1. Introduction

Aim and outline of the paper Unlike other Romance languages, Romanian disposes of nominal and pronominal dative morphology. Thus, feminine nouns and all flexible determiners have special dative-genitive morphology and furthermore the genitive differs from the dative through the presence of the genitival article. A second morphological detail is that Romanian disposes of special dative 3rd person reflexive clitics, differing from Romance languages which extend the se/si form to Indirect Objects, and thus to “dative” uses. The existence of a strong dative morphology makes possible the existence of a more extended class of dative-nominative unaccusative constructions than in other Romance languages. Thus, in addition to Belletti and Rizzi’s class III piacere ‘like’ Psych verbs, which exhibit the same dative-nominative structure, Romanian disposes of an extended class of Psych constructions based on unaccusative verbs, as apparent below. The unaccusative verbs function as light verbs, followed by a psych or somatic noun/adjective. The dative is interpreted as an Experiencer.

(1) Class 3 Psych Verbs  
Îmi place Ion  
I.Dat like.3rd.P.Sg Ion  
‘I like Ion’.

(2) Psych/Somatic Unaccusative Constructions  
a. Mi- este dor de cireșe.  
I.Dat.Cl is. 3rd.P.Sg longing of cherries.  
‘I long for cherries.’
These dative constructions are based on several classes of *light unaccusative verbs*: a) the verb fi ‘be’; b) change of location verbs, (e.g. veni, ‘come’, cădea ‘fall’), anticausative reflexive verbs (*a se face* ‘become’). Of the syntactic and interpretative problems raised by these constructions this paper aims to give an account of the following:

1. Our first aim is to understand the syntax of this type of dative. We claim that the sentences in (2) are *applicative constructions*, where the dative is case-licensed by an *expletive* applicative head (Pylkännen 2002, Georgala 2011).

2. One characteristic property of unaccusative datives is the obligatory presence of the dative clitic ((3)-(5)). In contrast, in most dative structures, the clitic is optional. In particular, the clitic is optional in ditransitive (6) and monotransitive (7) dative structures.

Our second aim is to understand why the clitic is obligatory only in unaccusative constructions. To this end, we offer a detailed presentation of the dative in ditransitive give-type constructions, in contrast with dative in unaccusative structures. Essentially, we claim that with unaccusatives, the dative cannot be case-licensed in its merge position. The clitic is required to pull the relevant DP out of the vP, to a position where it can be value its case feature.
3. One more property that differentiates between dative ditransitive and dative unaccusatives is nominalizations. Dative constructions of ditransitive verbs may be nominalized.

(8) a. *Profesorul a recomandat romanul unor elevi interesați.
    ‘The teacher recommended the novel to some interested pupils.’

b. recomandarea romanului unor elevi interesați
    ‘the recommendation of the novel to some interested pupils’

Unaccusatives show non-homogenous behavior. Some of them are *state verbs* and do not have event or result nominalizations, a case in point is the verb *fi*, ‘be’. Change of location verbs show an intriguing contrast: In their goal of motion or location sense they have the structure Theme_{nom} – Goal/Location_{PP/AdvP}, a structure which feeds nominalization. In the Experiencer_{dat}– Theme_{nom} construction, nominalization of the same verb is systematically excluded. We here illustrate with the verbs *veni* ‘come’ and *rămâne* ‘remain.’

(9) a. *Maria vine la mine.*
    ‘Mary is coming to me.’

b. *venirea Mariei la mine* ‘Mary’s coming to me

c. Mariei îi *vine poftă de cireșe.*
    Mary.Dat she.Dat.Cl comes longing.the of cherries
    ‘Mary is coming to be longing for cherries’

d. *venirea poftei de cireșe Mariei* coming.the longing.Gen of cherries Maria.Dat
    ‘Mary’s coming to be longing for cherries.’

(10) a. *Ion rămâne acasă.*
    ‘Ion remains at home.’

b. *rămânerea lui Ion acasă* John’s remaining at home

c. *Lui Ion îi rămâne această misiune.*
    Ion.Dat he.Dat.Cl remains this mission
    ‘This mission remains to Ion.’

d. *rămânerea acestei misiuni lui Ion.* remaining.the this.Gen. mission Ion.Dat
    ‘this mission’s remaining to Ion’

We claim that nominalization is impossible precisely because *the clitic is obligatory* in the nominative-dative construction. The functional structure of the nominalization is not rich enough to accommodate clitics. For lack of space the paper discusses only the verb *be*, with a few references to change of location verbs.
4. In these unaccusative structures, the dative is mostly interpreted as an Experiencer/Possessor. Landau (2010) convincingly argues that Experiencers are personal locations, a proposal that we adopt and implement in the present analysis. Landau’s view is particularly suited to dative Experiencers: demonstrably, these datives start out as locative arguments in small clauses and raise to value a grammatical [person] feature incorporated by the applicative head; it is this feature which is responsible for turning Goal/Locations into Experiencers/Possessors, that is, personal locations. The person feature is also overtly signaled by the clitic. The Experiencer/Possessor interpretation may thus be derivationally constructed, in addition to being inscribed in the θ-grid of particular predicates, as shown by Arad (1998).

5. We also propose that applicative heads, like other verbal functional heads, may be selective with respect to the case they value on the argument, this property is relevant not only at PF, but also in syntax. Applicatives which project particular case values on the DP assign “inherent” cases, which are always valued before structural cases within phasal domains.

The outline of the paper is as follows: Section 2 offers a detailed presentation of nominal dative fi ‘be’ constructions and proposes that they involve licensing of the dative by means of an expletive applicative verbal head V*Appl. Section 3 spells out the stand we adopt on applicative heads and clitic constructions. Having clarified ours assumptions, we present the analysis of nominal dative fi ‘be’ constructions. In section 4 we extend the analysis to adjectival fi ‘be’ constructions. Section 5 explores ditransitive dative constructions, in an attempt to understand the syntactic properties that differentiate them regarding clitic doubling and nominalization.

2. **On a class of Dative-Nominative be constructions**

2.1. **Varieties of unaccusative configurations**

We assume the following distinction between unaccusative and unergative configurations, from Irwin (2012).

(11) a. *Unaccusative sentence*
- EA (no external argument)
+ VP internal argument requiring structural case
b. *Unergative sentence
   +EA (+ external argument)
   -VP internal argument requiring structural case, typically null.

Irwin (2012) also acknowledges two complex unaccusative configurations, representing change of state unaccusatives (anticausatives) and place unaccusative. Place unaccusatives, which are discussed in this paper, may be *dynamic* (change of location or goal of motion verbs), or *stative* (existential verbs). They are assigned the configuration in (12b):

\[
(12) \quad \begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{The hippies arrived.} \\
\text{b.} & \quad \text{vP} \\
& \quad \text{v} \\
& \quad \text{-rive} \\
& \quad \text{SC} \\
& \quad \text{DP} \quad \text{sc'} \\
& \quad \text{some} \\
& \quad \text{sc} \\
& \quad \text{DP} \\
& \quad \text{hippies DP} \\
& \quad \text{a-PLACE}
\end{align*}
\]

In (12) the place unaccusative *arrive* is derived and incorporates the modifying goal particle *a*. We claim that one realization of the Place constituent in unaccusative constructions is a dative-DP, always headed by a clitic. We slightly simplify the unaccusative structure in (12b), considering small clauses as PredPs (as in Hazout 2004, among many) or as just lexical projections (Stowell 1983). The verb *fi ‘be’* will be analysed as an underived place unaccusative, at least in the uses discussed in this paper: somatic sentences and psych sentences.

2.2. *Be as a restructuring verb*

At least since Moro (1997), the verb *be* has been viewed as an always small clause-selecting, restructuring verb, where restructuring is understood as “the process by which the scope operations associated with a lower predicate (e.g. cliticization, case-licensing) is extended to the domain of a higher predicate” (Cardinaletti & Shlonsky 2004:510). *Be*, as well as its counterparts, exhibits the following properties: a) it doesn’t have a θ- structure; b) it always selects a (small) clause; c) it is a *restructuring verb*; any nominal or prepositional argument
which appears in the *be* clause originates in the small clauses. English *be* clauses uniquely present a nominative subject argument. In contrast, Romanian *fi* ‘be’ clauses may include both an nominative and a dative argument, as apparent in the following pair of sentences:

(13) a. John is [AP John dear to me].
    b. Ion mi-am [AP Ion drag [DP mi]].
       Ion I.Dat.Cl-is [Ion dear I.Dat.Cl]
       ‘Ion is dear to me.’

(14) a. *Ion mi-este numai mie foarte drag.*
    Ion I.Dat.Cl-is only I.Dat. very
    ‘Ion is very dear only to me.’

