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1. Introduction

The main aim of this paper is to add Romanian (Rom) to the languages with double object constructions (DOCs), which as far as we know is a novel task. Inspired by Marantz (1993), the recent literature abounds in discussions of languages of different families whose ditransitive patterns behave like DOCs with applicative characteristics (see Pylkkänen 2002: 16-45 for English, Finnish, and Japanese, McGinnis 2001: 1-14 for Albanian, Icelandic, and Italian, Cuervo 2003: 51-80 for Spanish). However, Rom has not been identified as one of those
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languages, and we argue that the pattern with dative clitic doubling in (1) shares the formal properties of DOCs in other languages, and is thus formally equivalent to English DOCs such as *Jane baked Bill a cake*. Unless otherwise indicated, from now on the language of the examples in the paper is Rom.

(1) *Mihaela îi trimite Marii o scrisoare.*

Mihaela DAT.CL sends Mary.DAT a letter

‘Mihaela sends Mary a letter.’

In Rom ditransitive constructions, dative clitics and dative clitic doubling systematically signal DOC status. To illustrate, (1) and (2) are rather similar, but (2) does not contain the dative clitic that doubles the goal in (1). We show that such a difference is theoretically significant, and indicates that the two sentences have rather different syntactic structures. As stated above, (1) is a DOC, while (2) is similar to the so-called prepositional ditransitive construction (PDC) in English given as the translation of the Rom sentence.

(2) *Mihaela trimite Marii o scrisoare.*

Mihaela sends Mary.DAT a letter
‘Mihaela sends a letter to Mary.’

In sum, Rom is one of the languages that participate in the dative alternation, which is indicated by the contrast between clitic doubled and non-doubled goals in ditransitive sentences. Ditransitives with dative clitics correspond to DOCs, and those without such clitics correspond to PDCs.

The proposal that Rom exhibits DOCs adds support to two general assumptions in the literature. The first assumption concerns the role of clitic doubling in doubling languages. In such languages, doubling may at first sight appear optional and without formal consequences, but is in fact obligatory because constructions with doubling and those that lack clitics have different properties and structures, as already argued by Anagnostopoulou (2003) in the case of Greek, and by Demonte (1995) and Cuervo (2003) in the case of Spanish, among several others. More recently, Slavkov (2005) proposes that in Bulgarian, another clitic doubling language, ditransitive constructions with indirect objects doubled by dative clitics are also DOCs, and differ from ditransitives without dative clitics. If dative clitic doubling in ditransitive constructions in Bulgarian, Rom, and Spanish is not optional in the sense that it is systematically a sign
of DOC status, then it seems that such a doubling is in great measure defined by principles of Universal Grammar. We shall see that Rom offers strong support for this idea because it exhibits two syntactic types of DOCs that differ as to the morphological shape of the phrase that plays the role of goal, but not about the doubling dative clitic, which suggests that the clitic is essential in defining the two Rom constructions as DOCs.

A second assumption that receives support from the hypothesis that Rom constructions such as (1) are DOCs relates to applicative constructions and their typology in UG. Traditionally, applicatives are constructions in which a verb bears a specific morpheme that licenses an oblique or non-core argument that would not otherwise be considered a part of the argument structure of the verb. If Rom dative clitics are morphological markers that signal DOC status, as we assume, then they function as heads of applicative phrases, as proposed by among others McGinnis (2001), when discussing Italian among other languages, and Cuervo (2003), when discussing Spanish.

The proposal that (1) is a DOC with an applicative bears interest for the general typology of applicatives in Universal Grammar. Building on Marantz (1993), Pylkkännen (2002: 17-26) argues that, crosslinguistically, applicative phrases fall into
two syntactic and semantic types that she labels high and low respectively. In the high type, which exists in Rom but is not discussed in this paper (see Diaconescu 2004: 205-262, Rivero 2004), the applicative head sits roughly speaking above VP, and denotes a semantic relation between an individual and an event. In the low type located roughly within VP, the applicative head denotes a transfer of possession between the direct and the indirect object. The Rom applicatives proposed for DOCs in this paper are of the low type, indicate a possession relation, and closely resemble the applicatives proposed by Cuervo (2003) for Spanish DOCs. However, we shall see interesting differences between Spanish and Rom, which in some variants offers two syntactic versions of DOCs and of PDCs, which is not the case in Spanish. In sum, the two syntactic variants of DOCs in Rom differ as to the morphosyntactic shape of the goal phrase but always contain a dative clitic. In our view, such a situation offers strong support for a constructionist view where DOC properties are derived from applicative functional heads, not from goals or themes as encoded in lexical phrasal categories.

With this background in mind, the paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we introduce four syntactic versions of ditransitive constructions in present Rom, which formally differ in the
morphosyntax of the dative phrase that counts as indirect object or goal. The four constructions differ in normative status, register, and geographical distribution, topics we briefly address in an Appendix. In section 3, we outline the analysis adopted for these four ditransitive constructions, and in section 4 we provide the diagnostics that justify the proposed analysis. In general, we adapt to Rom the proposals of Cuervo (2003) for Spanish, and argue that ditransitives with dative clitics are DOCs and those without dative clitics are PDCs.

2. Introducing Romanian ditransitive constructions

Rom is interesting because as discussed in some detail in the Appendix, some of its variants offer a larger number of ditransitive constructions than reported in the literature of closely related languages with clitic doubling such as Spanish and Greek. That is, there are Rom varieties that combine in their grammar four types of ditransitive constructions that we introduce in the next sections and label as follows.

