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1. Introduction

This paper is concerned with a less studied aspect of differential object marking (DOM) on full nominals in Romance, namely co-occurrence restrictions they give rise to, using data from Spanish and Romanian. Despite the valuable insights co-occurrence restrictions provide into the syntax of DOM, the data are yet to be explored in detail, many aspects being rather novel from both a descriptive and a theoretical perspective. Besides an empirical contribution, the paper will focus on two more formally-oriented aspects: i) differences in the syntactic behavior of DOM on clitics as opposed to full DPs; ii) the problems current analyses formulated in terms of a split between Agree and Case as licensing mechanisms for various types of DOM face as applied to the data.

Following Irimia (to appear), this short work will show that the local domain where the relevant ([PERSON]) features are licensed plays a role in these patterns, going beyond the commonly assumed split Agree vs Case. The structure of the paper is as follows. Section 2 introduces the data under scrutiny involving DOM co-occurrence restrictions from Spanish and Romanian. Section 3 provides some background on DOM with full nominals in the two languages. Section 4 presents various problems an analysis in terms of the split Agree vs Case faces with various types of DOM co-occurrence restrictions, covering differences between DOM on nominals and DOM on quantifiers, distinctions between goal dative clitics and possessor dative clitics in Romanian, as well as interactions with medio-passive SE. The following three sections show that each of these types of restrictions (Section 5 - the problem of possessor dative clitics in Romanian, Section 6 - DOM quantifiers, and Section 7 interactions with SE) need a better understanding of the local domains where the relevant licensing takes place. Section 8 concludes.

2. DOM and co-occurrence restrictions. Clitics vs full nominals

A seminal contribution in the area of co-occurrence restrictions involving DOM comes from Ormazabal and Romero (2007). The two authors note that in several varieties of Spanish

1 I would like to thank the audience at LSRL 2020 and the Annual Meeting of the CLA 2021 for very useful feedback and suggestions. A big thank you also to the editors. All errors are my own.

known as leísta, a direct object clitic which is restricted to an animate referent must be spelled-out with dative morphology, as in (1) vs (2). Note that, despite its surface dative morphology, the animate clitic in (2) acts as a true accusative syntactically (see Ormazabal and Romero 2007 et subseq. for relevant accusativity diagnostics).²

LEÍSTA SPANISH (based on Ormazabal and Romero 2007)

(1) Lo vi. see.PST.1SG CL.3M.SG.ACC 'I saw it/him.'

(2) Le vi. see.PST.1SG CL.3M.SG.DAT=DOM CL.3M.SG 'I saw him.'

As we also show in Section 3, ‘oblique’ surface morphology as a means to signal direct objects with certain features such as animacy, humanness, etc. is characteristic to the process known as differential object marking. What is surprising about the DOM clitic in (2) is that it gives rise to a non-trivial co-occurrence restriction: it bans the presence of an I(ndirect) O(bject) dative clitic, as in (3b). In this sense, ClOBL=DOM is distinct from the unmarked form of ClACC, as in (3a), which does not impose this type of restriction.

(3) LEÍSTA SPANISH (Ormazabal and Romero 2007; ex. 16a, b, glosses adapted)

a. Te lo di. 2CL.DAT 3CL.ACC give.PST.1SG 'I gave it to you.'

b. *Te le di. 2CL.DAT CL.3M.SG.DAT=DOM give.PST.1SG Intended: ‘I gave him to you.’

Ormazabal and Romero (2007, 2013a, 2013c, 2013b, a.o.) proposed a syntactic explanation for the clash triggered by ClOBL=DOM, building on so-called intervention-based accounts. For the two authors, differential morphology on the DO clitic in (2) grammaticalizes animacy, a category that must be obligatorily licensed via a mechanism of object agreement. The problem with (3b) boils down to the fact that the goal dative clitic itself needs to be licensed too, but the structure contains only one available licenser (or agreement locus). The two authors have proposed the O(bject) A(greement) C(onstraint) as in (4) which prohibits the verb from entering into additional agreement operations, besides object agreement.

(4) OAC (Ormazabal and Romero 2007:50): If the verbal complex encodes object agreement, no other argument can be licensed through verbal agreement.

