

# DOM and intervention effects in Romanian ditransitives

Alina Tigău (University of Bucharest) and Klaus von Heusinger (University of Köln)

**1. Introduction** This paper discusses Romanian (Rom) ditransitive constructions (DC) focusing on some intervention effects arising when a differentially marked direct object (DOMed DO) co-occurs with an indirect object (IO). Our study rests on three grammaticality judgement experiments involving 480 Romanian natives and testing quantificational binding relations between the two internal arguments. One of the most comprehensive studies on Rom DCs is Diaconescu & Rivero (2007)'s alternative projection account. They argue that the two interpretations of *give*-verbs, *caused movement* and *caused possession* mirror configurations (1) and (2) respectively:

- (1) *Theme c-commands Goal*: [<sub>VoiceP</sub> DP<sub>Agent</sub> Voice[<sub>VP</sub> v [<sub>PP</sub> DP<sub>Theme</sub> P DP<sub>Goal</sub>]]]  
 (2) *Goal c-commands Theme*: [<sub>VoiceP</sub> DP<sub>Agent</sub> Voice[<sub>VP</sub> v [<sub>ApplP</sub> DP<sub>Goal</sub> [**cl**<sub>Appl</sub>] [<sub>VP</sub> V DP<sub>Theme</sub>]]]]

In (1) the dative is a PP argument c-commanded by the Theme while in (2) the Goal is introduced by a low Appl°, it is interpreted as a Possessor and it c-commands the Theme, determining the asymmetries in Barss&Lasnik (1987) for the English Double Object Construction (DOC). D&R claim that the DOC properties obtain *only if the Goal is clitic doubled (CD)* with Appl° spelling out as a dative *clitic*. In order to test these predictions, we conducted a series of three grammaticality judgement tasks manipulating i) the surface order of DO and IO; ii) direction of binding between DO and IO; iii) the presence of a dative clitic doubling IO and iv) the DO form (unmarked vs. DOMed vs. CDed+DOMed). As the first three parameters already yield a 2x2x2 design, we decided to design three similar questionnaires with 32 test items each and which differed through the DO type used. The results (in 3) show that: a) binding dependencies *do not depend on CD*; b) the two internal arguments show *symmetric c-command*; c) surface word order is an important factor for acceptability: items where the surface word order matches binding directions obtain higher scores than instances where reverse binding obtains. d) The presence of a dative clitic doubling the IO significantly lowers the acceptability of the items in comparison to their undoubled counterparts. e) Finally, sequences where a DOMed DO co-occurs with a CDed IO are highly problematic for surface word order *DO precedes IO*. The analysis in (1) & (2) is thus severely *incomplete*, excluding many grammatical patterns. These findings suggest that the alternative projection account in its present form cannot be maintained.

(3) Mean values for acceptability judgements of a Likkert scale (1 very bad – 7 very good) for DCs showing quantificational binding dependencies between the two internal arguments

	DO before IO				IO before DO			
	DO binds into IO		IO binds into DO		DO binds into IO		IO binds into DO	
	-cl	+cl	-cl	+cl	-cl	+cl	-cl	+cl
Unmarked DO	4.57	3.64	3.08	3.00	3.40	3.22	4.56	4.35
DOMed DO	4.43	<b>2.64</b>	3.05	<b>2.36</b>	3.36	3.27	4.32	3.68
CDed+DOMed DO	4,51	3,52	3,47	3,18	3,67	3,42	5,52	3,51

**2. Aim** The paper has two aims: a) to provide a derivational analysis of Romanian DCs; b) to account for the difference in the evaluation of the DOMed DO > cl-IO pattern. The co-occurrence of DOMed DOs with CDed IOs was granted very low acceptability scores by the respondents in both directions of binding for the *DO before IO* surface order (4). This effect was not noticed with the counterparts of these patterns in the experiments featuring unmarked DOs (5) and CDed+DOMed DOs, which prompt us to hypothesize that the lower acceptability has to do with the internal structure of the DPs involved.

DO before IO; DO binds into IO; +cl

**DO before IO; IO binds into DO; +cl**

**(5) Unmarked DO + CDed IO (high acceptability)**

DO before IO; DO binds into IO; + cl

**DO before IO; IO binds into DO; + cl**

**3. A derivational account.** Given the experimental findings, we argue in favour of a derivational account for DCs. The symmetric binding potential of the two internal arguments obtains as a consequence of their relative hierarchical order in the VP (6) combined with subsequent movement for reasons of case assignment and [Person] checking (the feature valuation system used is that from Pesetsky & Torrego 2007).

(6) ApplP/  $\alpha$ P

ei  
Appl/  $\alpha$   
ei  
Appl<sup>o</sup>/  $\alpha$  VP  
IO V' ei  
V DO ei

**References:** Barss, A. & H. Lasnik. 1986. A note on anaphora and double objects. *LI* 17: 347–35./Diaconescu, C.

& Rivero M. L. 2007. An Applicative Analysis of DOC in Romanian. *Probus*. 19 (2): 209-23./Pesetsky, David and Torrego, Esther. 2007. The Syntax of Valuation and the Interpretability of Features. In S. Karimi, V. Samiian, W.K. Wilkins (eds), *Phrasal and Clausal Architecture: Syntactic Derivation and Interpretation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 262-194.