1. Bare morphological dative or Mdative constructions.
2. Dative clitic doubled MDative constructions.
3. Bare prepositional dative or Pdative constructions.

4. Dative clitic doubled Pdative constructions.

We show in the Appendix that clitic doubled Pdative constructions are particularly controversial from a prescriptive point of view, but are documented both in the literary works of Transylvanian authors, and the adult speech recorded in the Childes data base on Rom, the only available corpus for this language. The four constructions are characterized by a theme or direct object that is accusative, but exhibit formal variation in the goal or indirect object, which can (a) be doubled by a dative clitic or not, and (b) appear as a morphological dative, or preceded by a preposition with a noun that shows no morphological marking but is traditionally considered accusative. Let us illustrate each type of construction in turn.

2.1 Bare morphological or Mdative constructions

The example in (2) repeated now as (3a) and those in (3b) and (3c) are representative of bare morphological or Mdative ditransitive constructions. In such constructions, the goal *Mariei* is marked morphologically dative and the theme is accusative.
Rom nouns such as *scrisoare* in (3a) are not overtly marked for case, but object clitics such as those in (3b) show that themes are nevertheless accusative in this type of construction.

(3) a. *Mihaela trimite Mariei o scrisoare.*
    Mihaela sends Mary.DAT a letter
    ‘Mihaela sends a letter to Mary.’

b. *Mihaela o trimite Mariei.*
    Mihaela ACC.CL sends Mary.DAT
    ‘Mihaela sends it to Mary.’

There are close counterparts of the construction in (3a) and (3b) in Greek, with case marking on nouns. To illustrate, in Greek (4), the goal phrase bears a genitive case marker, which corresponds to dative case in Rom, since Greek does not distinguish between datives and genitives.

(4) *O Gianis estile tis Marias to grama.*
    The John.NOM sent the Maria.GEN the letter.ACC
    ‘John sent Mary the letter.’

(Greek)

(Anagnostopoulou 2003: 9)
2.2 Dative clitic doubled MDative constructions

A second version of ditransitive constructions in Rom, which is very common and considered standard in prescriptive grammars, is with MDatives that are clitic doubled, as in (2) repeated now in (5a). That is, the phrase standing for the goal bears morphological dative case on the noun as in (3a) and (3b), and, in addition, is doubled by a dative clitic. The theme appears in the accusative, as suggested by the object clitic in (5c).

(5)  

a. *Mihaela îi trimite Mariei o scrisoare.*  
Mihaela DAT.CL sends Mary.DAT a letter  
‘Mihaela sends Mary a letter.’

b. *Mihaela îi trimite o scrisoare Mariei.*  
Mihaela DAT.CL sends a letter Mary.DAT  
‘Mihaela sends Mary a letter.’

c. *Mihaela îi trimit-o Mariei.*  
Mihaela DAT.CL ACC.CL sends Mary.DAT  
‘Mihaela sends it to Mary.’
As can be deduced from a comparison of (5a) and (5b), it is possible for the goal to precede or follow the theme. In this paper, we abstract away from word order differences, assuming that they are not crucial to establish core differences between DOCs and PDCs. ³

Close counterparts of (5) may also be found in Greek as illustrated in (6) with a genitive clitic tu that doubles the genitive phrase tu Gianī.

(6) Tu edhosa tu Gianī to vivlio.

GEN.CL gave the John.GEN the book.ACC

‘I gave John the book.’

(Greek)

(Anagnostopoulou 2003: 15)

³ Göbbel (2003) proposes that V IO DO order is the result of object shift due to the Nuclear Stress Rule, and notes that both V IO DO and V DO IO can receive a broad focus reading, i.e. one where the sentence is neutral or in focus in its entirety. Thus, the two orders are equivalent from an information structure point of view, which provides motivation for our position. However, an anonymous reviewer mentions some effects of word order consistent with observations in the literature of other languages to the effect that the dative can scope over the accusative independent of word order, while the accusative can scope over the dative only if it comes first (see Lidz and Williams (2001) on Kannada). We abstract away from such effects.

The assumption that V IO DO is the basic order fits better with the analysis advocated in this paper (see also Pedro de Munilla 2004 on Spanish). On such a view, accusative as structural case dubbed K by Cornilescu (1995) for Rom and Cuervo (2003:49) for Spanish can percolate to the theme object, which need not move (in more recent terms, long distance Agree licenses accusative).
2.3  Bare prepositional or Pdative constructions

A third variant of ditransitive constructions in Rom dubbed Pdative constructions contains a goal introduced by preposition *la*, and the usual accusative theme, as illustrated in (7a), (7b), and (7c).

(7)  a.  *Mihaela trimite la Maria o scrisoare.*
     Mihaela sends to Mary a letter
     'Mihaela sends a letter to Mary.'

     b.  *Mihaela trimite o scrisoare la Maria.*
     Mihaela sends a letter to Mary
     'Mihaela sends a letter to Mary.'

     c.  *Mihaela o trimite la Maria.*
     Mihaela ACC.CL sends to Mary
     'Mihaela sends it to Mary.'

Prepositional datives resemble the morphological datives of section 2.2 in so far as they can precede the theme or be preceded by the theme. As stated, we do not consider variation in word
order significant for the proposals in this paper, even though this could be an oversimplification. The interpretation of la datives and morphological datives is also similar. The Grammar of the Romanian Academy (Gramatica Limbii Române 1963, vol I: 367-368) states that preposition la introduces the indirect object, which expresses the person or the being goal or possessor of the action of the verb.

Other than introducing goals in ditransitive constructions of type (7a), (7b) and (7c), preposition la has a directional use illustrated in (8), which will be recalled later when the analysis of (7a), (7b) and (7c) is introduced.

