

1. Introduction This paper discusses Romanian (=Rom) ditransitive constructions (DC) focusing on the intervention effects arising when a differentially marked direct object (DOMed DO) co-occurs with an IO.

Currently, the most comprehensive study on Rom DC is Diaconescu & Rivero (2007); they treat Dative DPs as applied arguments, offering an alternative projection account. In their analysis, the two interpretations of *give*-verbs, caused movement and caused possession are supposed to respectively correspond to configurations (1) and (2):

- (1) *Theme c-commands Goal*: [_{VoiceP} DP_{Agent} Voice[_{vP} v [_{PP} DP_{Theme} P DP_{Goal}]]]
 (2) *Goal c-commands Theme*: [_{VoiceP} DP_{Agent} Voice[_{vP} v [_{AppIP} DP_{Goal} [_{cl}Appl] [_{VP} V DP_{Theme}]]]]

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

A closer look at the Rom binding data reaches different conclusions: a) DOC readings *do not depend on CD*. b) The two internal arguments show *symmetric c-command*. c) The analysis in (1), (2) is severely *incomplete*, excluding many grammatical patterns. These findings have been proven to be correct in an experimental study (Cornilescu et. al, 2017), which suggested that the alternative projection account in its present form cannot be maintained.

2. The problem The experiment designed to test the binding possibilities of the internal arguments also uncovered a novel empirical problem, namely, the fact that DOMed DO are severely restricted in DCs in that a DOMed DO simply cannot bind an IO, either when it is not CDed (pattern a) or when it is CDed (pattern b). A DOMed DO is fine in a DC only if its doubled by a clitic (pattern c). Surprisingly, in a second follow-up experiment, pattern a) came out grammatical, while judgments for b and c kept constant (see table (3)):

(3)	a. DOM-DO > IO	b. DOM-DO > cl-IO	c. cl-DOM-DO > (cl)-IO
1	*	*	OK
2	OK	*	OK

3. Aim The paper has two aims: a) to provide a derivational analysis of DCs with DOMed DOs; b) to account for the grammaticality difference in the evaluation of the DOMed DO > IO pattern.

4. A derivational account In line with Larson (2010), we take the DP_{Goal} as *part of the verb's a-structure*, and assume the basic configuration of a ditransitive vP to be Theme-over-Goal (4). Appl^o takes VP as its complement and case licenses the Dat, while an AgrOP case licenses the Acc. Apart from its unvalued Case feature, Appl carries strong [*u*Pers], where [Pers] expresses the one property common to all the characteristic Dative θ -roles (e.g. Possessor, Experiencer, Beneficiary) and thus functions as a θ -feature. Importantly, since datives are *inherently specified for the animacy hierarchy*, we consider them to bear a [*u*Pers] feature.

- (4) [_{VP} DP_{Su} v [_{AgrOP} [_{AppIP} Appl [_{VP} DP_{Theme} [_V DP_{Goal}]]]]]

The analysis is maximally simple. With *give*-verbs the Goal must raise to the SpecAppl phrase, checking the [*u*Pers] feature of Appl (MacDonald, 2016). Appl may also case license the Goal. The symmetric binding facts are accounted for. The basic configuration explains the DO>IO facts, while movement to Spec,AppIP of the Goal phrase is sufficient to account for the IO> DO facts. The presence of the Dative clitic makes no difference.

One key ingredient in the analysis is that Datives in DCs have *dual categorial status* as either DPs or PPs and there is an important correlation between their categorial status and CD, in the sense that only Dative DPs may cliticize or be CDed. (Cornilescu, 2017). The DP and PP