In both languages, the Theme subject gets to be in the main clause by the cross-linguistically available subject-to-subject raising strategy. The Experiencer argument, however, has different realizations. In English it appears inside the adjectival small clause as a PP dative. In Romanian, in (13b) it is realized in the main clause as a dative clitic, through a process of restructuring. Notice, however, that this is not merely an instance of clitic climbing; Romanian is a clitic doubling language, and, in such clauses, the double dative may also surface in the main clause, to the left of the adjective (14). Raising of a dative from a subordinate domain, namely a DP, into the main verb has often been discussed in connection with possessor datives (Landau 1999b, Deal 2011), and the proposed rule of Possessor Dative Raising has sometimes been extended to A-movement of datives from subordinate into main clauses (Cornilescu 2009). In the present paper, we are trying to integrate dative licensing in unaccusative constructions into the general view of datives as extra arguments of the main verb, licensed by applicative heads.

2.2. *Somatic &Psych fi ‘be’ constructions*

This is a highly frequent structure, whose obligatory constituents are the dative clitic, the verb *fi*, and an NP/DP, always in the singular. The clitic may be doubled by a full dative DP. Two types of NPs occur in this pattern: a) nouns which denote somatic states (*foame* ‘hunger’, *sete* ‘thirst’, *somn* ‘sleep’, *rău* ‘sickness’, *greață* ‘nausea’, etc.); b) nouns which denote intensional psychological states: *poftă* ‘wish’, *drag* ‘love’, *urât* ‘dislike’, *dor* ‘longing’, *grijă* ‘concern, worry’, *milă* ‘pity’, *silă* ‘disgust’ *teamă* ‘fear’. Some of these nouns have internal arguments introduced by the (genitive) preposition *de* (e.g. *sete de adevăr* ‘thirst for truth’, *dor*
de el, ‘longing for him’). From a cross-linguistic perspective, the pattern is familiar exhibiting a dative with certain subject properties and a (normally) post-verbal nominative. The verb is always in the singular, irrespective of the Person of the dative, showing agreement with the singular nominative NP (or DP). Since fi ‘be’ is a one place argument verb devoid of θ-structure, the dative in the fi clause must be the output of some raising strategy. Here are some typical examples:

The somatic nominal fi ‘be’ construction

(15) Dative clitic + fi + somatic NP(DP)

a. Mi-le- este foame/ sete/ frig.
I.Dat.Cl/ they.Dat.cl is hunger/ thirst /cold
‘I am / They are hungry/ thirsty/ cold.’

b. Mi-le- e foarte bine/ foarte rău / greaţă.
I.Dat.Cl/they.Dat.Cl is very good/ very harm/ very nauseous.
‘I feel very well/very ill/very nauseous.’

c. Le- este somn copiilor.
they.Dat.cl is sleep children.Dat
‘The children are sleepy.’

(16) a. Mi- este tot răul din lume.
I.Dat.Cl is all sickness.the in world.
‘I feel terribly sick.’

b. Mi- este o foame de lup.
I.Dat.Cl is a hunger of wolf.
‘I am as hungry as a wolf.’

c. Cand mi-e aşa, când mi-e altfel
now I.Dat.Cl is so, now I.Dat.Cl is otherwise
‘Now I feel one way, and now I fell another way.

d. Cum îti- este?
how you.Dat.Cl is
‘How do you feel?’

The psych fi construction : Dative clitic+ fi + Psych noun

(17) a. Mi-le era poftă de cireşă.
I.Dat.Cl/they.Dat.cl was a craving of cherries
I was/they were longing for cherries.

b. Mi-le- era milă/silă de refugiaţii aceea.
I.Dat.Cl/they.Dat.cl was pity/disgust of refugees those
‘I /They felt pity/disgust for those refugees.’

c. Mi-le este dragurăt de ei.
I.Dat.Cl/they.Dat.cl - is love/hate for them
‘I feel love/hate for them.’

2.3. Properties of the somatic and psych constructions
Properties of the Dative

The property that we exploit is that the dative may alternate with prepositional or adverbial locative phrases, confirming the view that it is interpreted as a Location in a person’s mind. This suggests merger of the dative as a locative constituent.

\[(18)\]  
\[a.\] Mi-\[\text{este}\]\ frig/bine.  
I.Dat.Cl is cold/good.  
‘I am cold/well.’  
\[b.\] \[\text{Este}\] frig/bine \[\text{în cameră}.\]  
is cold/good in the room.  
‘It is cold/well in the room.’

\[c.\] Le \[\text{era}\] groază/teamă.  
they.Dat.Cl was dread/fear.  
‘They were terrified/afraid.’  
\[d.\] Groază/teamă \[\text{era}\] \[\text{în sufletele}\] tuturor.  
Dread/fear was in souls the of all/  
‘Dread/fear was in all their souls.’

Also, in the nominal somatic/psych construction the lexical double may equally be a locative PP introduced by la ‘at’, ‘to’; this PP is also obligatorily clitic-doubled.

\[(19)\]  
\[a.\] Le \[\text{este}\] foame/teamă \[\text{la copii}.\]  
they.Dat.Cl is hunger/fear at children  
\[b.\] *\[\text{Este}\] foame/teamă \[\text{la copii}.\]  
is hunger/fear at children  
‘The children are hungry/afraid.’

This also strongly suggests an initial conceptualization of dative Experiencers as (mental) locations. As already mentioned, the dative clitic is an obligatory constituent, always overtly expressed. It is the clitic, not the lexical dative which is required. This distinguishes dative unaccusatives from dative monotransitive and ditransitive structures, where, with postverbal lexical datives, the clitic is optional. This contrast has already been illustrated in (3)-(7) above.

Dative Experiencers with class 3 piacere psych-verbs have often been claimed to be quirky subjects (Landau 2010, among many). Such a description is only partly adequate for the datives under discussion. Of the properties currently attributed to canonical subjects, the datives in nominal fi constructions clearly show only ability to control the subject of an adjunct clause.

\[(20)\]  
\[\text{Mi-}\] \[\text{e}\] destul de foame pentru a pro mânc\[\text{a}\] prăjiturile.  
I.Dat.Cl is enough of hunger to eat all cakes.the
‘I am hungry enough to eat all cakes.’

(21) I-a fost prea râu pentru a pro nu merge imediat la spital.
     I.Dat.Cl was too much sickness for to not go immediately to hospital.
     ‘He was too sick not to go to the hospital at once.’

While this property may be taken to indicate subject status, there are stronger arguments that the dative does not have full subject status. In the first place, the verb agrees in person and number with the post-verbal NP/DP, as already stated. Furthermore, with specific reference to unaccusative constructions, the dative cannot undergo Subject to Subject Raising. A topicalized plural dative (25) does not trigger agreement on the main verb, as is the case with the plural nominative raised by SSR in (23), and it also does not trigger the expected clitic climbing of the dative clitic, as apparent in (26). Compare the behavior of clitics in ECM constructions, where the (optional) clitic does show up on the main verb, as in (28). The dative clitic simply cannot climb on a raising trigger like: a urma ‘to be to’, a apărea, ‘to appear’.

Given the evidence, there is no need to assume that the dative occupies “the canonical subject position”, a post-verbal case position in a VSO language like Romanian (see Dobrovie Sorin 1994, Cornilescu 2000, Alboiu 2002). It is enough to assume that the dative constituent reaches a position where it is case-licensed. The clitic further raises to the Person field, while the
double may also further move to periphery positions, as shown in examples like (25) above. We conclude that the dative does not qualify as a derived subject.

On the state denoting noun The state denoting noun is a bare singular NP, or a DP in case there is a pre-nominal or post-nominal modifier which forces the insertion of a determiner (see (16)). The morpho-semantic investigation of these nouns in other languages has shown that they are conceptually derived from psych verbs. Some of the nouns in the examples above are deverbal nouns in Romanian too. As shown in the 2010 Dictionary of the Romanian language, published by the Romanian Academy (i.e. *Dicționarul Limbii Române* (=DLR)), some of these nouns are based on psych-verbs and denote a particular type of reified eventualty, a psy-chose to quote Bouchard (1992). An example is poftă, ‘craving’ derived from a pofti ‘crave’ (DLR, Vol. 11:937), or urăţ ‘hatred’ from the verb a urăţ, ‘hate’ (DLR, Vol. XVII: 287). Others are deverbal Slavic borrowings such as drag ‘love’ (see DLR, Vol. 4: 141o) or milă ‘pity’ (DLR Vol. 9: 533). Like the verbs they are based on, these nominalizations are gradable, and accept all the range of modifiers typical of scalar predicates (see (15b), (16a, b) above), as well as typical adjectival substitutes, such as așa, ‘so’, altfel ‘otherwise’, or the degree adverb ‘cum, ‘how’ (see (16c, d)).