(8) Maria merge la școală.

Maria goes to school

Close counterparts of the constructions in (7) may also be found in Greek with the preposition se, as illustrated in (9a) and (9b).

(9) a. O Gianis estile to gramma s-tin

The John.NOM sent the letter.ACC to the Maria.

Maria.ACC
‘John sent the letter to Mary.’ (Greek)

(Anagnostopoulou 2003: 9)

b. *Edhosa s-ton Petro to vivlio.*

Gave to.the Peter.ACC the book.ACC

‘I gave Peter the book.’ (Greek)

(Anagnostopoulou 2003: 166)

The Rom patterns in (7) also resemble ditransitive constructions in Spanish. Spanish nouns do not carry morphological case, so this language has no ditransitive constructions corresponding to Rom (3a) and (5a). In Spanish, the goal must be introduced by a preposition, as illustrated in (10), so this language offers less syntactic options for ditransitives than Rom.

(10) *Micaela envió una carta a María.*

Micaela sent a letter to Mary

‘Micaela sent a letter to Mary.’ (Spanish)

Finally, in Bulgarian, nouns do not carry morphological case either, so there are no ditransitives corresponding to Rom (3a)
and (5a), and goals are introduced by a preposition, as illustrated in (11).

\[(11) \text{Ivan  izprati  pismo  na Maria.} \]

Ivan sent letter to Maria

‘Ivan sent a letter to Maria.’ (Bulgarian)

2.4 Dative clitic doubled Pdative constructions

The fourth version of ditransitive patterns in Rom is the PDative construction where a dative clitic doubles a prepositional-like la-phrase, as illustrated in (12a), (12b), and (12c).

\[(12) a. \text{ Mihaela  îi  trimit\textsuperscript{e} la Maria  o scrisoare.} \]

Mihaela DAT.CL sends to Mary a letter

‘Mihaela sends Mary a letter.’

b. \text{Mihaela  îi  trimit\textsuperscript{e} o scrisoare la Maria.}

Mihaela DAT.CL sends a letter to Mary

‘Mihaela sends Mary a letter.’

c. \text{Mihaela  i-\textsuperscript{o} trimit\textsuperscript{e} la Maria}

Mihaela DAT.CL ACC.CL sends to Mary
It seems important to stress that the Rom ditransitive constructions introduced in sections 2.1 through 2.3 are considered standard, with the version with dative clitic doubling in 2.2 very common, as an anonymous reviewer notes. By contrast, as discussed in more detail in the Appendix, the clitic doubled Pdative constructions in (12a), (12b), and (12c) are prescriptively controversial, more restricted in register and geographical distribution, and are not part of the grammar of all speakers of Rom.

Greek counterparts to (12) are ungrammatical, as shown in (13). Anagnostopoulou states that genitive clitics cannot double se-phrases, and Greek grammars do not contain prescriptive preoccupations like those on clitic doubled la-datives in Rom grammars reflected in our Appendix. Thus, Greek is more limited in the syntactic options for ditransitives than Rom.

(13) *Tu edhosa to vivlio s-ton Gianni.

CL.GEN gave the book.ACC to.the John

‘I gave the book to John.’ (Greek)

(Anagnostopoulou 2003: 17)
In Spanish, clitic doubling of prepositional-like goals is fine as (14) illustrates. This is well known and unsurprising since Spanish lacks morphological datives, with the only syntactic option for a goal being with a.

(14) Micaela le envió una carta a María.

Micaela DAT.CL sent a letter to Mary

‘Micaela sent Mary a letter.’ (Spanish)

Finally, Bulgarian resembles Spanish. Clitic doubling goes against the prescriptive norm in this language, but in colloquial style goals preceded by na can be doubled by dative clitics, as illustrated in (15). Slavkov (2005) argues that Bulgarian clitic doubling of this type is a sign of DOC status, joining voices on Spanish and Rom to the same effect.

(15) Ivan izpratilo pismo na Maria.

Ivan DAT.CL sent letter to Maria

‘Ivan sent Mary a letter.’ (Bulgarian)
To conclude, in this section we showed that Rom is rich in ditransitive constructions because phrases that function as goals may have two different shapes in general, and, depending on variant and register, be doubled by a dative clitic or not. By contrast, clitic doubling languages that closely resemble Rom such as Spanish and Bulgarian seem to offer less syntactic versions of ditransitive constructions, in part because they have prepositional-like datives that can be doubled by clitics or not, but do not have morphological datives.

3. Syntactic structure of DOCs and PDCs

In this section, we propose syntactic analyses for the four ditransitive constructions introduced in section 2. In the next section we give arguments to motivate those analyses.

Our main hypothesis is that the Rom bare Mdative constructions in (3) now partially repeated in (16a) and the Rom bare Pdative constructions in (7) now partially repeated in (16b) correspond on the one hand to the English pattern known as the prepositional ditransitive construction (PDC) illustrated in (17), and on the other hand to the Spanish constructions in (10) and
(18), which are also PDCs for Demonte (1995: 15-16) and Cuervo (2003).

(16) a. *Mihaela trimite Mariei o scrisoare.*  Rom PDCs

Mihaela sends Mary.DAT a letter

‘Mihaela sends Mary a letter.’

b. *Mihaela trimite la Maria o scrisoare.*

Mihaela sends to Mary a letter

‘Mihaela sends Mary a letter.’

(17) *Michael sent a letter to Mary.*  English PDC

(18) *Miguel envió una carta a María.*  Spanish PDC

Michael sent a letter to Mary

‘Michael sent a letter to Mary.’