Despite its adequacy in explaining ungrammaticality in examples such as (3b), a shortcoming become immediately apparent (see also Irimia to appear for discussion). If

²Abbreviations: ACC=accusative, CL=clitic, DAT=dative, DEF=definite, DOM=differential object marking, F=feminine, IO=indirect object, LK=linker, LOC=locative, M=mascule, MP=medio-passive, NEG=negative, OBL=oblique, PL=plural, PST=past, REFL=reflexive, SBJV=subjunctive, SG=singular.
grammaticalized animacy were a problem of licensing via Agree, the prediction would be that it should produce co-occurrence restrictions with dative clitics in other contexts. This is, however, not borne out. (Leísta) Spanish exhibits other instantiations of differential object marking, for example as seen with definite animate full nominals, abbreviated here as DP_{OBL=DOM}, to set it aside from clitic DOM. Although DOM on full nominals similarly exhibits ‘oblique’ surface behaviour (see Section 3), in the form of a preposition which is homophonous with the dative (and the locative), it does not produce ungrammaticality when a dative (goal) clitic is present in the structure.

The sentences in (5a) and (5b) show that DP_{OBL=DOM} is well formed with Cl_{DAT}, irrespective of the latter’s person feature. Thus, the contrast with examples such as (3b).

(5) SPANISH: Oblique DOM on full nominals possible with a dative goal clitic

a. Te/me

vieron [a] todos los enfermos.

CL.2/1SG.DAT send.PST.3PL LOC/DAT=DOM all the sick people.M.PL

‘They have sent all the sick people to you/me.’ (LEÍSTA/STANDARD, adapted after Ormazabal and Romero 2007, 2013a)

b. Le

vieron [a] todos los enfermos.

CL.3SG.DAT send.PST.3PL LOC/DAT=DOM all the sick people.M.PL

‘They have sent all the sick people to him/her.’ (LEÍSTA/STANDARD)

It is, however, not the case that DP_{OBL=DOM} is completely immune to co-occurrence restrictions. As Ormazabal and Romero (2007, 2013a, 2013b, 2013c) themselves have noticed, if the dative clitic is accompanied in the configuration by its full DP dative correlate, ungrammaticality obtains, as in (6).

(6) Le

vieron [*a] todos los enfermos.

CL.3DAT send.PST.3PL LOC/DAT=DOM all.M.PL DEF.M.PL sick people.M.PL

a la doctora.

LOC/DAT DEF.F.SG doctor

Intended: ‘They have sent all the sick people to the doctor.’ (adapted after Ormazabal and Romero 2013a)

These types of co-occurrence restrictions cannot be easily derived in the morphology. This indicates that DP_{OBL=DOM} has special syntactic constraints, even if different from those seen with Cl_{OBL=DOM}. This hypothesis is strengthened by data from Romanian, as illustrated in the contrast below. Here we see that despite the identical form of the dative clitics on the surface, it is only the dative clitic interpreted as a possessor in (7a) which blocks DP_{OBL=DOM}. To restore grammaticality, the differential marker must be removed, as in (7b). In (8) we notice, in turn, that the dative clitic with a goal interpretation is well formed with DP_{OBL=DOM}, irrespective of its person specification.

(7) ROMANIAN: *Cl_{DAT=POSS} DP_{OBL=DOM} (DOM blocked with possessor Cl_{DAT})

\footnote{The alternation in the shape of Cl_{DAT=POSS} in (7) has a purely phonological source; Cl_{ACC} (-i) doubling DP_{OBL=DOM} in (7a) triggers the short form of the dative clitic (see also the short form of Cl_{DAT=GOAL} in (8)).}
3. DOM on full nominals

Many Romance languages exhibit a non-uniform morphological encoding of their direct objects, as an instantiation of the cross-linguistically robust phenomenon of differential object marking (see especially Bossong 1991, 1998). In Spanish and Romanian the regulating factors are conjunctive sets of features, generally including animacy and specificity. Direct object carrying these specifications (must) carry special marking in the form of a preposition. In (9) we see a human definite direct object in Spanish, which must be introduced by the preposition *a, which is homophonous with the dative/locative. Inanimate objects as in
(10), on the other hand, do not have this possibility and must stay unmarked. A similar split is seen in Romanian (12) vs (13), with the slight difference that a locative (*pe) preposition is used for differential object marking, and not the dative.