An examination of pairs like the ones below shows that the somatic/psych states in the dative nominal constructions are stage-level predicates, which are true of the dative Experiencer for a time-interval determined by the tense-aspect properties of the sentence.

\[(29)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{Mi-e încă teamă de el.} \\
& \quad \text{‘I am still afraid of him.’} \\
\text{b.} & \quad \text{Pe atunci mi-era teamă de el.} \\
& \quad \text{‘At the time, I was afraid of him.’}
\end{align*}
\]

Finally, the contrast between the inchoative and the stative construction shows that the gradable state nouns always designates the result of some normally gradual passage from one state into another.

\[(30)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{Mi-e foame.} \\
& \quad \text{‘I am hungry’} \\
\text{b.} & \quad \text{Mi s-a făcut foame.} \\
& \quad \text{‘I got to be hungry.’}
\end{align*}
\]

Under a localist conceptualization of eventualties, the becoming event in (30b) is conceptualized as change of location event in the sense that the gradable state noun introduces a
path or scale (Beaver 2011), so that the Experiencer moves along this somatic/psychologic scale into the target state.

On the semantic properties of the construction as a whole Given substitution of the dative with locative PPs, it is reasonable to assume that he Dative always starts out as a Location/ Goal. Dative Experiencers are interpreted as mental locations. We propose that a mental location is interpreted as the class of eventualities (manifestations of ) which are “contained” in that mental space. In the constructions under analysis, the nominative subject of the small clause denotes a reified state (hunger, love, etc.). In addition to being a mental space, the Experiencer is also a person, a feature which is associated with an individual concept variable. We may then define the Experiencer as the totality of eventualities (reified states in this case) that overlap/are in contact with a particular mental location. This is the equivalent of saying that the Experiencer denotes the class of states s. such that the individual variable x is in s, i.e. s. s(x); more precisely, if s(x) ⇒ s is in x. This interpretation has first been suggested, to our knowledge, by Bouchard (1992) “The mental state is itself extracted from the verb and stands as a co-argument of the Experiencer”. The latter is either the object of a preposition which locates the reified state within it or has morphology which signals the locative reading. According to Bouchard, psychological verbs are modeled on the relation of contact. “In mental space, the psychose is somehow put in contact with the argument it affects. This argument must be an entity capable of hosting the emotion or feeling that the psychose refers to. Inclusion of a reified state into a location (meaning that there are manifestations of that state at the location) is an interpretative strategy available to both mental and physical locations as shown by existential sentences of the following type:

(31)  E foamete/secetă în acea parte a lumii.
      is starvation/thirst in this part of the world
      ‘There is starvation in this part of the world’

The intuition that psych states, emotions are contained in our mind/body has also been extensively developed by prominent cognitive semanticians like Jackendoff (1990). Our contribution is to suggest a syntactic account of this interpretation, to which we turn in the next section.
3. **The derivation of the nominal *fi* ‘be’ somatic/psych construction**

We propose that nominal dative *fi* constructions should be analysed as *applicative constructions*. The applicative head case licenses the dative constituent and also contributes to its semantic interpretation supplying a necessary [person] feature, which is an obligatory semantic ingredient of the Experiencer θ-role. The clitic not only makes visible this [person] component, but has an essential syntactic role in solving the locality problems faced by A-movement of the dative into the main clause. Given this proposal, we now spell out the assumptions we adopt on applicative heads and on clitic constructions.

3.1. **On applicative heads and applied arguments**

As convincingly shown by Pylkkänen (2002), languages are similar regarding their core arguments (presumably, the subject and the direct object), but differ in the range of non-core arguments they allow. In principle, non-core arguments are not part of the θ-structure of the verb, but may be licensed as event participants by special applicative heads. In Bantu languages, the verbal functional heads which introduce non-core arguments are identifiable as affixes in the morphology of the verb. These morphemes are known as *applicative heads* and they introduce *applied arguments*. In this analysis dative DPs are applied arguments, rather than core ones.

Pylkännen (2002) distinguishes between *high* and *low* applicative heads. High applicatives merge above the VP/νP and denote a thematic relation between an individual and the *event* denoted by the verb phrase. A characteristic context for high applicatives is that of unergative verbs, where only the subject may count as a core argument. A clear instance of high applicative Dative constructions for Romance is the Latin *Dativus Comodi/Incomodi* (=DCI), also identifiable in modern Romance languages, analysed in Roberge and Troberg (2009). The Latin DCI is described as *the person in whose interest or to whose detriment the action is performed*. The applicative head is morphologically null in Latin, and the applied argument is in the Dative Case. The applicative head is projected in the configuration below and it accounts for examples like Latin (33) from Roberge and Troberg (2009):

(32) **DCIs in Latin**
In contrast, Pylkkänen claims that low applied arguments bear no semantic relation to the verb; they only bear a transfer of possession relation to the direct object. This view is also adopted by Cuervo (2003) for Spanish and Diaconescu (2007) for Romanian. The low applicative is the head of a small clause, introducing the extra argument, as in (34b):

While Pylkännen’s description of high applicative heads has gone unchallenged, her view of low applicatives has been found to be problematic.

1. **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 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 (32). This prediction is amply confirmed in Bantu languages. 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, and Georgala, Paul & Whitman (2008) extensively argue that applicative morphemes uniformly occupy the same suffixal position.

2. Larson’s semantic problem Larson (2010) objects to the low applicative analysis on semantic grounds, proving that it endorses wrong entailments; he suggests that the root of the trouble is “exactly Pylkkänen’s departure from standard neo-Davidsonian semantics”[2010:703], 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 VP. In syntactic terms, the low applicative head should also be a VP sister, rather than the head of a subconstituent small clause. The conclusion appears to be that in low applicative constructions both internal arguments are part of the thematic structure of the main verb. The applicative head simply has a case-licensing role. Hence the emergence of a cross-linguistic typology of applicative heads (Harada & Larson 2009, Georgala 2011), which distinguishes between thematic and expletive (raising) applicative heads, in the characteristic structures in (35), due to Georgala (2011). Thematic applicatives are provided with θ-features, valued by the non-core arguments they introduce, as in (33a). 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. Thus the applicative head in (33b) merely case-licenses the IO introduced by the lexical V, attracting it to its specifier.

(35) a. Thematic applicatives

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{SUBJ} \quad \text{v'} \quad \text{v} \quad \text{ApplP IO Benf/Loc/Instr...} \quad \text{Appl'} \quad \text{Appl} \quad \text{VP V DO]}}\]
\end{array}
\]

b. Raising applicatives

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{SUBJ} \quad \text{v'} \quad \text{v} \quad \text{ApplP IO rec ...} \quad \text{Appl'} \quad \text{Appl} \quad \text{VP t IO V DO]]}}\]
\end{array}
\]

In addition, the data we have looked at suggest that an expletive applicative, especially when it is associated with an inherent case, may also involve checking a supplementary semantic feature, thus sharpening the thematic interpretation of the DP. Similarly, depending on the initial position of the applied argument, movement to Spec, ApplP may change the c-command relations between the verb’s arguments, a fact that may have interpretative effects.

In conclusion, what the expletive/thematic applicative hypothesis contributes to the discussion of the extra-object construction is that it reconciles the evidence that extra objects
merge in two positions (inside or above the VP) with the evidence that there is a single position for applicative heads. The one position of the Appl head is above a lexical VP. The analysis below makes use of both expletive and thematic appilcatives. The applicative may be semantically enriched by incorporating an unvalued [person] feature, which makes the difference between Location/Goal and Experiencer datives.

3.2. Clitic constructions

Since the class of unaccusative dative constructions which form the object of our paper presupposes obligatory doubling, it is appropriate to briefly present our assumptions regarding clitics and Clitic Doubling (=CD).

Firstly, we assume that the clitic and its double are licensed as one event participant, at least in languages where the double occupies an argument position. One reviewers wonders whether there is evidence for this claim, since it is known that in practice it has proved difficult to distinguish between Clitic Doubling, i.e. the cases where the clitic doubled DP occupies a vP-internal argument position, and Clitic Right Dislocation (=CLRD), where the doubled DP sits in an adjunct position, especially when the only empirical difference between the two is the intonational contour. Fortunately, Romanian clearly distinguishes between CDing and CLRD at least for accusative clitics. CD is possible only with a subset of the differential object marked PE DPs. Consequently, there is a unilateral dependence of CD on the prepositional accusative strategy (see for details Cornilescu & Dobrovie (2006), Tigău (2010) among many). In contrast, CLRD is compatible with all types of accusative DPs, bare or prepositional.

(36) a. In final, Maria l-a adoptat, #copilul/#pe copil.
at last, Maria he.ACC.CL-has adopted, child.the./PE child.
‘At last, Mary adopted him, the child.’

b. In final, Maria l-a adoptat pe copil.
at last, Maria he.ACC.CL-has adopted PE child.

c. *In final, Maria l-a adoptat copilul.
at last Maria he.ACC.CL-has adopted child.the
‘At last, Mary adopted the child.’