On the stated view, Rom is interesting because unlike English and Spanish it has two syntactic versions of PDCs, which differ as to whether the goal is introduced by a preposition or not.

A second hypothesis is that Mdative constructions with dative clitic doubling as in (5) now partially repeated in (19a), and dative clitic doubled Pdative constructions as in (12) now
partially repeated in (19b) are parallel on the one hand to the English DOC in (20), and on the other hand to the Spanish DOCs in (14) and (21), following proposals of Demonte (1995: 17-20) and Cuervo (2003: 19).

(19) a. *Mihaela îi trimite Mariei o scrisoare.* Rom DOC  
Mihaela DAT.CL sends Mary.DAT a letter  
‘Mihaela sends Mary a letter.’

b. *Mihaela îi trimite la Maria o scrisoare.*  
Mihaela DAT.CL sends to Mary a letter

(20) *Michael sent Mary a letter.* English DOC

(21) *Miguel le envió una carta a María.* Spanish DOC  
Michael DAT.CL sent a letter to Mary  
‘Michael sent Mary a letter.’

Here too, Rom is interesting because unlike English and Spanish it has two syntactic versions of DOCs, again with a goal with or without a preposition.

Thus, in Rom, DOCs are always characterized by the presence of a dative clitic by contrast with PDCs. Since the Rom
phrase that functions as a goal can take two different shapes, a morphological dative or a prepositional phrase, such a variation supports that in doubling languages, the dative alternation is crucially based on clitics as functional categories, that is, in the contrast between clitic doubled goals and non-doubled goals in ditransitive sentences, and that lexical categories corresponding to the goal are less symptomatic of DOC status. Thus, Rom supports the idea that in doubling languages, dative clitics as functional items are obligatory signals of DOCs. If we add Bulgarian to the picture, and recall that Slavkov (2005) argues that in this language dative clitic doubling is also a signal of DOC status, then we can conclude that doubling is in fact not optional, and regulated by Universal Grammar.

In this paper, we adapt to Rom an analysis first proposed by Cuervo (2003) for Spanish. We assume that DOCs such as (16a-b) and PDCs such as (19a-b) contrast in syntactic structure because the first contain a (dative) Applicative Phrase and the second do not. We further assume that the two versions of Rom DOCs in (19a) and (19b) contain low applicatives in the sense of Pylkkänen (2002), with the dative clitic as the head of such applicatives. On this view, the underlying structure of (19a) and (19b) is as in (simplified) (22), with the crucial point being that
little \( v \) embeds an Applicative Phrase that holds both the goal and the theme. The goal is in the SpecAppIP position, and the accusative theme is the complement of the applicative head, which is spelled out as a dative clitic in both versions of the construction in Rom. As to the derivation, the verb raises to Voice, and the dative clitic “climbs” out of the Applicative Phrase in a process whose (syntactic or morphological) nature we do not discuss, which results in the word order in (19a-b).

(22) The Syntactic Structure of DOCs in Rom

As we see in the next section, the two syntactic versions of DOCs in Rom do not differ in relation to binding and other clausal relations, so we capture this situation in (22) by treating the goal
with dative morphology - *Mariei* in (19a) - along the same lines as the goal preceded by preposition *la* in (19b). That is, we consider that in DOCs such as (19b) preposition *la* is a case marker in the same sense as the dative morphology on the noun in (19a). The hypothesis that *la* can be a case marker parallels proposals by Demonte (1987) and Cuervo (2003) for Spanish *a*, and by Slavkov (2005) for Bulgarian *na*, and is reinforced in Rom by the structural parallelism between the two types of DOCs. Below we also assign a double role to dative morphology, which can function as a case marker, as we just stated, or play the role of a preposition, as seen later.

Previous analyses for DOCs reviewed by Cuervo (2003) and by Diaconescu (2004), to whom we refer the interested reader, include Marantz (1993), Demonte (1995), and Anagnostopoulou (2003), and assume that the hierarchical relations among indirect and direct object are also as in (22). However, as Cuervo (2003) points out, those analyses are not equipped to capture the correct semantic relations. The analysis for DOCs in (22) borrowed from Cuervo (2003), contains an applicative head that assigns inherent dative case to the argument it licenses, a dative clitic as the spell-out of the applicative head, and has a constructionist spirit. On this view, possible meanings
for dative arguments are derived from properties of the syntactic configuration, which include the applicative head that licenses the dative DP, Voice, and little \( v \).

Turning now to PDCs, we propose that (16a) and (16b) are PDCs, not DOCs, and syntactic variants with parallel structural properties for several reasons given in the next section. The structure of (16a) and (16b) is as in (simplified) (23), which adapts to Rom the analysis of Spanish in (Cuervo 2003: 51). The essential point in (23) is the presence of a Prepositional Phrase of a directional type with the accusative theme in the Spec position, and the goal as complement. In this structure, the verb raises to Voice, and clitic climbing processes are, of course, absent.

(23) The Syntactic Structure of PDCs in Rom:
In this way, in PDCs the theme is structurally superior to or c-commands the goal, in contrast with the situation found in DOCs. We show in the next section that in the two variants of the PDC, morphological dative *Mari* and the dative *la*-phrase have similar binding properties and establish the same relations within the clause, which means that dative morphology plays the same formal role as *la*. In the analysis in (23), such a parallelism is captured by the hypothesis that the directional PP can be headed by a preposition that is overt, i.e. *la*, or can be covert. The parallelism between (16a) and (16b) reinforces the view that functional structure is the essential factor in the distinction between DOCs and PDCs in Rom. In simple terms, Rom supports an applicative approach to DOCs because the crucial diagnostic is the presence or absence of a dative clitic, given that there are syntactic versions where in both DOCs and PDCs the lexical phrase standing for the goal can be a morphological dative or preposition-like.