The recruiting of a preposition places Spanish and Romanian in the class of languages instantiating the so-called *oblique* DOM strategy (see Bossong 1991, 1998, Torrego 1998, Cornilescu 2000, Aissen 2003, Rodríguez-Mondónde 2007, Tighă 2011, López 2012, Ormazabal and Romero 2013, Manzini and Franco 2016, Hill and Mardale 2021, a.o.). However, despite this oblique appearance, marked nominals show accusative syntactic behavior in both languages. This can be seen, for example, from the behavior of clitic doubling. For example, in non-leísta varieties of Spanish, only the accusative form of the clitic is possible with differentially marked nominals. as in (11). In Romanian, marked nominals (with the exception of certain types of quantifiers as in 12) normally require clitic doubling, which is only possible in its accusative form, as already illustrated in (8). Another example is in (14).\(^4\) Also note that Romanian DOM is subject to a process which deletes the definite marker on a nominal which does not have overt modification (see also the contrast between (7a) and (7b); but, even if definiteness morphology is not pronounced, the object in is still interpreted as a definite.

\[
\begin{align*}
(9) \quad & \text{Vi } \text{\textit{la niña}.} & \text{Vi } \text{\textit{el libro}.} \\
& \text{see.PST.1SG DAT=} & \text{see.PST.1SG DAT=} \\
& \text{DOM the girl} & \text{DOM the book} \\
& \text{‘I saw the girl.’} & \text{‘I saw the book.’} \\
(10) \quad & \text{Lo } \text{\textit{él}.} \\
& \text{CL.3SG.ACC.M see.PST.1SG DAT/LOC=} & \text{DOM he} \\
& \text{DOM} & \text{‘I saw him.’} \\
(11) \quad & \text{Văd } \text{\textit{al cineva}.} & \text{Văd } \text{\textit{cărți}.} \\
& \text{see.1SG LOC=} & \text{see.1SG LOC=} \\
& \text{DOM other somebody} & \text{DOM books} \\
& \text{‘I see somebody else.’} & \text{‘I see books.’} \\
(12) \quad & \text{Îi } \text{\textit{copii/*copii-i.}} \\
& \text{CL.3M.PL.ACC see.1SG LOC=} & \text{DOM children/children-DEF.M.PL} \\
& \text{DOM} & \text{‘I see the children.’} \\
\end{align*}
\]

\(^4\)Thus, here I follow accounts that assume an accusative syntax for oblique DOM, as opposed to analyses which link this class to an oblique syntax. See especially Manzini and Franco (2016) for discussion on the problem of oblique morphology for DOM.

4. **Agree vs Case and the problems with DP\textsubscript{DOM}**

Going back to the splits in co-occurrence restrictions between clitic DOM and full nominal DOM, we have seen the following: to derive examples such as (3b) where Cl\textsubscript{OBL=}DOM is not grammatical with a dative clitic, Ormazabal and Romero (2007) have proposed that grammaticalized animacy encoded by oblique morphology on the animate clitic must establish
obligatory Agree with the verb. This is the OAC in (4). The result of this operation is that the licensing of any other argument, such as the (goal) dative clitic, is blocked. Thus, Cl\textsubscript{DAT} which also needs obligatory licensing but cannot enter into the relevant Agree relation, will produce ungrammaticality.

This, however, does not explain why DP\textsubscript{OBL=DOM} (i.e., prepositional \textit{a-DOM}), does not produce with the clitic-doubled dative, such as in (5a)). Oblique morphology encodes grammaticalized animacy with DP\textsubscript{OBL=DOM} too, as it triggers co-occurrence restrictions, but with clitic doubled datives, as in (6).

