BACKGROUND. The observation that that (C/case) licensing operations may apply to nominals more than once has been supported by several recent accounts (Baker and Vinokurova 2010, Richards 2013, Pesetsky 2014, Levin and Preminger 2015, Levin 2017, Preminger 2017, Chen 2018, a.o.). Some of these contributions have also shown that movement out of the local (case) domain is not a prerequisite for multiple case assignment (Richards 2013, Chen 2018, a.o., mainly for case-stacking). This paper provides further support for this assumption, focusing on the merge of a [+PERSON] feature requiring additional licensing without (overt) raising.


(1) (*[fjo] (l)-add5o *kwotta/kotta a l’aragosta.
   ‘I have cooked the lobster (*[for him]).’
   NEAPOLITAN (ROMANCE)

(2) Zu-k ni[r] ikusi didazu. NON-STANDARD BASQUE
   you-ERG I-DAT=DOM see AUX.ABS-DAT.1SG-ERG.2SG
   ‘You have seen me.’ (Odria 2017, p.214, ex. 2b; glosses adapted)

PROPOSAL. The novel hypothesis explored here is that non-canonical morphology of the type seen above is connected to a secondary licensing operation on a DP in the same local domain (building on some remarks in Suñer 1988, a.o.). Unifying such objects to structural local case-stacking phenomena (of the type discussed in Richards 2013, Chen 2018, a.o.) derives their behavior in many genetically-unrelated languages.

ANALYSIS. I. DOM AS STRUCTURAL CASE. In recent licensing accounts, DOM encodes a split between Case-checked/licensed nominals (DOM-ed) and Caseless/unlicensed nominals (e.g., DOM-less inanimates) - Ormazabal and Romero (2013a), Kalin (2018), Levin (2018), a.o.. II. SIMPLE LICENSING IS NOT ENOUGH. However, cross-linguistically, these classes are not the only ones that need a licensing account. In the Neapolitan (1), we also notice object past participle agreement (PPA), which is independent of DOM and only signals direct objects. Example (3), with a definite inanimate, cannot take DOM, but shows PPA:

(3) ([fjo] (l)-add5o *kwotta/√kotta a pasto.
   ‘I have cooked the pasta ([for him]).’
   NEAPOLITAN (ROMANCE)

Connecting PPA to some type of inherent case assignment (Rodríguez-Mondoñedo 2007, a.o.) does not solve the problem. We still need to explain how the ACC clitic, a structural operation, comes about in (3). Equally problematic are data from languages like non-standard Basque, which also exhibit agreeing absolutive arguments, independently of DOM, as in (4). Among others, agreeing ABS trigger PCC-effects (Rezac 2011, a.o.) which cannot be explained as resulting from inherent marking. Indo-Aryan varieties with object PPA, ergativity, and adpositional DOM, or languages like Guaraní make the same point: oblique DOM is not simply a split between unlicensed/(pseudo-)incorporated objects and those undergoing structural Case licensing.

(4) Ordenagailua ikusi dut. NON-STANDARD BASQUE
   computer.ABS see AUX.ABS.3.SG-ERG.1SG
   ‘I have seen the computer.’ (Odria 2017, ex.3a, p.11)
MORE THAN ONE CASE ASSIGNMENT STRATEGY irrespective of movement. Starting from overt object agreement as in (3), this morphology signals either a low licenser (below v, (5)) or configurational case assignment (Marantz 1991) on a DP with an [uC]. Supplementary, a [+PERSON] feature can be merged on a DP argument. If found on a gender (γ)-related projection, [+PERSON] will be interpreted as semantic gender ([+PERSON γ] in (6)), giving the split between animates and inanimates. See also Cornilescu (2000), Ormazabal and Romero (2007), Adger and Harbour (2007), Richards (2008), a.o. for animacy as [+PERSON]. Argument DPs can show yet another [+PERSON], merged higher in the DP, and which, when licensed, outputs clitic doubling ([+PERSONClitic]), see (1), or (3); it has distinct interpretive effects from [+PERSON γ] (no linking to animacy, see (3), and independent contexts of use from DOM). What unifies both [+PERSON γ] and [+PERSONClitic] is that their licensing cannot fail when merged; they are dependent on a previous licensing operation (see also Preminger 2017). However, [+PERSONClitic] is distinct in that it requires raising for licensing. In Neapolitan (eg.), ACC clitic doubled arguments take wide scope with respect to EAs, indicating that they are interpreted above vP. In the languages examined here, DOM DPs have the same position as agreeing objects of the type in (3), (4) and are not interpreted above EAs. This special behavior can be best captured if they undergo an additional licensing operation in the same local licensing domain (6). We further hypothesize that, as the canonical licenser in the local domain has been used up, an additional licenser from the discourse-related low verbal periphery (Belletti 2004, a.o.) is recruited. A recent proposal by Zubizarreta and Pancheva (2017) is that low Perspectivization is encoded by Appl heads. We assume that a similar head (α) licenses OBL DOM as last resort in a domain, explaining DAT morphology, but ACC agreement/ syntax and PCC effects.

MULTIPLE AGREEMENT IS MOTIVATED. 1) A prominent line of accounts connects both oblique DOM and agreeing objects to the same syntax, but sets them apart by a morphological impoverishment operation (see especially Halle and Marantz 1993, Keine and Müller 2008, a.o.). However, oblique DOM and the agreeing objects are distinct syntactically. As seen in (1) vs. (3), oblique DOM triggers PCC-like effects (banning IO-clitic) which cannot be derived in morphology (see also Ormazabal and Romero 2013b for Spanish, or Odria 2017 for Basque). 2) Another account, proposed for Basque (Odria 2017), in terms of the Distinctiveness Condition (OBL added to differentiate two φ-objects in a c-command relation) cannot be used unstipulatively for all DOM patterns discussed here; it also incorrectly predicts that EAs and IOs cannot co-occur. 3) Reducing DOM and DAT to a larger structural OBLIQUE category (Manzini and Franco 2016) is hard to apply to configurations where a) animates are rather signaled by ACC-Case stacking, b) OBL is preserved just on lower-scale animates and banned on higher animates (contrary to expectation), or to aspect-based DOM-splits (OBL alternating with agreement on

Argumenthood, individuation, etc.

Animacy, prominence, low topicalization ⇒ ADP/DAT

Wide scope specificity, D-linking, partitives/generics, etc.
animates). Under the current proposal, the spell-out of ([+PERSON γ]) licensing depends on the licenser(s) available in a given domain, and not on an intrinsic OBL structure in animates.
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