Dative have different features, which entail different derivations. PP-Datives are headed by a nullP, which assigns them inherent case (presumably by incorporating into V). Secondly, the P bears an [*i*Pers] feature, valuing the inherent [*u*Pers] feature of the Dative DP. The PP-Dat is thus [*i*Person, Case:Dat] and does not need to agree with any other functional head. As to the derivation of PP datives, with PP_{Goal}, Appl probes its c-command domain and encounters the DP_{Theme} case-licensing it. Appl further scans its c-command domain in search of a matching [Pers] feature which it finds on the PP_{Goal}. Since the [*u*Pers] feature of Appl is EPP, the PP-Dat will raise to Spec, ApplP to value the person feature of Appl. Therefore, PP-Datives, too, take scope of over DOs which are not DOMed. At this point both features of Appl have been valued and both arguments are case-licensed. The Dat-DP has a different grammar, having to check its [*u*Pers] and Dat-case features. While by raising to Spec,ApplP, it checks Case, its [*u*Pers] feature goes unchecked since both the Dat-DP and Appl have [*u*Pers]. In order to check their [*u*Pers] feature, Dat-DPs must cliticize or be CDed; intuitively they must exit the vP and move to a suitable person-checking position. Following the literature (Dobrovie-Sorin 1994, Cornilescu, 2017) we assume a PersonP, right above vP, whose head bears [*i*Pers]. Dat-DPs[*u*Pers] move to SpecPersP, valuing their own [*u*Pers] features, and the corresponding feature of Appl. After movement to SpecPersP, cliticization becomes obligatory.

4. A solution to the puzzle Consider now the grammaticality judgements obtained in the two experiments, as well as the configuration in (5) representing them (irrelevant details aside)

(5) [_{AppIP} Appl [*u*Pers,EPP] [_{VP} DP_{Theme} [*i*Pers] [_{V'} V DP_{Goal}[*u*Pers]/PP_{Goal} [*i*Pers]]]

We need to account for the difference in the evaluation of the cliticless structure DOM-DO>IO. Let us first understand why a DOMed DO behaves differently in DC. As often shown (e.g. Richards, 2008) DOM is a means of upgrading a DP on the animacy/definiteness scale, syntactically treating it as a DP[*i*Pers]. Dative phrases are also sensitive to animacy, and endowed with a [Pers] feature ([*u*Pers], for DPs, or [*i*Pers] for PPs), as seen above. Sameness in marking animate DO/IO is a common situation (Spanish, Hindi, a.o.). Recall that Appl itself bears [*u*Pers, EPP], so that in a configuration like (5), both the DO and the IO act as potential goals. Both objects are in a configuration of Agree with Appl, but the DO is closer, and it is the DO that Agrees with Appl, valuing its Person (and Case) features. If the Dative is a DP, it will remain caseless, causing the derivation to crash. Consider structure a) now. Under the hypothesis that the IO is analyzed as a DP, the sentence is predicted to be ungrammatical as just explained. This analysis is reflected by the sharp rejection of such sentences by the speakers in the first experiment. However a cliticless Dative may also be analyzed as a PP [*i*Person, Case:Dative]. Under this analysis, the IO has no active features left, and the features of Appl have both been valued by the DOMed DO. The PP (re)analysis of the Dative is a last resort strategy, which saves the derivation from crashing. Subjects in the second experiment analyze the Dative as a PP and find the grammatical. Important confirmation of this account is supplied by the consistent judgments regarding the DOM-DO > cl-IO structure. In this case, the clitic clearly indicates the DP status of the IO. Appl will agree with the closer DO and the Dative remains with its person and case features unchecked. The pattern is rejected by all subjects. In structure a), the CDed DO is forced to exit the vP and move to the PersonP, making cliticization possible. Movement to the PersonP allows the DOMed DO to check its person feature, after having checked case in AgrOP. If the DO moves to the PersonP, Appl will probe its c-command domain and agree with the IO, whether it is a PP or a DP (in which case it will also cliticize).

Barss, A. & H. Lasnik. 1986. A note on anaphora and double objects. *LI* 17: 347–35/Cornilescu, A. 2017. Landscaping Romanian Datives, ms. Univ. of Bucharest/Cornilescu, A., et. al., 2017. Romanian Dative Configurations, *RRL LXII* (2)/Cuervo, M. C. 2003. *Datives at large*. PhD, MIT/ Diaconescu, C. & Rivero M. L. 2007. An Applicative Analysis of DOC in Romanian. *Probus*. 19 (2): 209-23/ Dobrovie-Sorin, C. 1994. *The Syntax of Romanian*, Berlin: M. de Gruyter/Larson, R. 2010. On Pyllkänen's Semantics for Low Applicatives. *LI*, 41: 701-704.