Ormazabal and Romero (2007, p. 338) hypothesize that the contrast between DP\textsubscript{OBL=DOM} and Cl\textsubscript{DAT} can be explained in the following way: ‘whatever rule or principle is involved in A-insertion (in DP\textsubscript{OBL=DOM}, our note) it has to be independent of object agreement.’ In later works (Ormazabal and Romero 2013a, et subseq), some more specific remarks are made in the sense that Cl\textsubscript{OBL=DOM} in (3b) is linked to licensing in terms of Agree, while DP\textsubscript{OBL=DOM} (i.e., prepositional \textit{a-DOM}), as in (9) or (5a) is associated with licensing in terms of Case.

### 4.1 Spanish Quantifier\textsubscript{OBL=DOM} vs DP\textsubscript{OBL=DOM} on lexical nominals

However, as Irimia (to appear) notes, the Agree/Case distinction is not sufficient, and might even be problematic. Starting with Spanish, a fact that has not been extensively documented before is that not all types of DP\textsubscript{OBL=DOM} trigger co-occurrence restrictions. Irimia (to appear) has shown that \textit{DOM}-ed \textit{Neg(ative) Q(uantifier)s} (more easily) escape them. The contrast in (27) from Spanish is telling. Similar facts also hold in Romanian (see Irimia to appear for extensive exemplification).

(15) a. *Le enviaron \textbf{a} todos los enfermos \textit{a} CL\textsubscript{3DAT} send.PST.3PL DAT/LOC=DOM all.M.PL the sick people.M.PL DAT la doctora. DEF.F.SG doctor Intended: ‘They have sent all the sick people to the doctor.’

b. No \textit{le} enviaron \textbf{a} nadie \textit{a} la doctora. NEG CL\textsubscript{3SG.DAT} send.PST.3PL DAT=DOM nobody DAT the doctor ‘They haven’t sent anybody to the doctor.’ (SPANISH)

This contrast also clearly demonstrates that the co-occurrence restriction is not due to haplology, that is prohibition of two \textit{a}-marked arguments. As expected, contexts with DP\textsubscript{OBL=DOM} and a full nominal dative are grammatical, even if both nominals are introduced by \textit{a}, as in (17). To get the facts right in (15b), it would be necessary to assume that \textit{DOM} in NegQ\textsubscript{OBL=DOM} in (15b) is \textit{not} active syntactically, possibly because it lacks a Case feature. Obviously, this is a no starter. Note that in Romanian, NegQ\textsubscript{OBL=DOM} still results in ungrammaticality in a configuration with a dative clitic interpreted as a possessor.

(16) \textbf{Nu} \textit{și-a ajutat \textcolor{red}{pe} nimeni dintre ai săi.} NEG CL\textsubscript{3SG.DAT-has helped LOC=DOM nobody from LK.DEF.M.PL his.PL
4.2 Romanian restrictions with $\text{DP}_{\text{OBL}}=\text{DOM}$

Although Romanian does not grammaticalize animacy on clitics, the split Agree/Case proves out to be problematic in other respects. For example, it does not explain the difference between the dative possessor clitic and other types of dative clitics, as seen in (7) and (8) and as schematically represented in (18).

(18) Possessor Dative vs Goal Dative with $\text{DOM}$ in Romanian

Ungrammatical - $\text{Cl}_{\text{DAT}}=\text{POSS} \ldots \text{DP}_{\text{OBL}}=\text{DOM}$ (Romanian 7a) vs

Grammatical - $\text{Cl}_{\text{DAT}}=\text{GOAL} \ldots \text{DP}_{\text{OBL}}=\text{DOM}$ (Romanian 8)

To derive this type of contrast, one would have to say that $\text{Cl}_{\text{DAT}}=\text{POSS}$ needs licensing in terms of Agree, while other dative clitics either stay unlicensed or require licensing in terms of Case (or the other way around). It is not clear what type of independent evidence could be used to motivate this analysis.

To these facts and other restrictions discussed in Irimia (to appear) we add another class here, namely the ungrammaticality produced by $\text{DP}_{\text{LOC}}=\text{DOM}$ with medio-passive $\text{SE}$ (see especially Dobrovie-Sorin 1998, among others). In (19a) a differentially marked nominal gives rise to ungrammaticality with the pronominal element $\text{SE}$, when interpreted as a medio-passive. The unmarked nominal must be used instead, making example (19b) grammatical. In this respect, Romanian is different from Spanish which allows marked objects under medio-passive $\text{SE}$, but only if the verb shows default 3 person singular inflection (Mendikoetxea 2008, Ormazabal and Romero 2021, among others).