Thus, since the noun copil ‘child’ is inherently person-denoting, it allows both a bare accusative and a differentially marked pe ‘on’ accusative. CLRD is possible in both cases (36a),
but CD requires the *pe* accusative, as the contrast between (36b) and (36c) shows. While for dative DPs, there is no differentially marked form, there is independent evidence that shows that the double dative DP sits in an argument position, not only when it is undoubled, but also when it is doubled. One piece of evidence is that the dative may act as a controller in obligatory control configurations, and control is possible only from an arguments position, as shown in Landau (1999a). In the structure below, the supine clause, introduced by DE is the direct object of the main verb *da* ‘give’, while the dative DP is an indirect object controller.

(37)  

\[ Au \text{ dat} \quad [\text{de PRO rezolvat trei probleme}] \text{ fiecărui elev}. \]  

have.3\text{rdP.Pl} given [PRO to solve three problems] each.Dat pupil.  

‘They have given to each pupil to solve three problems.’  

b.  

\[ I\text{-au dat} \quad [\text{de PRO rezolvat trei probleme}] \text{ fiecărui elev}. \]  

he.Dat.Cl- have.3\text{rdP.Pl} given [PRO to solve three problems] each.Dat pupil.

As a second piece of evidence, a doubled dative may be coordinated with a non-doubled one, which shows that both are arguments, since coordination of an argument with an adjunct is disallowed:

(38)  

\[ I\text{-am împrumtat bani} \quad \text{fratelui meu și părinților mei}. \]  

he.Dat.Cl- have.1\text{stP.Sg} lent money my brother.Dat and to my parents.  

‘I lent money to my brother and to my parents.’

In the analysis below we adopt a variant of the *Movement Hypothesis* on clitics, retaining, however the idea that the clitic licenses the double from the *Base Generation Hypothesis*. As known, there have been two major approaches in analyzing single clitic and CD constructions. The *Movement Hypothesis*, as old as Kayne (1975), always treats the clitic as an ordinary *pronominal argument*, which merges in a VP internal position and is regularly assigned a \(\theta\)-role and also case; however, since the clitic is “light”, being “structurally deficient”, it is attracted to the *inflectional* domain of the clause, for T-clitics, or to the *left periphery* in the case of second position, C-clitics. A minimalist implementation of this view is Roberts (2010). Precisely because the clitic behaves like an ordinary DP, it “absorbs” the case feature of the licensing head, for instance, the accusative feature of the verb. This creates a problem for CD languages, since it is not clear how the double values its own case feature. An elegant answer was supplied by
Kayne’s Generalization, which claimed that an object DP may be doubled by a clitic only if it is preceded by a special preposition, such as Romanian pe ‘on’ or Spanish ‘a’. While this generalization holds true for Romance languages, it faces well-known counterexamples, for instance in the Balkan languages, such as Albanian (Kalluli 2000) or Greek (Anagnastopoulou, 1994). As already shown, Romanian dative clitics also may be doubled by non-prepositional DPs, against Kayne’s Generalization.

The Base Generation Hypothesis, detailed in Sportiche (1998), views the clitic as a functional category of the verb, an agreement marker, which, far from depriving the verb of its case assigning abilities, makes possible case valuation for the argument DP, through the clitic chain. In this analysis, the clitic merges in the inflectional field, as the head of a Cl(itic) P(hrase), while the double, also known as the associate, merges in a vP-internal A-position. In this approach, the role of the clitic is precisely that of case-licensing the associate, integrating it into clause structure. A very different implementation of the same intuition is found in Boeckx (2001), inspired by Kayne’s analysis of strong pronouns in French. Kayne claims that, in examples of doubling, the strong pronoun, being adjunct like, has inert φ-features and cannot participate in the agreement operations in the clause. Its case feature remains unvalued. Hence the clitic is necessary to integrate the associate into the structure of the clause by case-licensing it. The unilateral dependence of the associate on the clitic appears in that it is often the case that the associate may be null, if the clitic is overt, while an overt associate requires an overt clitic, as shown by Kayne (2001):

(39)  
a. \textit{J’aime la chimie.}
I.Nom.Cl love chemistry.

b. \textit{Moi j’aime la chimie.}
I I.Nom. Cl love chemistry.

c. \*\textit{Moi aime la chimie.}
‘I love chemistry’

More recent minimalist studies on clitics emphasize their special role at the interfaces, treating them as “regular” DPs, as far as syntax goes. Thus, according to Krivochen (2014), clitics are lexical items which are syntactically independent, and phonologically dependent; they are maximal projections throughout syntax, but take no complements or specifiers. Since they are non-branching maximal projections, they count as both maximal and minimal (light)
elements. The advantage of this position is that a strong uniformity thesis is maintained, there are no syntactically extraordinary elements (e.g. a category of clitics, CL-phrases, etc) all differences between categories arise at the interfaces. In this case the relevant interface is PF, all that clitics have “anomalous” is their phonological form: their need to attach to a host (since they are light) and the impossibility of stress. Cliticization and reordering rules within clitic clusters are post-syntactic operations which take place at PF (see Săvescu 2009).

Another “special” feature of clitics is that they license the presence of associate XPs. 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. In particular, the case-feature of the clitic is transmitted to the associate, as also suggested, in different manners, by both Sportiche (1998) and Kayne (2001). We will assume that the agreement of the clitic with its associate occurs when the clitic has valued all its features. The agreement relation between the clitic and the associate is made visible in the phonological exponent of both, (all) the features of the clitic being copied on the associate at PF. There cannot be a mismatch between the clitic and the associate with respect to φ-features and Case.

There are several different implementations of the idea that the associate and the clitic are components of the same constituent at merge. Probably the best known is the Big DP hypothesis, first proposed by Uriagereka (1995); see also Torrego (1998) for Spanish, Fischer (2000) for Catalan, Tigău 2010 for Romanian). In this analysis, the clitic is a D-head at merge and it selects the associate as its specifier (Uriagereka, 1995) or as its complement (Papangeli 2000, Cornilescu 2006). For reasons explained above, we will adopt slightly different analysis which regards both the clitic and the double as phrases licensed in a small clause configuration (Uriagereka 2002, Krivochen 2014). Specifically, the structure that we adopt for doubled DPs is a small clause headed by an empty D, with the clitic as specifier and the associate as a complement.

\[ (40) \quad [\text{DP} \text{DP}_\text{cl} [\emptyset_D] \text{DP}_\text{ass}] \]

Since cliticization is regarded as a PF interface phenomenon, clitics 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 it values
through the derivation. To check their unvalued person features (and perhaps other semantic features as well, as suggested in Manzini & Savoia 2002), clitics move as phrases up to a Person field, situated above Tense (as proposed in Bianchi (2006) and Săvescu (2009) for Romanian). As to their case feature, work on clitics has shown that they never value their case feature in merge positions, but, on the way to the Person field, they systematically pass through structural case positions, exiting the lexical vP, as proposed in Săvescu (2009) for Romanian.

The view that clitic phrases pass through vP external case positions is strongly supported by binding and scope facts, which unambiguously prove that doubled DOs or IOs (unlike undoubled ones) may bind the subject (reconstructed) in Spec, vP and may scope over it, even if 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. Thus, in (41), the possessive lui ‘his’, a part of the preverbal subject, may be bound by the post verbal IO, lui Ion ‘to Ion’, but the coreferential reading is not possible if the IO is not doubled (42). Similar binding data are given in (43) and (44). In (45), the IO, fiecărui profesor ‘to every professor’ scopes over the preverbal subject câte doi studenți ‘some two students’, where câte is a distributive particle:

(41)  Nici filmele lui i/j nu-i mai plac lui Ion.
      nor films.the his not-he.Dat.Cl anymore please to Ion
      ‘Ion doesn’t like his movies any more.’
(42)  Nici filmele lui i/j nu mai plac lui Ion.
      nor films.the his not-he.Dat.Cl anymore please to Ion
(43)  Religia lor le ajută multora.
      Religion.the theirs they.Dat.Cl helps many.Dat
      ‘Many people are helped by their religion.’
(44)  *Religia lor ajută multora.
      Religion.the theirs they.Dat.Cl helps many.Dat
(45)  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.’

We conclude that, before going to the Person field above T, the clitic phrase reaches a vP external case position, above the Nominative constituent. The applicative analysis of dative licensing instantiates this proposal.