---

4 Thus *la* resembles Spanish *a*, because it can function as a directional preposition, or a case marker. See Miyagawa (1997) for a similar ambiguity in Japanese *ni*, with (i) illustrating it as case marker.

(i) *Taro-ga gakusei-ni futari kaado-o okutta.*
Taro-NOM students-DAT two card-ACC sent
‘Taro sent two students a card.’ (Miyagawa, 1997)
4. **DOC and PDC diagnostics in Romanian.**

In this section, we apply classical tests in the literature to show that in Rom there are two types of syntactic DOCs with the structure in (22) and two types of syntactic PDCs with the structure in (23), with the two groups of constructions differing from each other in important ways. The general idea is that in DOCs the goal asymmetrically c-commands the theme as in (22), which is not the case in PDCs in (23). This leading idea serves to establish that in Rom both dative clitic doubled Mdative constructions, which are considered standard, and dative clitic doubled Pdative constructions, which are not considered standard, are DOCs in the sense of (22). By contrast, bare Mdative and Pdative constructions, namely those without dative clitics, have the different formal properties of (23), and resemble English and Spanish PDCs.

There are three main types of tests used in English to distinguish between DOCs and PDCs: Binding, Frozen Scope, and Weak Crossover. Similar tests have been used in Spanish to also
distinguish between DOCs and PDCs, and in the next sections we apply them to Rom.

4.1 Binding

Barss and Lasnik (1986: 347-50), Larson (1988: 342-353) and Pesetsky (1995: 121-147) note binding asymmetries in English PDCs and DOCs. Let us briefly introduce the relevant English constructions to show that similar asymmetries are found in Rom ditransitives, suggesting a parallel division.

4.1.1 Binding of anaphors

The goal in English DOCs can bind an anaphor or a possessive in the theme as in (24a) and (24c), but the theme cannot bind into the goal as in (24b) and (24d).

(24) a.  *I showed John, himself, in the mirror.
       b.  *I showed himself, John, in the mirror.
       c.  I denied every worker, his, paycheck.
       d.  *I denied its, owner every paycheck.

       (Pesetsky 1995: 125)
In Spanish, the same results apply when the goal is clitic doubled, as discussed by Demonte (1995: 17-24) and Cuervo (2003: 53-63) (and see Slavkov 2005 on Bulgarian). Likewise, in Rom dative clitic doubled ditransitives, the goal can bind an anaphor in the accusative theme (25a), so it c-commands it as in (22), but the theme cannot bind into the dative goal, as in (25b) (accusative marker *pe on the direct object is glossed C[ase]M[arker]).

(25) a. *Ion i -a descris [iofetei],
   John DAT.CL -has described [girl.the.DAT]
   \[\text{[do pe ea} \text{ însăși]}\]i
   [CM she herself]
   ‘John has described herself to the girl.’

b. *Ion i -a descris [io ei înzeși],
   John DAT.CL -has described [she.DAT herself]
   \[\text{[do fata]}\]i
   [girl.the]
   ‘John has described the girl to herself.’

Sentence (25a) has a marginal status in Rom, which we attribute to the anaphor, which is an expression that is rarely used.
In view of examples such as (25a) and (25b), an anonymous reviewer raises the interesting issue of clitic doubling of accusatives, which has not been discussed in the literature on DOCs, and is not possible in Spanish DOCs. This reviewer finds that examples of the type in (26a) and (26b), which are parallel to (25a) and (25b) in relevant respects but contain a clitic doubled direct object, are well formed:

(26)  a. Ioană i l -a descris [Io lui Ion]

Ioană DAT.CL ACC.CL -has described [John.DAT]

[depe el însusi].

[CM he himself]

‘Ioană has described himself to John.’

b. Ioană i l -a descris [depe Ion]

Ioană DAT.CL ACC.CL -has described [CM John]

[Io lui însusi].

[he.DAT himself]

‘Ioană has described John to himself.’

An analysis of clitic doubled direct objects is beyond the scope of this paper, but (26a) and (26b) could suggest that in Romanian such objects should also be treated as applicatives. That is, clitic
doubled objects could resemble clitic doubled indirect objects in so far as they are not part of the argument structure of the verb, but reside in “low” applicatives within the VP, with the accusative clitic as head. On this view, Romanian object and indirect object as members of low applicatives when clitic doubled could symmetrically c-command one another other, thus accounting for the symmetric binding effects in (26a) and (26b). We leave the development of this idea, its technical implementation, and the relation between dative and accusative clitic doubling in Romanian and its contrast with Spanish to future research.

After this aside, we note that PDCs do not have the same properties as DOCs. By contrast with (25a) and (25b), which as stated are DOCs with the structure in (22), in PDCs without dative clitics such as those with Mdatives in (27) with the syntactic structure in (23), the goal cannot bind an anaphor in the accusative theme since it does not c-command it, (27a), and the theme can bind into the dative goal because it c-commands it, as in (27b).

(27) a. *Ion a descris [\fetei], [\ope \ea
John has described [girl.the.DAT] [CM she
I ș. i. însăși).

herself]

‘John has described herself to the girl.’

b.  

Ion a descris  [io  ei  însăși],

John has described  [she.DAT herself]

[do  fata].

[girl.the]

‘John has described the girl to herself.’

