of the derivational analysis is better than that of the alternative projection account, where sentences like (45b), or (48) where simply underivable.

6. DOM-ED OBJECTS AND LOCALITY

6.1. Semantic Hierarchies and Syntactic features

The experiment presented in the companion paper, revealed the previously unnoticed fact that in evaluating the binding dependencies typical of ditransitive *give*-structures, speakers are sensitive to the DOM of the Theme. Surprisingly, as found in the experiment (see the scores given in *Table 1* for DOM-ed DOs), despite its initial higher position (43), a DO "upgraded" by DOM has trouble binding into an IO, irrespective of whether the IO is doubled or not. This is apparent in examples like (52a) and (52b), which are marginal. These examples are configurationally identical with the flawless (45) and (48) above, where the DO is inanimate and it is not DOM-ed. The problem disappears if the DOM-ed object is not only DOM-ed, but also clitic-doubled, as shown in examples of type (53).

(52) ??*pe*+DO > IO (69>87)

a. ??*Romanul arată cum boierii vindeau* ***pe*** *toți* ***domnii*** ***țării*** *duşmanilor* ***lor*** *de moarte.*
novel.the shows how boyars.the sold PE all princes.the country.the.Gen foes.the.Dat their of death.
'The novel shows how the boyars sold the ruling princes of the country to their deadly foes.'

b. ??*Comisia a decis deja cum să distribuie* ***pe noii/ unii medici rezidenți*** *foştilor* ***lor*** *profesori*.
board.the has decided already how to distribute PE new some medical residents former.the.Dat their professors.
'The board has already decided how to distribute the new medical residents to their former professors.'

(53) *Cl*+*pe*+DO > IO

a. *Romanul arată cum boierii* ***îi*** *vindeau* ***pe*** *toți domnii țării duşmanilor* ***lor*** *de moarte.*
novel.the shows how boyars.the they.Acc.cl sold PE all princes country.the.Gen foes.the.Dat their of death.
'The novel shows how the boyars sold the ruling princes of the country to their deadly foes.'

BDD-A26034 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 20:53:49 UTC)

b. *Comisia a decis déjà cum să* ***îi*** *distribuie*
board.the has decided already how to they.cl.Acc distribute
pe *unii medici rezidenți foștilor* ***lor*** *profesori*.
PE some.the doctors resident former.the.Dat their professors
'The board has already decided how to distribute the new medical residents to their former professors'

This problem deserves a full treatment and will be left for further research.

7. GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

The paper has proposed a *derivational analysis* of Romanian ditransitive configurations. While apparently more complex than the alternative projection account, the derivational account proposed is flexible enough to accommodate the eight structures that obtain by free word order and cliticization of the two internal arguments. The analysis does justice to the symmetric binding potential of the Theme and the Goal in Romanian. It has also been shown that for Romanian too, there is a difference between *give*-verbs and *throw*-verbs, apparent in their different syntactic properties, and following from the fact that *give*-verbs always have the caused-possession reading, while *throw*-verbs may express both caused-possession and caused-movement.

The paper signals the interesting fact that ditransitive constructions are more constrained when the DO is DOM-ed. Lastly, The paper implicitly argues for a constructivist approach to θ-role interpretation. Functional heads, such as the Applicative, may introduce θ-features, such as [Person], in the derivation, modifying the interpretation of an initially assigned role (e.g. Possessor is the sum of {Location, Person}).

REFERENCES

Anagnostopoulou, E., 2005, "Cross-linguistic and cross-categorial variation of datives", in: M. Stavrou, A. Terzi (eds), *Advances in Greek Generative Syntax*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 61–126.

Anagnostopoulou, E., 2006, "Clitic Doubling", in: M. Everaert, H. van Riemsdijk (eds), *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax*, Volumes I–V, Blackwell Publishing, 519–580.

Avram, L., M. Coene, 2009, "Null objects and accusative clitics in Romanian", *Bucharest Working Papers in Linguistics*, 11, 233–252.

Beavers, J., 2011, "An aspectual analysis of English ditransitive verbs of caused possession", *Journal of Semantics*, 18, 1–54.

Beck, S., K. Johnson, 2004, "Double objects again", *Linguistic Inquiry*, 35, 97–123.

Belletti, A., 2005, "Extended Doubling and the VP periphery", *Probus*, 17, 1–35.

Bianchi, V., 2006, "On the syntax of personal arguments", *Lingua*, 116, 2023–2067.

