EDITORS’ INTRODUCTION

This issue contains a selection of the papers presented at the international Workshop *On the syntax and interpretation of the DP: around the dative*, held on June 2–4, 2016, at the English Department of the University of Bucharest.

The volume opens with Manzini and Savoia’s paper, which focuses on the internal structure of the DP in Aromanian. The paper offers the advantage of a systematic comparison between Aromanian, Romanian and Albanian with respect to Differential Object Marking and Linkers. The two authors analyse oblique case in terms of a lexicalisation of a part-whole or possessee-possessor relation, which they formalize by means of the inclusion predicate ‘⊆’ and which enables a unification of the genitive and the dative cases. This analysis extends to DOM cases, where it is assumed that the oblique form of DOMed objects signals the fact that these DPs are actually introduced by means of the inclusion predicate and that they are inserted as the ‘possessors’ of the event.

Linkers are crosslinguistically analysed as D expressions i.e., agreement elements, even if the three languages under scrutiny evince a number of differences. The authors argue against the copular nature of these elements and propose instead that the inclusion predicate (oblique case) is responsible for introducing a predication, with linkers partially satisfying one of the arguments of the predication within the ‘⊆’ projection.

The paper also provides an account of possessive structures in the three languages, distinguishing between 3P pronouns and 1/2P pronouns. Thus, while the former pattern with lexical DPs, the latter possess a specialized possessive forms with a complex internal structure containing an initial linker, the 1/2P pronoun itself as well as an inflectional element that agrees with the possessee.

Tănase-Dogaru and Uşurelu’s paper examines adnominal datives in Old Romanian. Its aim is twofold: to build a comprehensive corpus of these constructions and to propose a tentative account. The head noun is analysed either as an agentive nominalization or as a relational noun, which further proves that nouns heading adnominal datives are theta-assigning expressions. Several tentative proposals are made: it is argued thus argued that the adnominal dative is part of the
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NP, and that the adnominal dative is inherently case-marked by the head noun. Lastly, it is shown that adnominal datives show possession.

The two papers on Double Object Constructions representing the joint work of Alexandra Cornilescu, Anca Dinu and Alina Tigău present the results of an experiment carried out on Romanian ditransitive constructions and propose a derivational analysis of these configurations.

The first paper focuses on describing the experiment proper and extends upon its results concerning the binding potential of the two internal arguments in ditransitives: the indirect object (IO) and the directobject (DO) are shown to exhibit symmetrical binding abilities in the sense that each of them can bind a possessor or an anaphor contained in the other. Furthermore, the presence of a clitic doubling the dative argument is shown to have no import on the binding potential of its double. This counts as a strong argument against those accounts in the literature which assume structural differences between ditransitive configurations containing clitic doubled IOs and their undoubled counterparts. Such accounts defend a parallelism between English and Romance, grouping ditransitives containing clitic doubled IOs with Double Object Constructions (DOC) and ditransitives with undoubled IOs with Prepositional Datives (Demonte 1995, Cuervo 2003, Diaconescu and Rivero 2007 a.o.).

In view of the newly obtained experimental evidence, the authors argue against the alternative projection analyses and propose that Romanian ditransitives instantiate the DOC configuration irrespective of whether the IO has been clitic doubled or not. Their findings are in line with other recent studies on Romance (Ormañazabal and Romero (2010), Pineda (2012, 2013 a.o.) and seem to favor a derivational account which constitutes the focus of the second paper. Another interesting result uncovered by the experiment concerns the difference between ditransitive constructions containing differentially object marked DOs and ditransitive constructions where the DO is not DOM-ed: DOM-ed DOs cannot bind IOs, irrespective of clitic doubling of the indirect object. The sequences become acceptable, however, if the DO is clitic doubled. An account of this phenomenon is proposed in the second paper.

The goal of the second paper is to provide a derivational account of Romanian ditransitive configurations in line with the experimental data presented in the preceding companion paper. The symmetric binding potential of the DO and the IO comes as a consequence of the relative hierarchical order of the two internal arguments (with the DO generated higher than the IO, which is merged within a low PP) combined with subsequent movement of the IO into AppP for reasons of case assignment and θ-features checking. As already shown in the first paper, the dative clitic has no structural import and may not be assumed to merge as the head of the AppP as it has been proposed in alternative projection accounts.

The constraints exhibited by ditransitive configurations where the direct object bears Differential Object Marking (DOM) and which seem acceptable only
if the DO is clitic doubled is also accounted for: in line with Richards (2008), it is proposed that pe-marked DOs are endowed with an [+iPerson] feature. As such, the DO competes with the IO when it comes to valuing the person feature of the Appl°. The doubling of the DO forces its movement to a higher position, which in turn allows the IO to agree with the applicative and check it case. The restriction on differentially marked DOs is thus explained away in terms of a locality problem. The accusative clitic seems to have an important syntactic role in this respect by removing a potential intervener, the DO, blocking agreement of the IO with Appl°.

Adina Bleotu’s paper focuses on denominal verbs which may be paraphrased by means of the verb give, and argues that the light verb GIVE cannot incorporate. A first solution to the problem would be to claim that GIVE does not represent a semantic primitive and is decomposable into other verbs (e.g. give x to y= CAUSE [x TO BE of Y]). However, this explanation might be slightly problematic given that other non-primitive verbs have been argued to incorporate (BECOME, PUT) (Rappaport and Hovav 1998, Hale and Keyser 2002): shelve, for instance, has been analyzed as PUT ON shelf (Hale and Keyser 2002). On the other, 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 different case-assigning properties than the light verb it allegedly derives from (a da bucurie cuiva ‘to give joy’, requiring a Dative object vs. a bucura pe cineva ‘to make somebody happy’, requiring an Accusative object), the formation of a verb with a completely different meaning from the expected one (a da forma ‘to give form to something’ vs. a forma ‘to form something’) a.o. Such evidence supports the idea that paraphrases need to be clearly distinguished from the actual lexical semantic representation of denominals. Moreover, the behaviour of the light verb GIVE seems to be paralleled by the behaviour of the lexical verb give, which fails to create compounds incorporating nouns in English, Romanian and other languages.