(19) a. * $\text{Se întâmpină pe oaspeți.}$
   $\text{SEM}_{\text{MP}}$ welcome.3 $\text{LOC}=\text{DOM}$ guests
   Intended: ‘The guests are being welcomed.’

b. $\text{Se întâmpină oaspeți-i.}$
   $\text{SEM}_{\text{MP}}$ welcome.3 guests-DEF.M.PL
   Intended: ‘The guests are being welcomed.’ (Romanian)

(20) $\text{Se felicita a los héroes.}$
   $\text{SEM}_{\text{MP}}$ congratulate.3SG $\text{DAT}=\text{DOM}$ DEF.M.PL heroes
   ‘The heroes are being congratulated.’ (Spanish)

---

5 See Irimia (to appear) for more extensive discussion and other types of co-occurrence restrictions with $\text{DOM}$, which have not been illustrated here for lack of space.

6 Pronominal $\text{SE}$ can have many other interpretations in Romance languages, among which the reflexive, the impersonal, or the unaccusative ones. Here we examine only its medio-passive realization.
In the next section we show that these types of splits with differentially marked objects can be straightforwardly derived once the narrow licensing domains for various categories are taken into account.

5. Possessor clitics vs goal dative clitics

The differences between the possessor clitic and the goal dative clitic are the most problematic under the assumed Agree/Case split and we start our discussion with them. In the examples we repeat in (21) we see that only the dative possessor clitic gives rise to a co-occurrence restriction with a differentially marked nominal in Romanian. These examples clearly indicate that the restriction does not have a morphological source - it is not dative morphology per se that produces clashes with DOM, as the same dative morphology interpreted as a goal is fine with DOM in (21b).

   CL.3SG.REFL.DAT-CL.3M.PL.ACC welcome.3SG LOC=DOM guest.M.PL
   Intended: ‘He welcomes his own guests.’ (i.e., ‘welcomes the guests to himself’)

   b. Ți-l trimit *[pe] George (să te ajute).
      CL.2SG.DAT-CL.3SG.M.ACC send.1SG LOC=DOM George (to help you)
      ‘I’ll send you George (to help you).’
      (ROMANIAN)

Irimia (to appear) has pointed out two important observations related to the more specific interaction between DOM and the possessor clitic. On the one hand, if the dative possessor is not interpreted as a possessor on the differentially marked nominal, but on some other nominal in the structure, the co-occurrence restriction disappears. For example, in (22) a possessor interpretation of the dative clitic is possible, but not on DOM; the possessor could instead be interpreted on the nominal inside the PP în ajutor (lit. ’in aid’). A similar ameliorating effect is seen when DP OBL=DOM is dislocated to the left periphery, as in (23) vs (21a). Many speakers mention that dislocation contexts are much better, even if they contain both DOM and a dative clitic interpreted as a possessor.

(22) Nu șii-a trimis [pe] nimeni i în ajutor,.
   NEG CL.3SG.REFL.DAT-have.3SG sent LOC=DOM nobody in help
   ‘He hasn’t sent to himself anybody as his aid.’
   # ‘He hasn’t sent anybody of his as an aid.’
   (ROMANIAN)

(23) [pe] oaspeți, Ion șii-i întâmpină mereu.
    LOC=DOM guests, Ion CL.DAT.3SG.REFL-CL.3M.PL.ACC welcomes always
    ‘His own guests, Ion always welcomes them.’
    (ROMANIAN)

These examples suggest that considerations related to locality are important for the licensing of DOM, beyond the split Case/Agree. The question is how to formalize them.
Based on the discussion and motivation in Irimia (2020, to appear), I take oblique DOM to spell out a feature beyond Case per se, notated here as [PERSON] (Cornilescu 2000, Rodríguez-Mondoñedo 2007, Richards 2008, a.o.), which needs obligatory licensing in the syntax. The dative possessor clitic also encodes a [PERSON] feature, which equally needs licensing. The data give evidence that the dative clitic encodes a type of possessor which is based generated inside the DP, as in (24), and then raises to T (as Romanian clitics are T-oriented, see Hill and Mardale 2021 among others). This is very similar to analyses in terms of Possessor Raising (see especially Landau 1999, Diaconescu 2004, a.o.), under which the possessor clitic is generated DP-internally and then raises to its spell-out position.

