Bien qu’ils constituent le point de départ des opérations morphologiques dérivationnelles, les lexèmes simples ne font que rarement l’objet d’études en morphologie dérivationnelle. En se limitant au domaine nominal, l’objectif de cette présentation est double : il s’agit d’une part de définir ce que sont les lexèmes simples en français, et d’autre part de les caractériser sémantiquement.

Dans un premier temps je tenterai donc de circonscrire les noms simples tout en soulignant les problèmes posés par la notion de simplicité morphologique.

Puis je présenterai la constitution d’un corpus de noms simples et un essai de classification sémantique de ces noms. Le point de départ de cette classification est l’hypothèse de Croft (1991) selon laquelle les noms simples dénotent prototypiquement des objets, contrairement aux noms construits qui renvoient principalement à des actions ou à des propriétés selon qu’ils dérivent de verbes ou d’adjectifs. L’objectif est de vérifier cette hypothèse sur un corpus de grande ampleur. Nous verrons que celle-ci est en partie vérifiée, mais laisse de côté un certain nombre de problèmes.
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The analysis of ditransitive configurations has vacillated between two accounts: the alternative projection account and the derivational account. The alternative projection account was first proposed for English by Pesetsky (1995) and it is founded on the existence of assumed systematic differences between the prepositional Dative and the Double Object Construction (DOC). The two configurations are argued to be independent one of the other in the sense that one does not derive from the other (Oheerle (1976), Marantz (1993), Pesetsky (1995), Harley (1995, 2002), Bruening (2001, 2010), Pylkkänen (2002, 2008) a.o.). According to the derivational account, on the other hand, one of the constructions is syntactically derived from the other (Larson 1988, 1990, den Dikken 1995, Ormazabal & Romero 2010, 2012 a.o.).

In the Romance domain (see Demonte 1995, Cuervo 2003, among many), including Romanian (Diaconescu and Rivero 2007, D&R from now on), a distinction has been set up between the cliticless construction, assimilated to the prepositional to-Dative of English and the CD construction, which is assimilated to the English DOC. In this description, the Romance DOC is viewed as an applicative construction and the clitic is interpreted as a spell-out of the applicative head.

This presentation is devoted to the study of ditransitive configurations in Romanian and presents some new experimental data arguing against the purported existence of two distinct configurations i.e., a DOC and a Prepositional Dative in this language. We will thus argue that a unified analysis of ditransitive constructions is more appropriate for Romanian and refute the claim according to which Romanian ditransitives with a clitic doubled dative object correspond to DOCs, while their non-doubled counterparts correspond to the so-called Prepositional dative constructions, contra D&R (2007). More specifically, we will defend the
view that Romanian ditransitives instantiate the DOC configuration irrespective of whether they carry Clitic Doubling (CD) or not. One experimental result supporting this claim is the fact that the two objects in the Romanian ditransitive construction have symmetrical binding potential and roughly equal privileges with respect to binding phenomena.

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 (2010) that the Goal is part of the argument structure of the verb, which assigns it basic thematic interpretation. The Goal always merges in a low position, where it is c-commanded by the Theme. Furthermore, the dative Goal is always an applied argument, always case-licensed by a (raising) applicative head.

In addition to its case-valuation role, the Applicative head is optionally endowed with a strong EPP[feature]. This feature is valued by movement of a semantically appropriate or clitic-doubled dative to the Spec AppIP, in a position where it c-commands the Theme. The higher possessor reading of the dative is thus derivationally obtained by valuing the strong [person] of the Vappl head.

The basic Theme > Goal structure: The two DPs are theta-licensed by the lexical verb and they are respectively case-licensed by Appl and by the v-head. Appl necessarily agrees with the Goal. If it agreed with the Theme, the Goal could not be case-licensed, since it is not visible to little v (nesting paths are disallowed). The essential property of the low dative construction is that the Goal is licensed in situ.

The derived Goal>Theme structure: The underlying configuration is the same but the [uperson] feature checked by the GoalDP is EPP so that the Goal phrase will not only agree with VAppl, but also be attracted to its Specifier. 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 Possessor interpretation. By moving to Spec, VApplP, the dative c-commands the Theme and can function as a binder.

The proposed analysis makes a number of correct predictions: 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 as the results of the experiment show. Secondly, given that in certain derivations, the dative must be [+person], given its Possessor role and may be doubled, we expect phrases whose idiomatic interpretation stands or falls with the presence of the clitic. This expectation is also confirmed.