Probably the most interesting result of recent research on clitics has been a better understanding of the semantic properties of the CD construction. As Krivohen insists, doubling is a form of redundancy, which is acceptable only because it has “a drastic effect at the output”,
i.e. at the semantic interface, in the sense of Grohmann 2003. In this conception the CD construction could not have, and actually, does not have the same interpretation as the cliticless construction. Thus, Delfitto (2002) points out that the compositional semantics of clitic doubled arguments differs from that of undoubled arguments, presupposing a two-step interpretative process. The clitic alone abstracts on an argument variable forming a $\lambda$-abstract. The associate is then interpreted as the subject of the clitic-headed $\lambda$-abstract (functional application). In contrast, an undoubled argument may directly undergo functional application saturating one role of the predicate. A well studied semantic effect of the clitic is sharpening the denotation of the associate. The associate of an accusative clitic is interpreted as referentially stable and speaker prominent. Of the three denotations of the DP, the property reading is eliminated. (see Dobrovie-Sorin 1994, Cornilescu 2001, Avram & Coene 2009). For dative clitics there is also an effect of "increased referentiality", in the sense that, through its locative, deictic feature, the dative clitic may introduce an entailment of actuality of the associate’s referent (see Martin 2012 and Section 5 below).

A specific effect of dative clitics, quite apparent in the data analyzed in this paper, is to signal a person feature in the interpretation of other functional heads, such as the applicative head. This change in the feature of the applicative head amounts to a shift from the Locative/Goal to the Experiencer interpretation of the dative argument. Thus, whenever a mental space is required for a particular interpretation the clitic is obligatory. If this is not the case, the Dative is (also) interpretable as a location. Consider the examples below involving veni ‘come’:

(46) a. Coletul a venit la mine abia ieri.
   parcel.the has come to me only yesterday.
   b. Coletul mi-a venit abia ieri.
   parcel.the I.Dat.Cl has come only yesterday.
   ‘The parcel reached me only yesterday.’

(47) a. *Idee a venit la mine abia ieri.
   idea.the has come to me only yesterday.
   b. Ideea mi-a venit abia ieri.
   idea.the I.Dat.Cl has come only yesterday
   ‘The idea occurred to me only yesterday’

As emphasized by Uriagereka (2005) the clitic is a means of grounding and perspectivizing a particular subevent in the event structure of the clause, facilitating a particular
relation between two DPs in the clause. In particular, it introduces integral part-whole relations. Thus in (46a) there is no implication that the parcel belongs to me (is a part of me). This interpretation is possible in (46b) with the clitic. On the other hand in the psych interpretation (‘occur to smb’) the clitic is obligatory and the part-of relation is obvious, the idea is part of the mental space represented by the Dative constituent.

3.3. The derivation of the Unaccusative configuration

Under these assumptions on CD, it may be shown that in unaccusative configurations, movement of the Goal dative for case-licensing and, consequently, doubling by the clitic are both obligatory. Let us start from an example like (48a), which allows for word order variation, as in (48 b-e). Assume that V*Appl does not have an EPP feature. If, as shown above, the V*ApplP must be a sister to some VP, in (49), it can only merge above vP, which is the only verbal node. The essential remark to make is that the dative-DP is too low to be licensed in situ, across the vP, as apparent in (49), since the closest nominal to V*Appl is the subject poftă de cireșe ‘craving for cherries’. Imagining a foot driven motivation for movement, the clitic, which is endowed with unvalued case and person features is forced to move to edge positions until it is in the domain of a suitable functional head. As to the associate, we will accept Kayne’s (2001) suggestion that the associate has inert φ-features and an unvalued case feature and cannot be attracted to value the features of verbal functional heads, this being the task of the clitic phrase. The clitic and the associate must however be in a local configuration to allow the formation of the clitic-associate chain. The unvalued case feature of the associate will be valued by agreement with the clitic, when the latter has reached the Person field. It is on the strength of this syntactic agree operation that at PF, all the formal features of the clitic are copied on the associate. To allow agreement, the associate must remain accessible throughout the derivation. This condition is fulfilled in an unaccusative configuration, since an unaccusative vP is not a phasal domain, as stressed by one of the reviewers. Indeed, a vP is phasal only if its specifier is filled by merge (which is the case of unergative and transitive configurations, but not of unaccusative configurations (Beek 2008).

Let us continue discussing the derivation of (48a). The null Place head raises and adjoins to Ộ, allowing the clitic DP to move to the edge of the vP, in a Spec, vP position, (leaving the associate behind). The clitic phrase in Spec, vP is accessible to the V*Appl head, and can agree
with it. V*_{Appl} case-licenses the clitic, while the clitic DP values the [iperson:___] feature V*_{Appl} is endowed with. V*_{Appl} is now specified as [goal/location, +person]. The locative or goal interpretation is current for applicative heads, as already shown by Pylkkänen (2008). The addition of the [person] feature, contributed by the agree relation with the clitic, changes the θ-interpretation of the dative DP to that of an Experiencer, understood as a personal location. The Experiencer interpretation is thus *derivationally constructed*. The Experiencer role appears to be a contextual reading of other θ- configurations, in this case the Locative/Goal configuration, as first shown by Arad (1998). One more detail should be specified: Romanian V_{Appl} heads license a particular value of the Case feature, Dative or Accusative. This property, which is relevant at the syntax-morphology interface, may be inscribed on the V_{Appl} head, using the star notation, suggested in Sigurðsson (2012), hence the star on V*_{Appl} above.

Pursuing the derivational steps, in (50), the verb fi raises to the V*_{Appl} head, since the latter is part of its extended domain. Suppose the T head merges then, endowed with uφ and a case feature. The clitic phrase is now inactive, as far as case is concerned. Consequently, the Tense head can access the subject of the small clause, even if the latter remain *in situ*. When the Person head merges, endowed with an EPP feature, the clitic phrase is attracted to it and values its interpretable person feature, so that the clitic phrase in Spec, PersP now has a fully specified matrix. There follows agree of the clitic with the associate, as explained above, resulting in the formation of the clitic-associate chain. In this derivation, the resulting word order is that of (48a).

A lot of word order variation is allowed, as apparent in (48 b-e), due to the fact that Romanian is an VSO language (Dobrovie-Sorin 1994, Cornilescu 2000, Alboiu 2002, Hill 2002), so the subject may remain postverbal or move to a left periphery position. A second source of variation is the Pied Piping parameter, allowing the big clitic DP, to be displaced with the clitic. Under these assumptions, deriving the word order in (48b) is not problematic: in (48b) the dative clitic pied pipes the big DP, so that the associate ends up preceding the small clause subject.

Finally, as seen in (48 c, d, e), either the nominative DP or the dative associate or both may target left-periphery positions.

(48)

(a) Mi- este poftă de cireșe numai mie.  
I.Dat.Clis craving of cherries only to me  
‘Only I have a craving for cherries.’

(b) Mi- este numai mie poftă de cireșe.  
I.Dat.Clis only to me craving of cherries.
c.  *Numai mie mi-* este poftă de cireşe.
   only to me  I.Dat.Clis craving of cherries

d.  *Poftă de cireşe mi-este numai mie.*
   craving of cherries  I.Dat.Clis only to me

e.  *Poftă de cireşe numai mie mi-este.*
   craving of cherries  only to me  I.Dat.Clis

(49)

(50)

Conclusions
1. The clitic is obligatory in unaccusative constructions in as much as in these constructions the Dative cannot be licensed in situ.

2. The dative is case-licensed by \( V_{Appl} \) endowed with a \([u \text{ person}]\) which turns the Locative dative into an Experiencer.

3. The applicative head is a functional verb which extends the lexical phase, allowing computational operations which would otherwise have been barred.

One understands why in all unaccusative configuration doubling of the Dative DP by the clitic is obligatory, an empirical fact that had gone not only unexplained, but also unnoticed.

4. **The adjectival \( fi \) construction**

4.1. **Preliminaries**

The adjectival \( fi \) construction brings out more clearly the role of the clitic, as well as the case-licensing and sometimes \( \theta \)-licensing role of \( V^*_{Appl} \). Let us start from the empirical observation that with certain adjectives, such as the somatic and psych ones (see (52)), the dative, interpreted as an Experiencer, is part of their a-structure, while this is not the case with other adjectives, for instance, size adjectives. Actually, for many ordinary qualifying adjectives (see (53)), the dative is only optional and it is interpreted as a Bene/Male-Ficiary, paraphrasable by 'pentru 'for'.

(52) **somatic and psych adjectives:** drag ‘dear’, scump ‘dear’, urât, nesuferit ‘hateful’,

(\( ne \)plăcut, ‘(un)pleasant’, antipatic, ‘hateful’, egal/indiferent ‘all the same’; \( ne \)cunoscut,

‘unknown’, necesar/trebuincios ‘necessary’, etc,

(53) **Romanul mi-e necunoscut.**

novel.the I.DAT.CL us unknown

‘The novel is unknown to me.’

(54) **qualifying adjectives:** mare ‘big’, mic ‘small’, larg ‘wide’, strâmt ‘narrow’, bun ‘good’
potrivit ‘suitable’, util, folositor ‘useful’, etc.