The more specific problem with examples such as (21a) is that the two [PERSON] features are too local in the same KP, as represented in (24). Additionally, in the local domain that contains these two [PERSON] features, there is only one [PERSON] licenser, on the functional projection we label here α (following López 2012, which has motivated this licensing position for differentially marked objects). Romanian further indicates that [PERSON] licensing in the possessor dative is subject to another constraint, namely the existence of a phasal domain. More specifically, there cannot be two ([PERSON]) features of the same type requiring licensing in the same phasal domain.

Crash can be avoided, if one of the [PERSON] features can be removed from the phasal domain, for example via dislocation to/direct merge in the left periphery, as in (23). Here, the [PERSON] feature can be licensed by a [PERSON]-related functional projection in the C₀ domain, a different phase from vP. The [PERSON]-related specification in the possessor clitic is licensed by α₁ head, inside vP. Another way out is to have the two [PERSON] features on different categories, as in (25). Here, the Possessor-related [PERSON] feature is generated inside the PP, while the object DP contains a separate [PERSON] feature. As the PP is a distinct phasal domain, crash is avoided.

Another type of evidence supporting the importance of locality comes from some facts related to DOM under coordination. For some Romanian speakers examples such as (26a) appear to be somehow acceptable. The problem is that the first element of the co-
ordination is an unmarked nominal, which is not possible without differential marking in an in-situ position, as seen in (26b). The unmarked nominal is more similar to a hanging Topic, which does not require obligatory differential marking on objects. The differentially marked object in (26a) gets licensed in the high left periphery, possibly as a result of Information Structure specifications (Topic), and we obtain a coordination of topics.

(26) a. ?Domnul acela și pe Ion, nu îi mai invit la noi.
   gentleman.DEF that and DOM Ion NEG CL.3PL.M.ACC more invite at we
   ‘That gentleman and Ion, I’m not inviting them to our place even again.’

   b. Nu (il/i) mai invit *(pe) domnul acela (și pe Ion).
      NEG CL.3M.SG/PL more invite.1 DOM gentleman.DEF that and DOM Ion
      ‘I’m not inviting that gentleman (and Ion) ever again.’ (ROMANIAN)

Thus, DOM under left-dislocation is licensed in terms of features that are specific to the CP phase, for example Information Structure, as opposed to animacy licensing which is a characteristic to the θP phase. We know from independent evidence that, in the absence of overt dislocation to the high CP periphery, animates that are differentially marked do not get licensed above θP. For example they cannot bind into the EA (see López 2012 for data from Spanish, and Hill and Mardale 2021, Irimia 2020, Cornilescu 2020 for Romanian DOM without clitic doubling, as illustrated by the contrast in (36)).

6. DOM and negative quantifiers

Let’s turn now to examples involving NegQ_{OBL}=DOM. We have seen that NegQ_{OBL}=DOM can more easily escape clashes in configurations involving clitic doubled indirect objects. A split is illustrated in the Spanish examples repeated below:

(27) a. *Le enviaron [a] todos los enfermos a
   CL.3DAT send.PST.3PL DAT=DOM all.M.PL DEF.M.PL sick people.M.PL DAT
   la doctora.
   DEF.F.SG doctor
   Intended: ‘They have sent all the sick people to the doctor.’

   b. No le enviaron [a] nadie a la doctora.
      NEG CL.3SG.DAT send.PST.3PL DAT=DOM nobody DAT the doctor
      ‘They haven’t sent anybody to the doctor.’ (SPANISH)

