Setting the stage


- Main claim: Oblique DOM connected to a distinct (discourse) licensing condition, beyond Case

- focus on two aspects:
  1. interaction of oblique DOM with object agreement or, more generally, accusative morphology (complex DOM)
  2. syntactic correlates of oblique DOM (oblique DOM in syntax)

1. DOM and CASE

**Oblique DOM and CASE**

- adpositional ACC/ABS (Jaeggli 1982, a.o.)

Unlicensed objects DOM licensing

(1) NP  (2) KP

[φ/VAL]  [uC - ]  [PERSON - ]

- how to distinguish DOM from other structural objects which also indicate licensing? (Gujarati, Neapolitan, Basque, etc.)
- what type of licensing condition does oblique DOM signal?

3. Additional licensing

**Proposal:** oblique DOM signals an additional, independent licensing operation beyond the valuation of [uc] (building on Suñer 1988, a.o.)

(3) Oblique DOM

- oblique DOM: complex category, decomposed into basic features
- [+PERSON] (on gender) as animacy (Richards 2008, Cornilescu 2000, a.o.)
- v might not license [+PERSON]

more than one licensing operation on the nominal (adapting Jaeggli 1982, 1986, a.o.)

3.1. Discourse licensing

- additional licensor in the low discourse-related periphery is recruited (Belletti 2004, Miyagawa 2010, 2017, Wiltschko 2014, a.o.)
- Sentience locus: Appl head (Zubizarreta and Pancheva 2017, Sundaresan 2018, a.o.)
- this might also explain oblique morphology
- a characteristic of [+PERSON]

Must be licensed in the same domain as [uc]; oblique DOM - same position as agreeing (ACC/ABS) objects

- ACC/ABS profile (Bárány 2018, a.o.)

[uC] → object agreement (ACC/ABS)

[PERSON - ] → oblique DOM

- a nominal can enter into multiple valuation operations (Béjar and Rezac 2009, a.o.)

2. Data

(4) **GUJARATI (INDO-ARYAN)**

a. sita-e kagal vac- yo.  b. raj-e sita *(ne) pajav-i/*yo.

Sita,F-ERG.letter.M read-PF.M SG  raj,F-ERG.letter.M

‘Sita read a (specific) letter.’

(5) **NEapolitan (ROMANCE)**

a. (L)→addya *kwotta/kotta [a] l’aragosta.

cl.sg.ACC.F have-cooked.M/SG.cooked.M/F SG=DAT=DOM DEF.F.SG-lobster.F.SG

‘I have cooked the lobster.’

(adapted after Loporcaro 1998, 2010, a.o.)

b. (L)→addya *kwotta/kotta [*a] ll’ove.

‘I have cooked the egg.’

(6) **non-standard BASQUE**

a. Zu-l ni-[r]-ikusi didazu.

you-ERG.1-DAT see DAT.F.ERG-2SG

‘you have seen me.’

(b) Ordenaguil ikusi dut.

computer.ABS see ABS.3.SG-ERG.1SG

‘I have seen the computer.’

(7) **non-standard BASQUE**

a. Zu-l ni-[r]-ikusi nauzu.

you-ERG.1-DAT=DAT see AUX.ABS.3S-ERG.2SG

‘you have seen me.’

(ane Oria, p.c.)

4. Oblique DOM in morphology

Another prominent line of approaches to oblique DOM is the morphological one

- oblique DOM and the bare objects have the same syntax. The only difference is morphological - oblique DOM gets an extra marker (López 2012, a.o.)
- oblique DOM as impoverishment in morphology (Halle and Marantz 1993, Hale 2002, Bobaljik and Branigan 2006, Keine and Müller 2008, a.o.)
- agreeing objects undergo impoverishment (Keine 2010, a.o.)

⇒ Problematic prediction: Agreeing objects and oblique DOM have the same syntax.

5. Oblique DOM in syntax: PCC-effects

(8) **PERSON Case Constraint** (Bonet 1991, Anagnostopoulou 2003, Béjar and Rezac 2003, a.o.)

If DAT, then ACC/ABS = 3rd
dative intervenes in the PERSON v-Agree relation of 1st/2nd (Anagnostopoulou 2003, a.o.)

(9) * ‘you have sold me to the butcher.’

the dative nominial

‘You have sold me to the butcher.’

(ane Oria, 2017)

PCC relativized to animacy (Ormazabal and Romero 2007)

generally ignored: PCC-like effects on full nominals, not just weak elements (Irimia 2018b)

(10) **(t)u** (l)-addya *kwotta/kotta [a] l’aragosta.

cl.dat.3SG.clFACC.3SG-have.1SG cooked.M/SG.cooked.M/F DAT=DOM DEF.F.SG-lobster.F.SG

‘I have cooked the lobster (for him).’

NEapolitan (Roberto Petrosino, p.c.)

(11) * ‘You have sold me to the butcher.’

the dative nominial

‘You have sold me to the butcher.’

(ane Oria, 2017)

Crucially: a syntactic condition beyond Case

(12) **le** [R] todos los enfermos *(a la doctora).*

cl.dat.3SG sent.3PL DAT=DOM all DEF patients DAT DEF doctor

‘They sent all the patients to the doctor.’

SPANISH (Ormazabal and Romero 2013b)

⇒ oblique dat as [uc] incorrectly predicts ungrammaticality of (12) without the dative nominal

Acknowledgements

Parts of this work have been funded by the ERC Grant 295734 [EusO-Lin], PI Giuseppe Longobardi, and a research grant from UniMiRo. Many thanks go to Julie Giraudoux, Giuseppe Longobardi, Adan Ledgeway, Robert Pétronis, Cristina Giannuzzi, Anna Ponzio, Sonia Cinci, Andrej Barani, Luisa Kula, M. Reza Mousavi, Teofilo Sumbuljian. All errors are my own. LaTeX template downloaded from www.overleaf.com