(55) a. **Rochia asta mi-e prea mare/prea largă.**

dress.the this I.Dat.Cl -is too big/too wide.

‘This skirt is too big/too tight for me.’

b. **Mi-este și mie fusta asta prea strâmtă.**

I.Dat.Cl –is also to me skirt.the this too tight
The perceptive reader will by now have guessed that the two adjective classes show the difference between datives licensed by expleyive applicative heads and datives licensed by thematic applicative heads. A natural analysis of the qualifying adjectival *fi* construction is to view the dative as an instance of Dativus Comodi/Incomodi, i.e. as a non-core argument introduced by a thematic applicative head, in the same configuration as for unergative verbs in Roberge e.a.’s analysis, illustrated in (32) above. The qualifying adjectives in (54) behave like unergative verbs and accept a Ficiary non-core argument.

Adapting the schema in (32) to a copulative configuration, a sentence like (55b) might start from a configuration like (56). The adjective is unergative, the applicative head merges above the vP and θ-marks and case licenses a non-core Beneficiary argument which has merged in the θ-free position Spec, vP. In representing the adjectival small clause, we have followed Matushansky (2002), who introduces the adjective’s external argument by means of a light adjectival head. When the copula and the clitic raise the resulting order is that of (55b)

(56) \[ V^{*}_{\text{ApplP}} \]
\[ V^{*}_{\text{Appl}} \]
\[ V^{*} \]
\[ vP \]
\[ DP_{\text{dat}} \]
\[ v' \]
\[ \text{mi- șii mie} \]
\[ v \]
\[ aP \]
\[ fi \]
\[ DP \]
\[ a' \]
\[ \text{fusta asta} \]
\[ a \]
\[ \text{AP} \]
\[ \text{prea strâmtă} \]

Psych adjectives show a more complex grammar. There are two possibilities of realizing the dative argument. With some of these adjectives, such as *plăcut*, ‘pleasant’, *drag* ‘dear’, and a
couple more, the dative may be a complement internal to the AP, in which case there is no raising into the main clause and no clitic, as in (57a). With all of the somatic and psych adjectives the dative may also occur in the main clause, with clitic doubling as in (57b).

(57)  

a.  *Un om drag mie nu s-ar comporta așa.*  
   ‘A man dear to me would not behave like this.’

b.  *Mie omul ăsta mi-e drag.*  
   ‘To me this man is very dear.’

Let us turn to the dative inside the AP construction and consider the realization of the internal argument of the adjective as a dative DP. Generally, Romanian adjectives realize their internal argument as a PP, just like English ones. Some adjectives allow a variation between the dative and the PP construction, illustrated in (58) below. Others, including many of those listed above, have the marked option of c-selecting only dative complements, rejecting both the preposition la ‘at/to’ and pentru ‘for’. The correct generalization seems to be that (with certain known exceptions) adjectives that c-select DP (to the exclusion of PP) realize it as a Dative.

(58)  

produs util pentru agricultură/ agriculturii  
‘product useful for agriculture/to agriculture’

(59)  

a.  *drag/scump sufletului meu*  
   ‘dear to my soul’

b.  *drag/scump la mine ; drag pentru mine*

As already discussed, a dative DP inside an AP cannot be clitic doubled, since there isn’t sufficient functional structure to accommodate the clitic (there are no T and Person projections). In this construction the dative is a core argument, both θ-licensed and case licensed by the adjective and it is not an applied argument. The structure of (60a) is as indicated in (60b).

(60)  

a.  *Acest om este drag sufletului meu.*  
   ‘This man is dear to my soul.

b.  \[
    \begin{array}{c}
    \[P \[DP_{Theme acest om} [fI,] \] \[AP \[A \[\text{drag} \] \[DP_{Exp sufletului meu}]]
    \end{array}
    
The next case to consider is realization of the Experiencer as a main clause dative. One could envisage two analyses. The first is to analyse the Experiencer as a non-core argument and use the derivation already discussed. One must then extend θ-Theory and assume then that the
satisfaction of \( \theta \)-features is phasal and since the AP is not a phase, the adjective’s \( \theta \)-features are checked at the close of the \( vP \) phase, i.e. after \( V^*_{\text{Appl}} \) has licensed the Experiencer role. This solution misses the essential distinction between the two types of adjectives: the dative of psych adjectives is interpreted as an Experiencer, not a Ficiary and this interpretation requires doubling by the clitic, for all adjectives which do not realize the dative inside the AP. Given this, it is preferable to adopt a derivation very similar to that of the nominal somatic construction.

Consider example (61a) below, and a possible intermediate representation of this example in (62). Assume that the dative clitic DP merges in the regular internal argument position of the adjective. In contrast with the Ficiary-selecting unergative adjectives, the internal argument is \( \theta \)-licensed by the adjective, which assigns it an Experiencer role.

\[
\begin{align*}
(61) & \quad \text{a. } Le & \text{era} & \text{tuturor elevilor foarte drag} & \text{acest profesor.} \\
& & \text{they.Dat.Cl was to all pupils.the very dear this teacher} \\
& & \text{‘This teacher was very dear to all the pupils.’} \\
& \text{b. } Tuturor elevilor & \text{le} & \text{era foarte drag} & \text{acest profesor.} \\
& & \text{to all pupils.the they.Dat.Cl was very dear this teacher}
\end{align*}
\]

(62)

\[
\begin{align*}
V^*_{\text{ApplP}} \\
\quad V & \quad vP \\
\quad a+v+V & \quad AP & \quad v' \\
\quad fi & \quad A & \quad DP & \quad a+v & \quad aP \\
\quad drag & \quad DP & \quad D' & \quad DP & \quad a' \\
\quad \text{le-} & \quad D & \quad DP & \quad acest profesor & \quad \& \quad AP \\
\quad \triangle & \quad \text{tuturor elevilor}
\end{align*}
\]
In (62), as well as in (56) above, the subject of the adjective merges as the specifier of a light adjectival head, as proposed in Matushansky (2002). If the light adjectival head raises to the little vfi, the complement AP, containing the clitic phrase, may move to Spec, vP. The verb fi, naturally raises to the applicative head and further to T. Importantly, since the AP is not phasal, the dative DP in Spec, vP is accessible to V*Appl. In the example represented the nominative subject has remained in the aP, where it is nevertheless accessible to T, given that the intervening (dative) DP is case licensed. The associate, as well as the subject may also target periphery position, producing word-order variation. An examples is given in (51b). Note that V*Appl is expletive this time, since the θ- role has been assigned by the lexical adjective.

Conclusions

1. Adjectival constructions exhibit the same type of derivation as nominal ones. The more selective applicative head licenses its argument first. When the dative DP is inactive, the nominative subject becomes accessible to Tense and can value its case feature.

2. The adjectival data clearly show the difference between thematic and expletive applicatives.

5. On the distribution of the Dative Goals and Accusative Themes

5.1. Empirical problems

The aim of this section is to sketch a possible account of the difference between ditransitive and unaccusative dative constructions, regarding the following empirical contrasts: a) in unaccusative dative constructions the clitic is obligatory, while in ditransitive constructions the clitic is optional even with DOC readings; b) transitive dative constructions may be nominalized, unlike unaccusative ones.

The analysis makes the following claims: a) In ditranstive constructions, the dative always merges below the Theme, even when it is an applied argument (as also proposed in Gierling (1996); b) The [person] feature incorporated by the expletive applicative head does not (always) have the EPP property, so that it is possible to license a dative in situ. Moreover, the clitic, whose main role is to pull the dative out of the vP is possible, but not required for DOC-readings in Romanian. Secondly, V*Appl merges above the lexical VP and below ν, so that the
dative may be licensed even in nominalizations, where v is replaced by n. For the sake of brevity, we will only refer to Romanian give-verbs (da ‘give’, trimit ‘send’, descrie ‘describe’, etc.).

5.2. Double-readings of Romanain ditranstive dative constructions

We heavily draw on the pioneering analysis of the DOC in Diaconescu & Rivero (2007). The two authors make several important points:

a. Just as in English, in Romanian, the Goal may be an inflectional dative, but also a PP, introduced by la ‘at, to’. Dative Goals and Prepositional Goals (la+ Acc DP) share their syntactic and interpretative properties, but differ stylistically, in as much as Goal datives belong to standard Romanian, while PP Goals are restricted to popular or dialectal speech. A first common syntactic property is that both types of Goals show free word-order with respect to the Theme.

b. Secondly, not only the dative Goal, but also the PP Goal may be clitic doubled. Given this, the authors suggest that, at least in clitic doubled constructions, la is a case-marker rather than a lexical preposition with descriptive content.