5.1.2 Binding of possessives

As in English or Spanish DOCs, in Rom a possessive in the theme can be bound by a dative goal, as shown in (28a) with a syntactic skeleton along the lines of (22). Sentence (28a’) with a syntactic structure that also corresponds to (22), shows that the same situation obtains in those variants that allow clitic doubled prepositional datives. However, the reverse is not true, because in a DOC a possessive in the theme cannot bind the goal, as shown in (28b) and (28b’).
(28)  a.  \( I \am\, dat\, muncitorul,\, cecul \)  
\[ \text{DAT.CL -have.1sg given worker.the.DAT check.the} \]  
\[ \text{său.} \]  
\text{his}  
\text{‘I gave his check to the worker.’} 

a’.  \( I \am\, dat\, la\, un\, muncitor,\, cecul \)  
\[ \text{DAT.CL -have.1sg given to a worker check.the} \]  
\[ \text{său} \]  
\text{his}  
\text{‘I gave his check to a worker.’} 

b.  \( ?\cdot Poliția\, i\, -a\, dat\, tatălui \)  
\[ \text{Police.the DAT.CL -has given father.the.DAT} \]  
\[ \text{său, copilul, pierdut.} \]  
\text{his child.the lost}  
\text{‘The police gave the lost child to his (respective) father.’} 

b’.  \( ?\cdot Poliția\, i\, -a\, dat\, la\, tatăl \)  
\[ \text{Police.the DAT.CL -has given to father.the} \]  
\[ \text{său, copilul, pierdut.} \]  
\text{his child.the lost}  
\text{‘The police gave the lost child to his (respective) father.’}
The anonymous reader mentioned in the previous section brings up the issue of accusative clitic doubling in connection with examples of the type in (28a), pointing out that the parallel (29) with a clitic doubled object and a pronoun used as a possessive is well-formed (equivalent Spanish sentences are ungrammatical as the direct and indirect object cannot both be clitic doubled).

(29)  
I -am incredintat-o Mariei
DAT.CL -have.1sg entrusted-ACC.CL Mary.DAT
pe prietena ei.
CM friend her
‘I have entrusted her friend to Mary.’

The above sentence seems to fit the analysis suggested for Romanian clitic doubled objects in the previous section, which is that they could be constituents of low Applicatives that symmetrically c-command clitic doubled indirect objects in a second low Applicative, a topic left to future research.

Now let us turn to PDCs with the syntactic structure in (23). The opposite situation to what we just reported for DOCs is found in ditransitive constructions without dative clitics such as
the Mdatives in (30). That is, a possessive in the theme cannot be bound by the dative goal, as in (30a) and (30a’), but the possessive in the dative may bind into the accusative theme, as in (30b) and (30b’). This is because in analyses of the PDC type proposed in (23), the goal does not c-command the theme.

(30)  
a.  */'Am dat muncitorului, cecul său,  
have.1sg given worker.the.DAT check.the his  
'I gave his check to the worker.'  
a’.  *'Am dat la un muncitor, cecul său,  
have.1sg given to a worker check.the his  
'I gave his check to a worker.'  
b.  Poliţia a dat tatălui, său, copilul,  
Police.the has given father.the.DAT his child.the  
pierdut.  
lost  
'The police gave the lost child to his (respective) father.'  
b’.  Poliţia a dat la tatăl, său,  
Police.the has given to father.the his  
copilul, pierdut.  
child.the lost
‘The police gave the lost child to his (respective) father.’

In conclusion, binding of anaphors and possessives provides a first piece of evidence that in Rom DOCs, the goal c-commands a (non clitic doubled) theme in both types of dative clitic doubling configurations, those with morphological datives, which are general and deemed standard, and those with prepositional datives, which are found in some variants or registers. This situation shows that the dative clitic is the diagnostic factor for DOC status, not whether the phrase standing for the goal is a morphological dative or a prepositional-like phrase.

5.2 Frozen Scope

Aoun & Li (1989) and Bruening (2001) show that in PDCs, scope between theme and goal is free, as in (31). By contrast, in DOCs scope is frozen, as goals must take scope over themes (see 32).

(31) *Mary gave a doll to each girl.*  \( a > each; each > a \)
(32)  *Mary gave a girl each doll.  a > each; *each > a

(Bruening 2001: 234)

Demonte (1995: 21-23) and Cuervo (2003) show that in Spanish, scope is frozen in dative clitic doubled ditransitives. In Rom DOCs, which contain a dative clitic and have the syntactic structure in (22), scope is also ‘frozen’. This is illustrated in (33b) and (33b’) where the quantifier *fiecare ‘each’ in the theme cannot take scope over the indefinite goal. Recall that the patterns in (33a’) and (33b’) are restricted to certain registers/geographical varieties.

(33)  a.  fiecare>un

Profesoara i -a dat fiecârui
teacher.the DAT.CL -has given each.DAT copil un desen.
child a drawing
‘The teacher gave a drawing to each child.’

a’.  fiecare>un

Profesoara i -a dat la fiecare copil
teacher.the DAT.CL -has given to each child
un desen.
a drawing

‘The teacher gave a drawing to each child.’

b.  *fiecare > un

Profesoara i -a dat unui copil
teacher.the DAT.CL -has given a DAT child
(*diferit) fiecare desen.

(*different) each drawing

‘The teacher gave each drawing to a (*different) child.’

b’.  *fiecare > un

Profesoara i -a dat la un copil
teacher.the DAT.CL -has given to a child
(*diferit) fiecare desen.

(*different) each drawing

‘The teacher gave each drawing to a (*different) child.’