BDD-A26034 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 20:53:49 UTC)

Bleam, T., 2003, "Properties of the Double Object Construction in Spanish", in: R. Núñez-Cedeño, L. López, R. Cameron (eds), *A Romance Perspective on Language Knowledge and Use,* Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 233–252.
Braşoveanu, A., D. F.Farkas, 2013, "A Typology of Specificity", *Revue roumaine de linguistique*, LVIII, 4, 355–369.
Bruening, B., 2010a, "Double object constructions disguised as prepositional datives", *Linguistic Inquiry*, 41, 2, 287–305.
Bruening, B., 2010b, "Ditransitive asymmetries and the theory of idiom formation", *Linguistic Inquiry*, 41, 4, 287–305.
Boneh, N., L. Nash, 2012, "Core and non-core datives in French", in: B. Fernandez, R. Etxepare (eds), *Variation in Datives*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 22–49.
Chomsky, N., 2001, "Derivation by phase", in: M. Kenstowicz (ed.), *Ken Hale.A Life in Language*, Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press, 1–52.
Ciucivara, O., 2009, *A Syntactic Analysis of Pronominal Clitic Clusters in Romance: The Viewfrom Romanian*, Doctoral Dissertation, New York University.
Cornilescu, A., 2000, "Notes on the Intepretation of the Prepositional Accusative in Romanian", *Bucharest Working Papers in Linguistics*, 2, 1, 91.
Cornilescu, A., 2006, "On Clitic Doubling and Parasitic Gaps in Romanian", *Revue roumaine de linguistique*, LI, 1, 23–42.
Cornilescu, A., 2015, "On the Syntax of Datives in Unaccusative Configurations", in: E. O. Aboh, J. Schaeffer, P. Sleeman (eds), *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory*, 8, 119–158.
Cornilescu, A., 2016, "Landscaping Romanian Datives", ms., University of Bucharest.
Cornilescu, A., A. Dinu, A. Tigău, current issue, "Experimental data on Romanian Double Object Constructions".
Cuervo, M. C., 2003, *Datives at large*, Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
Diaconescu, C. R., 2004, *Romanian Applicative Constructions*, PhD Dissertation, University of Ottawa.
Diaconescu, C. R., M. L. Rivero, 2007, "An applicative analysis of double object constructions in Romanian", *Probus*, 7, 5–30.
Dobrovie-Sorin, C., 1994, *The Syntax of Romanian, Studies in Generative Grammar, 40*, Berlin, Mouton.
Freeze, R., 1992, "Existentials and Other Locatives", *Language*, 68, 553–595.
Georgala, E., 2011,*Applicatives in their Structural and Thematic Function: A MinimalistAccount of Multitransitivity*, PhD Dissertation, Cornell University.
Georgala, E., 2012, "Short object shift and ditransitive structure in Greek", in: S. Özsoy, A. Gürel (eds), *Current Issues in Mediterranean Syntax*.
Georgala, E., Waltraud P., J. Whitman, 2008, "Expletive and Thematic Applicatives", in: C. B.Huand, H. J. Hayrie, *Proceedings of the West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, 181–189.
Guţu Romalo, V. (coord.), *Gramatica limbii române*, 2005, Bucureşti, Editura Academiei Române.
Harada, N., R. K. Larson, 2009, "Datives in Japanese", in: R. Shibagaki, R. Vermeulen (eds), *Proceedings of the 5th Workshop on Altaic Formal Linguistics (WAFL5). MIT Working Papers in Linguistics Vol. 54*, Cambridge, MA, MITWPL, 3–17.
Harley, H., H. K. Jung, 2015, "In support of the phave analysis of the double object construction", *Linguistic Inquiry*, 46, 4, 703–730.
Iorga, A., 2014, *O tipologie a dativului românesc*, Phd Thesis, University of Bucharest.
Kayne, R. 2000, "A Note on Clitic-Doubling in French", in: G. Cinque, G. Salvi (eds), *Current Studies in Italian Syntax. Essays offered to Lorenzo Renzi*, Amsterdam, North Holland, 189–212.
Krifka, M., 2004, "Semantic and pragmatic conditions for the dative alternation", *Korean Journal of English Language and Linguistics*, 4: 1–32.
Larson, R. K., 1988, "On the double object construction", *Linguistic Inquiry*, 19, 335–391.
Larson, R. K., 2010, "On Pylkkänen's semantics for low applicatives", *Linguistic Inquiry*, 41, 701–704.
Lyons, J., 1968, *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics*, London, Cambridge University Press.