This view is confirmed by the occurrence of la-PPs in the Dativus Comodi/Incomodi of unergative verbs, where its interpretation is Beneficiary, not Experiencer, an interpretation normally expressed by the preposition pentru, ‘for’, not la ‘at, to’. Significantly, in this construction, the clitic is obligatory to convey the Beneficiary interpretation; in its absence, the la-PP is interpreted as a location, as shown by the contrast between (65) and (66).
(66) *Am muncit pentru patron/la patron.*

‘I worked for the employer/ at the employer.

We assume the same position on the similarity of the PP Goal and the Dative Goal in Romanian and discuss only Dative Goals from here on.

*On the distribution of DOC readings* In agreement with Cuervo (2003), Diaconescu and Rivero (2007) assume that the DOC interpretation is characteristically associated with a configuration where the Goal *c-commands* the Theme, a configuration which determines the well-known binding and scope asymmetries first discussed in Barss & Lasnik (1986). They further claim that these properties hold whenever the Goal is clitic doubled and the Theme is not. Hence they conclude that, in Romanian, DOC interpretations require doubling by the clitic. In implementing this view, the two authors adopt an alternative projection account, proposing (67) and (68) as alternative configurations (see also Anagnostopoulou 2006 or Georgala 2012).

(67) *Theme c-commands Goal*

\[
[\text{Voice}\, \text{DP}_{\text{Agent}} \quad \text{Voice} [v \, [\text{PP Treatment P DP}_{\text{Goal}}]]]
\]

(68) *Goal c-commands Theme (clitic doubling, DOC(*

\[
[\text{Voice}\, \text{DP}_{\text{Agent}} \quad \text{Voice} [v \, [\text{ApplP DP}_{\text{Goal}} [\text{cl}\, \text{Appl}] [vP V DP}_{\text{Theme}}]]]
\]

In the first case (67), the Goal phrase is the complement of a PP, null in the case of dative Goals or overtly realized as *la* for PP Goals. The Theme sits in the preposition’s specifier, c-commanding the Goal. The Dative has inherent case licensed at merge. DOC readings should not occur in this structure, which is not an applicative construction. In the second configuration (68), the Goal merges in the specifier of an ApplP, while the Theme occupies the lower complement position. The Appl head *spells out as the clitic* pronoun; therefore, in this interpretation *DOC readings depend on clitic doubling* since the higher Goal is introduced by the clitic, which is the Appl head. While the examples presented in the paper indeed support the proposals in (67) and (68), a closer look at the data clearly suggest that *DOC readings are possible even when the Goal is not clitic doubled.* Let us illustrate this possibility, for two classical c-command tests: the binding of anaphors and the binding of possessor.

a) *Binding of anaphors* Before examining the examples, recall that personal pronouns and emphatic reflexive anaphors are definite, so that, in Romanian, they naturally require differential object marking by the preposition *pe* and clitic doubling.
Interestingly, a non doubled dative may bind an anaphor contained in the clitic-doubled accusative, as in the examples below:

(69)  
\[
\text{Am descris-o Mariei, chiar pe ea însăși, (și nu și-a dat seama).}
\]
\[
\text{(I) have described-she.Acc.Cl Mary.Dat PE she.Acc herself, (and she didn’t realize it).}
\]
\[
\text{‘I described Mary to herself and she didn’t realize it.’}
\]

(70)  
\[
\text{I-am descris-o Mariei, chiar pe ea însăși,....}
\]
\[
\text{(I) she.Dat.cl have described-she.Acc.Cl Mary.Dat. even PE she.Acc herself}
\]

In (69) the accusative doubled emphatic reflexive pe ea însăși ‘herself’ is understood as coreferential with the dative Mariei, which is not clitic doubled. Given the low position of the non-doubled dative in (67), it is unclear how this reading emerges. Recall that the dative is assumed to be case-licensed at merge and has no reason to raise. Expectedly this interpretation also obtains with a clitic-doubled dative, as illustrated in (70).

b) Binding of possessors

As predicted by Diaconescu & Rivero’s analysis, doubled datives may bind possessors in the Theme (71). Surprisingly, however, undoubled dative Goals may also bind possessors in the Theme (72), against the predictions of (67). Again, since in (67) Theme c-commands Goal and the dative is case-licensed in situ, it is not clear how the DOC reading arises.

(71)  
\[
\text{I-am dat muncitorului, cecul său,}
\]
\[
\text{(I) he.Dat.Cl have given worker.the.Dat his cheque.}
\]
\[
\text{‘I gave the worker his paycheque.’}
\]

(72)  
\[
\text{Angajatorii nu au dat tuturor muncitorilor, drepturile lor, băneşti.}
\]
\[
\text{Employers.the not have given all.Dat. workers.the Dat rights their money-related.}
\]
\[
\text{‘The employers didn’t give all the workers their due money.’}
\]

We conclude that, in as much as the DOC is only characterized by binding and scope asymmetries, the Goal may be a binder of the Theme, both when it is clitic doubled and when it is not clitic doubled. DOC asymmetric readings do not depend on clitic doubling. As will be seen, however, the presence of dative clitic induces other interpretative effects, of the type discussed in Uriagereka (2005), mentioned above.

Importantly, binding asymmetries do not represent the only hallmark of DOCs. Bleam (2003) insists that the most characteristic feature of the DOC is that there are “semantic restrictions on the Goal”. The Goal referent is interpreted as a Possessor of the Theme, which means that the clitic introduces the characteristic, integral, part-whole relations. Indeed, in
Romanian an IO which is not a Possessor is not usually clitic doubled even if it is a Dative, not a la-PP. Excellent examples are furnished by abstract nouns which often require the dative in constructions with da ‘give’, but cannot be clitic doubled, since they cannot be viewed as possessors.

(73) a. *A dat trecutul uitării (he) has given past.the oblivion.Dat.
b. *I-a dat trecutul uitării. ‘She has forgotten the past.’

Bleam also notices that in the DOC, the Goal has an actuality entailment, implying the current existence of a dative referent. This is the effect of the strongly referential nature of the dative clitic, which includes a locative-deictic component (as extensively argued in Martin 2014). Clitic doubling of the Goal also signals this difference in Romanian, in pairs like (74).

(74) a. Ion a cumparat jucării pentru nepoții lui. ‘Ion has bought toys for his grandchildren.’
b. Ion le- a cumparat jucării nepoților lui. ‘Ion he/Dat.Cl. has bought toys grandchildren.the his.

In sentence (74a), with a prepositional benefactive, it is possible that the grandchildren are not born yet, in sentence (74b), with a doubled dative the grandchildren are assumed to already exist.

We propose that the possessor reading (a species of Experiencer reading) as well as the actuality entailment arise derivationally, if the dative (clitic) checks a person feature and moves to a position where it c-commands the Theme, at some point in the derivation. At the same time, while the Possessor-Experiencer reading is an essential, clitic-induced semantic property of DOCs, binding and scope facts continue to supply essential data for determining the relevant syntactic configuration.

5.3. A possible analysis of Romanian ditransitive dative constructions

Given the data discussed above, we tentatively propose that a derivational account of the DOC has a better empirical coverage than the alternative projection account discussed above. We agree with Larson (2011) that the Goal is part of the argument structure of the verb, and with Harada and Larson (2009) and Gierling (1996) for Romanian that the Goal always merges in a
low complement position, where it is c-commanded by the Theme. Furthermore, with Georgala (2011), we assume that the dative Goal is always an applied argument, always case-licensed by an expletive applicative head.

In addition to its case-valuation role, \( V_{\text{Appl}}^* \) may optionally incorporate an EPP unvalued [person] feature. This feature is valued by movement of a semantically appropriate dative DP, clitic-doubled or not, to \( \text{Spec}, V_{\text{Appl}}^* \)P, in a position where it c-commands the Theme. The higher possessor reading of the dative is thus derivationally obtained by valuing the strong [\( u_{\text{person}} \)] feature of the \( V_{\text{Appl}}^* \) head. In our analysis, too, there are two alternative projections, but their properties are different. The configuration in (75) underlies the basic Theme> Goal structure where the dative has a locative (Goal) interpretation.

\[
(75) \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{vP} \\
\quad \text{v'} \\
\quad \quad \text{VP} \\
\quad \quad \quad \text{DP}_{\text{Theme}} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \text{V'} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{V} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{V}^*_{\text{Appl}} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{V}^*_{\text{Appl}} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{VP} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{V} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{DP}_{\text{Goal}}
\end{array}
\]

The two DPs are \( \theta \)-licensed by the lexical verb and they are respectively case-licensed by \( V_{\text{Appl}}^* \) and by the \( v \)-head. The essential property of this construction is that the Goal is licensed \textit{in situ}. The empirical correlate of this structure is the impossibility of clitic-doubling, as in (73) above. The clitic cannot be generated, since it would be trapped inside the applicative phrase, and, given the multi-layered structure of the transitive \( vP \), it would not be able to reach the Person field. One may wonder why \( V_{\text{Appl}}^* \) is required, as long as one could claim that this low Goal simply checks case at merge, as proposed in (67). If the Goal dative could be licensed at merge, it is not clear why the same case-licensing strategy could not be extended to unaccusative configurations as well. On the other hand, if Locative/Goal datives are uniformly analysed as applied arguments, the different behaviour of the datives in ditransitive and unaccusative
structures is understandable and follows from the internal shell structure involved. The ditransitive vP contains several VP shells, so V*Appl, which requires a VP complement, has several merge positions, the lowest of which is the one in (75). In the unaccusative configurations, in contrast, there is only one VP shell, and thus only one merge position for V*Appl. The dative Goal is lower than the Nominative subject, and the clitic is required to license the associate, as shown above.