Although these examples require more detailed investigation, I follow Irimia’s (to appear) tentative explanation which connects the facts to intrinsic characteristics of NegQ_{OBL}=DOM, which can be assumed to trigger raising higher than θ^0. Raising can be unstipulatively motivated starting from the observation that NegQ_{OBL}=DOM carry emphatic accent which is related to a focus feature (Giannakidou 2020, a.o.), which forces raising. Under this hypothesis, animate NegQ have their accusative Case (and their [Person] feature) licensed by
\( \nu^0; \) [PERSON] on clitic-doubled datives is licensed by \( \alpha_1^0 \), as shown in (28). Therefore, ungrammaticality is avoided. In examples such (27a), on the contrary, both DP\(_{OBL=DOM}\) and the clitic doubled datives require [PERSON] licensing in \( \alpha_1^0 \), as shown in (29). See also Ormazabal and Romero (2013b, 2013c) or Irimia (to appear) for further motivation for the licensing of both DPQ\(_{OBL=DOM}\) and the clitic doubled dative in an intermediate position in the \( \nu P \), namely \( \alpha_1^0 \). Dative clitics, which do not have a full nominal double, give evidence of being licensed above \( \nu P \). Thus, they will not produce a clash with DPQ\(_{OBL=DOM}\), which is licensed by \( \alpha_1^0 \), nor with NegQ\(_{OBL=DOM}\), which undergoes licensing by \( \nu_1^0 \).

(28) \( \text{NegQ}_{OBL=DOM} \) and clitic doubled datives

(29) \( \text{DP}_{OBL=DOM} \) and clitic doubled datives

7. \( \text{DP}_{OBL=DOM} \) and SE passives

The last class of co-occurrence restrictions we are addressing in this short paper comes from SE medio-passives (SE\(_{MP}\)). We have seen that Romanian DP\(_{OBL=DOM}\) is different from Spanish in that it is not grammatical with medio-passive SE. The two relevant examples are repeated in (30).
    $SE_{MP}$ welcome.3 LOC=DOM guests  
    Intended: ‘The guests are being welcomed.’

    b. Se întâmpină oaspeți-i.  
    $SE_{MP}$ welcome.3 guests-DEF.M.PL  
    Intended: ‘The guests are being welcomed.’  
    (ROMANIAN)

(31) Se felicita [a] los héroes.  
    $SE_{MP}$ congratulate.3SG DAT=DOM DEF.M.PL heroes  
    ‘The heroes are being congratulated.’  
    (SPANISH)

    One possible explanation for the clash in (30a) could start from Dobrovie-Sorin’s (1998) observation that Romanian medio-passive $SE$ is a category which undergoes licensing in terms of accusative Case. More specifically, it signals a structural accusative. As $DP_{OBL=DOM}$ too needs licensing as a structural accusative, it will not be grammatical with medio-passive $SE$. This type of medio-passive is, in a sense, similar to the periphrastic passive, constructed with auxiliary $BE$. In the latter configuration, structural accusative licensing is not available for $DP_{OBL=DOM}$, either because it has been absorbed by auxiliary $BE$ or as a result of the fact that a subject has not been merged (the subject position will be occupied by the object, which moves there to get licensed), if analyses in terms of Dependent Case for structural accusative are to be followed instead (Baker 2015, Levin and Preminger 2015, a.o.). Thus, a differentially marked object will not be grammatical with $BE$-passive either, as shown in (32).

(32) *Au fost întâmpinat [pe] oaspeți.  
    have.3PL been welcomed.M.PL LOC=DOM guest.M.PL  
    ‘The guests have been welcomed.’  
    (ROMANIAN)

    Seeing Romanian $SE_{MP}$ as a category that needs licensing as a structural accusative explains why it is possible with dative clitics as in (33a), datives which are doubled by a dative clitics as in (33b), or types of obliques which are not structural accusatives, for example the locative as in (33c):

(33)  a. I [s-a] transmis să plece.  
    $CL\cdot DAT.3SG\ SE_{MP}\cdot have.3SG$ transmitted SBJV leave.SBJV.3SG  
    ‘He was told to leave.’

    b. I [s-au] dat bani lui Ion.  
    $CL\cdot DAT.3SG\ SE_{MP}\cdot have.3PL$ given money.PL DAT.M.SG Ion  
    ‘Ion was given money.’