On the one hand, in (33a) and (33a’) the quantified goal takes scope over theme, which results in a reading where several children can receive drawings. On the other hand, in (33b) and (33b’), the quantified theme cannot scope over theme, so a single child must receive all drawings.
An anonymous reviewer suggests examining in situ quantifiers. As illustrated in (34) with *trei* ‘three’, such quantifiers give results that are similar to those reported above.

(34) a. *trei > un

Profesoara le -a dat celor
Teacher.the DAT.CL-has given the.DAT
*trei copii un desen.*
three children a drawing
‘The teacher gave to the three children a drawing.’

b. **trei > un**

Profesoara i -a dat unui copil
Teacher.the DAT.CL- has given a.DAT child
(*diferit) *trei desene.*
(*different) three drawings
‘The teacher gave a (*different) child three drawings.’

Now let us examine PDCs with the syntactic structure of type (23). The situation is reversed in ditransitive constructions without dative clitics such as the Mdatives in (35), where fiecare
‘each’ in the theme or in the goal can take scope over the indefinite.

(35) a. fiecare>un

Profesoara a dat fiecărui copil

teacher.the has given each.DAT child

un desen. (diferit)

a drawing (different)

‘The teacher gave a drawing to each child.’

a’. fiecare>un

Profesoara a dat la fiecare copil un desen

teacher.the has given to each child a drawing
diferit.

(different)

‘The teacher gave a (different) drawing to each child.’

b. fiecare>un

Profesoara a dat unui copil (diferit)

Teacher.the has given a.DAT child (different)
fiecare desen.

each drawing

‘The teacher gave each drawing to a (different)
b’. fiecare & un

Profesoara a dat la un copil (diferit)

Teacher the has given to a child (different)

fiecare desen.

each drawing

‘The teacher gave each drawing to a (different)

child.’

4.3 Weak crossover effects

WCO effects take place when a possessive pronoun is coindexed with a lower constituent that undergoes wh-movement, as shown in (36).

(36) WCO

*{ wh-1 ... [ heri ... ] ... ti ... }
(37) WCO in English DOCs

a. Who, did Mary give t, his, check?

b. *What, did Mary give its, owner t,?

Turning now to Rom, the prediction is that if clitic doubled Mdatives and Pdatives are DOCs with the structure in (22), and constructions without clitics correspond to PDCs with the basic structure in (23), WCO effects should replicate those in English. Judgments for Rom dative clitic doubled ditransitives are open to variation in a situation that parallels English. For speakers representative of the variant that allows clitic doubled prepositional datives, including in particular older speakers with a Northern origin (see the Appendix), WCO effects approximate those reported for English DOCs, as can be deduced from the paradigm in (38). Note that all these patterns often sound rather forced, and are difficult to judge, but show a contrast.

(38) a. Cui, i -am dat t, cecul

who.DAT DAT.CL -have.1sg given check.the
sâu,?
his
‘To whom did I give his check?’

a’. *La cine i am dat t ce cul*
to whom DAT.CL -have.1sg given check.the
său,?

his
‘To whom did I give his check?’

b. *Ce (pământ), i -a fost redat*
what (land) DAT.CL -has been returned
proprietarului său, t,?

owner.the.DAT his
‘What (land) has been given back to its owner?’

b’. *Ce (pământ), i -a fost redat la*
what (land) DAT.CL -has been returned to
proprietarul său, t,?

owner.the his
‘What (land) has been given back to its owner?’

Let us now continue with WCO in English PDCs. Recall that WCO effects are produced when the *wh*-dative DP moves across a theme DP that contains a possessive coindexed with the dative.
Thus, no problems arise when the possessive is in the prepositional phrase, as shown in (38b).

(39) WCO in English PDCs

a. *Who, did Mary give his, check to ti?

b. What, did Mary give ti to its, owner?

While the relevant patterns in Rom are not particularly natural, it remains that ditransitive constructions without dative clitics, which we assume have the basic hierarchical structure in (23), behave along the lines of English PDCs, as illustrated in (40).

(40) a. *Cui, am dat cecul său, ti?

who.DAT have.1pl given check.the his
‘To whom did we give his cheque?’

a’. *La cine, am dat cecul său, ti?

to whom have.1pl given check.the his
‘To whom did we give his cheque?’

b. Ce (pământ), a fost redat ti,

what (land) has been returned
proprietarului său, ti?
In other words, in Mdative constructions such as (40a) and in Pdative constructions such as (40a’), a $wh$-phrase standing for the dative goal cannot move across an accusative theme that contains a possessive coindexed with the goal. Conversely, in both Mdative constructions such as (40b) and Pdative constructions such as (40b’), the accusative theme can move over the goal containing a possessive coindexed with the theme. Notice that the morphological form of the phrase standing for the goal is irrelevant in those variants that offer two syntactic versions. In other words, the possessive can stand within a phrase with a morphological dative or in one preceded by $la$, but crossover effects remain identical. In sum, all the above tests combine to indicate that the crucial factor that defines DOC status is the
functional applicative structure signaled by the dative clitic, not the nature of the lexical phrase.

To conclude, traditional tests for DOC status indicate that in Rom, ditransitive constructions that contain dative clitics are DOCs along the lines of the analysis in (22), while those without dative clitics are comparable to PDCs in other languages such as English or Spanish, and have the syntactic structure given in (23).

Finally, an important topic that should be explored in future work is the connection between the syntactic structure of dative clitic doubling in ditransitives taken here as a symptom of a dative applicative structure, and the syntactic structure of accusative clitic doubling in ditransitives, which remains undefined.

5 Conclusion

In conclusion, in this article we have argued that Rom is to be added to the inventory of languages with double object constructions (DOCs), with participation in the so-called dative alternation.

