

DOM AND CO-OCCURRENCE RESTRICTIONS IN ROMANCE: BEYOND CLITIC CLUSTERS

Monica Alexandrina Irimia - University of Modena and Reggio Emilia

SETTING THE STAGE. This work explores co-occurrence restrictions as in (1), induced by D(ifferential) O(bject) M(arking) on full nominals (generally human or animate DPs), with data from varieties of Spanish and Romanian. It shows that the *narrow local* domain where [PERSON] features are licensed is relevant to these patterns.

- (1) **Le** enviaron (***a**) todos los enfermos **a** la doctora.
 CL.3SG.DAT sent.3PL DOM all.PL DEF.M.PL patients DAT DEF.F.SG doctor.F

Intended: ‘They sent all the patients to the doctor.’ (Spanish, modeled after O&R 2013)

SOME PROBLEMS. Ormazabal and Romero (2007, et subseq.) unify the ungrammaticality of (1) with ‘classical’ P(erson)C(ase)C(onstraint): full DP DOM competes for Case licensing with the clitic-doubled dative. However, a previously ignored observation is that not all types of full DP DOM trigger restrictions. The sentence in (2) is *grammatical* although *obligatory* DOM co-occurs with a clitic doubled dative. Assuming that DOM on human Neg(ative) Q(uantifier) does not need (Case) licensing is untenable (NegQ DOM leads to ungrammaticality with medio-passive SE, indicating that it *does* need (Case) licensing, etc.).

- (2) No *le* enviaron *(a) nadie *a la* doctora.
 NEG CL.3SG.DAT send.PST.3PL DOM nobody DAT DEF.F.SG doctor

‘They haven’t sent anybody to the doctor.’ (Spanish)

Romanian shows similar problems. In (3) DOM cannot co-occur with a DAT clitic, interpreted as possessor (raising); the restriction is not seen with a goal dative (the quantifier blocks a possessor reading in (4)) or when DAT is a possessor on a different nominal than DOM. The AGREE/Case distinction (Ormazabal and Romero 2013) won’t work, because we see *full nominal* DOM (assumed to be licensed via Case) interacting with a dative *clitic* (licensed via Agree).

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>(3) *Și/*mi_{POSS}-(l) ajută pe prieten_{POSS}.
 CL.3/1DAT-3SG.ACC helps DOM friend
 <i>Intended:</i> ‘S/he helps her(his)/my friend.’</p> | <p>(4) Își_{POSS} trimite pe cineva (în ajutor_{POSS}).
 CL.3DAT sends DOM sbdy in help
 ‘He sends somebody and is affected by this.’
 ‘He sends somebody to his own help.’</p> |
|--|---|

PROPOSAL. We encode animacy-based DOM as a [PERSON] specification (see Cornilescu 2000, Rodríguez-Mondoñedo 2007, a.o.) beyond structural Case, connected instead with *sentience* (see also Zubizarreta and Pancheva 2017, a.o.). Assuming the presence of both Voice and *v* (Legate 2014, etc.), we individuate four loci of accusative licensing, as in (5): at *v* (structural ACC for inanimates), at α (for DOM, see especially López 2012), at Voice (for classes such as NegQ DOM), at Cl_{Person} above Voice (for clitics, see Belletti 2004, Ciucivara 2009, a.o.). The problem in (6), and (8) is that two [PERSON] features need licensing from the *same licenser* in a *narrow local* domain, irrespectively of whether they are clitics or not. The other configurations discussed here are grammatical, as the problem of licensing from the *same* head is avoided.

- (5) ...[Cl_{Person} .. [Voice [*Sentience+AccCase*] ...[α [*sentience*] [App] [*DatCase*]...[*v* [*AccCase*] ...[VP DO]]]]]]]]

- (6) for (1): [PERSON] in full DOM and [PERSON] in Cl-doubled DAT need licensing from α (see O&R 2013 or Cornilescu 2020, a.o., for licensing of Cl-Double DAT in α)

- (7) for (2): [PERSON] and Case_{ACC} on NegQ get licensed by Voice (a plausible explanation is that emphatic-accent focus - see Giannakidou 2020, a.o.- in NegQ forces raising to VoiceP); [PERSON] in Cl-doubled DAT gets licensed by α

- (8) for (3): two [PERSON] features *too local* in the same KP ($Cl_{DAT=POSS}$ generated inside KP and then raising) - * [_{POSSP} PERSON_{POSS} ...[_{KP} PERSON_{DOM} ...[_{DP} D.....]]]

- (9) for (4), etc: [PERSON] in DOM licensed by α ; [PERSON] in Cl_{DAT} licensed by Cl_{Person}

In conclusion, these (limited) data demonstrate that co-occurrence restrictions are not a matter of clitics. They allow us to start investigating the nature of full nominal DOM restrictions which are understudied both descriptively and formally, despite their pervasiveness.

References

- Belletti, Adriana. 2004. Extended doubling and the VP periphery. *Probus* 17(1):1–36.
- Ciucivara, Oana. 2009. A syntactic analysis of pronominal clitic clusters in Romance. Doctoral Dissertation, New York University, New York, NY.
- Cornilescu, Alexandra. 2000. On the interpretation of the prepositional accusative in Romanian. *Bucharest Working Wapers in Linguistics* 2:91–106.
- Giannakidou, Anastasia. 2020. Negative concord and the nature of negative concord items. In *Oxford Handbook of Negation*, ed. Vivianne Déprez and M. Teresa Espinal, Oxford Handbooks, 458–479. Oxford: John Benjamins.
- Legate, Julie Anne. 2014. *Voice and v. Lessons from Acehnese*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- López, Luis. 2012. *Indefinite objects: scrambling, choice functions and differential marking*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Ormazabal, Javier, and Juan Romero. 2007. The object agreement constraint. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 25(2):315–347.
- Ormazabal, Javier, and Juan Romero. 2013. Differential object marking, case and agreement. *Borealis: an International Journal of Hispanic Linguistics* 2(2):221–239.
- Rodríguez-Mondoñedo, John. 2007. The syntax of objects. Agree and differential object marking. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Connecticut, Storrs: CT.
- Zubizarreta, Maria Luisa, and Roumyana Pancheva. 2017. A formal characterization of person-based alignment. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 35(4):1161–1204.