    c. Se [mănâncă pe masă].  
    $SE_{MP}$ eat.3SG LOC table  
    ‘Eating is done on the table.’  
    (ROMANIAN)
However, this hypothesis does not explain why \( SE_{MP} \) is not possible with the dative possessor clitic, under a reflexive interpretation. The example in (34) is ungrammatical, irrespective of the position of the two clitics. The form of the possessor clitic is clearly dative; thus, the problem cannot be clash in terms of accusative licensing. Also, ungrammaticality cannot be easily attributed to PF effects, as the two clitics are distinct on the surface. On the other hand, given that both \( SE_{MP} \) and the reflexive dative possessor clitic give rise to co-occurrence restrictions with \( DP_{OBL=DOM} \), it would be more insightful if an analysis could be formulated that could derive this fact too.

(34) *Se îşi / Îşi se întâmpină/primesc/cinstesc
\[ SE_{ACC_{MP}} \text{DAT.REFL.}3SG / \text{DAT.REFL.}3SG \ SE_{ACC_{MP}} \text{welcome/receive/honour.}3PL \]
oaspeţ-i-i. 
\text{guest.M.PL-DEF.M.PL} \] (ROMANIAN) 
Intended. ‘One’s own guests are being welcomed/received/honoured.’

A less discussed fact is also that \( SE_{MP} \) is similar to the dative possessor clitic in that it blocks \( DP_{OBL=DOM} \) even if the latter is clitic doubled. Compare (35) with (21a).

(35) * Se îi / Îi se întâmpină [pe] oaspeţii. 
\[ SE_{CL.ACC.3PL.M} / \text{CL.ACC.}3PL.M \ SE_{MP} \text{welcome.}3 \text{LOC=}\text{DOM} \text{guests} \]
Intended: ‘The guests are being welcomed.’ (ROMANIAN)

In Romanian, there is evidence that clitic doubled \( DP_{OBL=DOM} \) is licensed higher than \( DP_{OBL=DOM} \). For example, clitic doubled \( DP_{OBL=DOM} \) allows binding into the external argument, indicating that it is licensed above \( \nu P \) (if not higher). \( DP_{OBL=DOM} \) does not have this possibility. The two examples below are telling.

(36) a. Muzica lor\( _{i} \) plictiseşte pe mulţii; 
\[ \text{music.DEF.F.SG} \text{their annoyance.}3SG \text{LOC=}\text{DOM} \text{many.M.PL} \]
‘Their (*own) music annoys many people.’

b. Muzica lor\( _{i} \) \( \text{îi} \) plictiseşte pe mulţii; 
\[ \text{music.DEF.F.SG} \text{their CL.ACC.}3\text{M.PL} \text{annoys.}3SG \text{LOC=}\text{DOM} \text{many.M.PL} \]
‘Their (own) music annoys many people.’ (ROMANIAN, Cornilescu 2020, ex. 24 and 25)

All these examples support the conclusion that \( SE_{MP} \) is similar to the possessor dative clitic in that its licensing is dependent on phases. In other words, it blocks categories that need licensing in terms of the same features across the whole phase in which such features are found. As a result, it will be ungrammatical with the dative possessor clitic, which is similarly sensitive to phases, and it will be also ungrammatical with differentially marked objects, which need obligatory licensing. This, in turn, indicates that co-occurrence effects involving differentially marked objects and their typology are not simply a matter of the split Case/Agree. They also show sensitivity to local domains in which the relevant features need to be licensed.
8. Conclusions

An examination of less studied co-occurrence restrictions with oblique DOM from (leísta and standard) Spanish and Romanian reveals that they cannot be reduced just to the Object Agreement Constraint or to the split Agree/Case. The paper has illustrated differences in the behaviour of clitic vs full nominal DOM, splits between DOM quantifiers and nominals, differences between possessor dative clitics and goal dative clitics in Romanian, as well as interactions with medio-passive SE. It has proposed instead that the local domain where the relevant [PERSON] features are licensed plays a role when it comes to various types of syntactic interactions triggered by DOM.
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