Understandably, (75) is also the structure which underlies Romanian ditransitive event nominalizations. Nominalization also forbids the presence of the clitic, since the nominal domain does not include the relevant verbal projection (Tense, in particular). Structure (75) also explains why word order is rigid in dative-containing event nominalizations, with Theme necessarily preceding the Goal: *acordarea de burse studenților* ‘the awarding of grants to the students.’

The derivation of the Goal>Theme reading  In this case, the V*Appl scopes over the whole lexical VP and incorporates an strong [uperson:___] feature. Since the [uperson] feature, checked by the DPGoal is EPP, the Goal phrase will not only agree with V*Appl, but also be attracted to its Specifier.

(76)  

```
  vP
     \   / 
    v'  v
      /     
     Appl*P
       / 
      DPGoal Appl*'
        / 
       VP
         / 
        DPTheme V'
          / 
         V
```

Movement to Spec, V*ApplP is open to doubled-, as well as *undoubled- datives*, as shown by the binding and scope data discussed in (69)-(71) above. Dative movement is not conditioned by the clitic. For this reason, we did not adopt the view that the clitic must head V*ApplP. The configuration is the same as proposed by Diaconescu and Rivero (2007), except that it is a derived configuration. Valuation of the person feature secures the characteristic Possessor
interpretation of the Goal. By moving to Spec, V*\text{Appl}P, the dative c-commands the Theme and can function as a binder.

The DO may still be case licensed by little v, after the Goal has valued its case feature and is no longer active. In principle, V*\text{Appl} is more strongly selective, it probes its c-commanding domain for a DP, endowed with the features [+ location, + person] and it projects on it a particular morphology, which signals the two semantic features. As has long been assumed, heads which are strongly selective, valuing lexical or inherent case, operate before heads which are less demanding and value structural case. If the dative is inactive, it cannot count as an intervener, so that he DP\text{Theme} can check its case feature and be realized as an accusative at PF.

5.4. Consequences of the analysis

The analysis we have advanced makes a number of correct predictions.

1. In the first place, it is expected that an undoubled Theme may bind into an (un)doubled Goal, since in the basic configurations the Theme c-commands the Goal. This is indeed the case. Here are two relevant examples. In the first example (77), an undoubled pe-marked Theme pe cineva ‘somebody’ is co-indexed with an emphatic reflexive Goal, serving as its antecedent. In the second examples (78), an undoubled Theme binds a possessive contained in the Goal.

(77) Un-doubled Theme binds undoubled Goal
Am descris pe cineva, chiar lui insuși.
(I) have described PE somebody even he. Himself.Dat
‘I described somebody to himself.’

(78) Theme binds Possessive in undoubled Goal
Redacția a înapoiat toate manuscrisele ț autorilor lor.
Editorial-office.the has returned all manuscripts.the their authors. Dat
‘The editors gave returned all the manuscripts to their authors.’

More generally, the derivational account, unlike the alternative projection account, successfully account for the many binding and scope possibilities noticeable in the data. A corpus analysis should also be undertaken, to uncover other factors which determine selection of one configuration over another to convey “the same” meaning.

2. Romanian and Greek double object passives The analysis proposed above can also account for an intriguing contrast between Romanian and Greek, as far as the passivization of
ditransitive structures is concerned. As is known, in Greek DOCs, the Goal is also realized as an inherent case, namely the genitive. Therefore, in Greek the IO cannot be passivized, just as in Romanian. Furthermore, Greek and Romanian are alike in that clitic doubling of the Genitive is not required to obtain genuine DOC-interpretations (Anagnostopoulou 2006: Chapter 14, 568). Despite these similarities, Greek and Romanian strongly contrast in the passive, where the DO cannot be passivized in the DOC, unless the Goal is clitic doubled.

(79) a. \*To vivlio charistike tis Marias apo ton Petro

The book-nom award-Nact the Mary-Gen from the Peter

‘The book was awarded Mary by Peter.’

b. To vivlio tis charistike tis Marias apo ton Petro

The book-nom Cl-gen award-Nact the Mary-gen from the Peter

‘The book was awarded Mary by Peter.’

To account for this distribution, Georgala (2011) posits the structure in (80) for Greek DOC. According to Georgala, and also Anagnostopoulou (2006: 569), in Greek, the Genitive Goal always merges above the Theme in Spec,VP and raises form [Spec, VP] to [Spec, ApplP]. The Greek applicative is also a starred head, geared to agree with the genitive alone. The DPGen is \( \theta \) licensed by the lexical V. Just as in Romanian, little \( v \) may case license the DPTheme if it is \( \phi \)-complete, since the inherent genitive does not count as an intervener.

(80)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{VP} \\
\text{SUBJ} \\
\text{v} \\
\text{v} \\
\text{ApplP} \\
\text{IO} \\
\text{Appl'} \\
\text{Appl} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{tIO} \\
\text{V'} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{DO}
\end{array}
\]

However, when \( v \) is not \( \phi \)-complete (as it is in the non-active voice), and the object should leave the \( vP \) to interact with T, the DO is trapped inside the VP and passive is blocked. A
legitimate question is why in clitic doubled constructions, passivization of the Theme is possible. Intuitively, the genitive clitic functions as a means of “raising the IO” out of the DO’s way. More formally put, in clitic constructions, the intervening formal D features of the genitive move to T before the nominative DP\text{Theme} and spell out as a clitic. In the clitic derivation, locality is thus duly respected (Anagnostopoulou, 2006: 568).

Romanian strongly contrast with Greek, allowing passivization of the Theme, not only when the Goal is doubled, but also when it is undoubled. This is expected given that in both of the assumed Romanian basic configurations Theme c-commands Goal and is always in a sufficiently high position to move. The counterpart of the Greek (79a) is grammatical in Romanian.

(81) \textit{Cartea a fost dăruită Mariei de către Petru.}
       \textit{book.the has been give Mary.Dat by Peter.} ‘The book was give to Mary by Peter.’

6. \textit{Conclusions}

1. The clitic is obligatory in unaccusative constructions since in these structures the dative cannot be licensed in situ, or inside the vP. Rather it is forced to exit the vP. Exiting the vP is always required for clitic doubled arguments. Hence, clitic doubling is required in unaccusative configurations, as a means of solving a locality problem/

2. The applicative head checks a [person], when there are Experiencer/Possessor interpretations. However, the clitic is not the only means of valuing the person feature. Inherent features of the dative DP are sufficient to attract the Goal to the higher position, producing asymmetric Goal> Theme interpretations. Thus, DOC readings merely require that the clitic should be possible, not that it should be obligatory. Our analysis fundamentally agrees with Diaconescu and Rivero (2007) and Bleam (2003) and Uriagereka (2005), that, semantically, the characteristic property of the DOC is the Experiencer/Possessor (cause-have) interpretation. The derivational account of the DOC is in a better position to cope with the scope and binding data and also to account for the emergence of the Experiencer/Possessor reading.

3. The clitic is not obligatory in ditransitive configurations, precisely because in this case dative DPs are licensed in situ, or, anyway, inside the vP.
4. Ditransitive configurations may nominalize precisely because they have sufficient functional structure to license the in situ dative DP (where a clitic is not required).

5. The possibility of licensing an Experiencer dative construction may be viewed as a diagnostic that distinguishes between unaccusatives and unergatives in Romanian, since unergatives license thematic applicative constructions with a Benefactive interpretation, while unaccusatives license datives with a derivationally constructed Experiencer reading.

\[(82)\]
\[
a. \text{Mi-a fost somn ieri} \quad \text{(unaccusative)}
\]
\[\text{‘I was sleepy yesterday.’}\]
\[
b. \text{Mi-a muncit numai ieri} \quad \text{(unergative)}
\]
\[\text{He worked for me only yesterday.}\]

1 I would like to thank the anonymous reviewers for their helpful and illuminating critical remarks. I am also deeply grateful for the kindness and competence of the editors. Remaining errors are all mine.
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