BDD-A26034 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 20:53:49 UTC)

MacDonald, J., 2015, "A Movement Analysis of Some Double Object Constructions", in: U. Steindl *et al.* (eds), *Proceedings of the 32nd West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, Somerville, MA, Cascadilla Proceedings Project, 276–285.

Manzini, M. R., L. Savoia, 2002, "Clitics. Lexicalisation patterns of the so-called 3rd person dative", *Catalan Journal of Linguistics* 1, 117–155.

Martin, F., F. Schäfer, 2012, "The modality of 'offer' and other defeasible causative verbs", in: N. Arnett, R. Bennett (eds), *Proceedings of WCCFL 30*, Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project, 248–258.

Ormazabal, J., J. Romero, 2012, "PPs without Disguises: Reply to Bruening", *Linguistic Inquiry*, 43, 2, 455–474.

Pesetsky, D., 1995, *Zero Syntax: Experiencers and Cascades*, Cambridge, MA, MIT Press.

Pineda, A., 2012, "Transitividad y afectación en el entornolingüístico romance y eusquérico", in: X. Viejo (ed.), *Estudios sobre variaciónsintácticapeninsular,*Oviedo, Seminariu de Filoloxía Asturiana de la Universidad de Oviedo, 31–73.

Pineda, A., 2013, "Double object constructions in Spanish (and Catalan) revisited", in: F.A.C. Drijkoningen (ed.), *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 2011*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 193–216.

Pylkkänen, L., 2002, *Introducing Arguments,*Doctoral Dissertation, MIT.

Pylkkänen, L., 2008, *Introducing arguments*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

Ramchand, G., 2008, *Verb Meaning and the Lexico, A First Phase Syntax*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Rappaport Hovav, M., B. Levin, 2008, "The English dative alternation: The case for verb sensitivity", *Journal of Linguistics*, 44, 129–167.

Reinhart, T., 2000, "The Theta System: Syntactic realization of verbal concepts", *OTS Working papers*, 00.0/TL (available also at http://www.let.uu.nl/~tanya.reinhart)

Richards, M., 2008, "Defective Agree, Case Alternations, and the Prominence of Person", in: M. Richards, A. Malchukov (eds), *Scales*. *Linguistische Arbeitsberichte*, vol. 8, Universität Leipzig, 137–161.

Roberge, Y., M. Troberg, 2009, "The high applicative syntax of the *dativus* commodi/*incommodi* in Romance", *Probus*, 21, 249–289.

Roberts, I., 2010, *Agreement and Head Movement. Clitics, incorporation, and defective goals*, Cambridge, MA, MIT Press.

Stegovec, A., 2015, "It's not Case, it's personal! Reassessing the PCC and clitic restrictions in O'odham and Warlpiri", in: P. Umbal (ed.), *Proceedings of the poster session of the 33rd WCCFL*, *SFU working papers in linguistics*, vol. 5, 131–140.

Tigău, A., 2010, *Syntax and Interpretation of the Direct Object in Romance and Germanic Languages with an Emphasis on Romanian, German, Dutch and English*, Bucureşti, Editura Universităţii din Bucureşti.

Tigău, A., 2014, "The Two-Object Construction in Romanian and German", in: R. Cosma, S. Engelberg *et al.* (eds), *Komplexe Argumentstrukturen. Kontrastive Untersuchungen zum Deutschen, Rumänischen und Englischen.* (Konvergenz und Divergenz Series), Berlin/Boston, de Gruyter, 85–141.

Tigău, A.,2016,*A DRT analysis of Clitic Doubling,*Bucureşti,Editura Universităţii din Bucureşti.

Uriagereka, J., 1995, "Aspects of the syntax of clitic placement in Western Romance", *Linguistic Inquiry*, 26, 79–123.

Uriagereka, J., 2005, "On the Syntax of Doubling", in: L. Heggie, F. Ordóñez (eds), *Clitic and Affix Combinations: Theoretical perspectives*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 343–374.

Wood, J., A. Marantz, 2016, "The interpretation of external arguments", in: R. D'Alessandro, I. Franco, Á. Gallego (eds), *The Verbal Domain*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 255–278.

Woolford, E., 2006, "Lexical Case, Inherent Case, and Argument Structure", *Linguistics*, 37, 111–130.

BDD-A26034 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 20:53:49 UTC)