What makes Rom particularly interesting is that certain geographical variants and registers exhibit two syntactic versions of DOCs, and two syntactic versions of PDCs. This variation
allows determining in a clearer way than in other clitic doubling languages what are the essential diagnostics of these two families of constructions, pointing towards functional structure -the presence of an applicative phrase headed by a dative clitic- as the crucial aspect. What defines DOCs in Rom is a dative clitic, that is, a functional morphological marker, independently of the form of the phrase standing for the goal, which can take two different shapes in some variants or registers. Thus, Rom provides clear support for, and confirms the idea that in clitic doubling languages, dative clitics signal DOC status in ditransitives, and function as heads of low applicative phrases.

Appendix

We stated at several points that DOCs with prepositional datives are prescriptively controversial, and more restricted in register and geographical distribution than DOCs with morphological datives. In our view, prepositional DOCs identify syntactic variation in the present stage partially defined by register, geographical origin and age, as we detail next.

DOCs with dative clitics doubling prepositional phrases with *la* are mentioned in traditional grammars (Iordan 1978: 659). For
the Grammar of the Romanian Academy (Gramatica Limbii Română 1963: vol II p. 139), doubling with prepositional dative indirect objects is obligatory if they precede the verb and optional if they follow the verb. Prepositional DOCs are attested since the beginning of the 19th century in literary or popular works of Transylvanian authors (i.e. North Romania). Such written sources exhibit several types of constructions with clitic doubled la-datives, including psychological verbs with ‘quirky dative subjects’. In (i), we limit illustration to ditransitives - i.e. DOCs-, with idiomatic English translations (clitic and prepositional dative are in bold).

(i) a. Și Culă, cu ochii mici, strălucitori de bucurie, le împarte la toți caz dulce.  
   and Culă, with eyes.the small, shining of joy, CL.DAT gives to all cheese sweet  
   ‘And Culă, with tiny eyes shining of joy, gives them all sweet cheese.’

   Ion Agărâbiceanu, Culă Mereuț (1905)

   b. Tu la toți le ai dat hodiâ.  
   you to all CL.DAT -have given rest
‘You have given rest to all.’

Octavian Goga, Din umbra zidurilor: Inima (1913)

To our knowledge, the only presently available oral corpus of Rom is the recent one in the Childes database (Avram 2004). Such a corpus is interesting for the aims of this paper because it contains examples of adult speech with prepositional DOCs, as in (ii.a) and (ii.b).

(ii) a. Le dai de furcă la doamne.
       DAT.CL give.2sg problems to ladies
       ‘You are giving problems to the ladies.’

b. Dă -i la mama.
       Give.2sg DAT.CL to mother
       ‘Give (it) to mother!’

(Rom Childes Corpora: Avram 2004)

We may wonder why mothers and adult interviewers use constructions in the Childes database that as we see next are objectionable to some prescriptive grammarians. We may speculate that given that such constructions belong to the colloquial level, they seem appropriate to address small children.
In addition to ditransitives as DOCs, adult speech in the Childes database exhibits constructions with clitic doubled *la*-datives formally equivalent to those with doubled morphological datives, such as (iii.a) in the near-to minimal pair in (iii).

(iii) a. *Cum îi spui tu la iaurt?*

   how DAT.CL call you to yogurt

   ‘How do you call the yogurt?’

b. *Cum îi spui tu vîntului?*

   how DAT.Cl call you wind.the.DAT

   ‘How do you call the wind?’

   (Avram 2004)

Sentence (iii.a) is formally equivalent to the literary Transylvanian example in (iv), but as question for a small child we consider that its tone is familiar, not old-fashioned or literary.

(iv) * Şi -i zice la acest stăpân al întunericului*

   and-CL.DAT calls to this master of darkness.the

   *Patronul Noptii.*

   patron.the night.the.GEN

   ‘And he calls this master of darkness Patron of the Night.’
The constructions in (iii.a) and (iii.b) reinforce the idea that some variants of colloquial Rom not limited to Transylvania have two types of dative phrases, those with morphological case and those preceded by *la*, and both can be clitic doubled.

It remains that prepositional DOCs are a source of worry to normative grammarians, with a subclass of such constructions singled out for criticism in a recent book on difficulties in Rom (Forăscu 2003). Forăscu tells us that prepositional datives with doubling - our DOCs - are unobjectionable and equivalent to those with morphological datives, when they contain modified dative phrases including those with quantifiers, as in her example in (v).

(v) \( \text{Le } -a \text{ dat salarii mari } la \text{ diversi} \)

CL.DAT-has given salaries big to different

*angajați*.

employees

‘He has given different employees big salaries.’

However, DOCs with unmodified datives such as those in (vi) have a different status for Forăscu, who tells us that they are a
diachronic extension of those in (v), popular or colloquial, and should be avoided in standard registers in favor of clitic doubled morphological datives.

(vi) Le -a dat la copii să mănânce.

CL.DAT -has given to kids SBJ eat

‘He has given to eat to the children.’

A last remark concerns (Diaconescu 2004), which reports on a detailed grammaticality test on sentences including DOCs with MDatives and Pdatives, carried out with 18 speakers divided into 3 groups based on age and geographical origin that had already participated in a psycholinguistic experiment (Diaconescu and Goodluck 2004). In this test, the three groups generally accepted DOCs with Pdatives, older speakers from Banat and Transylvania (North) showed the highest rate of acceptance, and Northern and Southern younger speakers resembled one another in their (lower) rates of acceptance. Judgments in this paper reflect the intuitions of a speaker that could be classified as a member of the older group from Banat and Transylvania.
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