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BACKGROUND. In a pioneering contribution, Ormazabal and Romero (O&R 2007) have demonstrated that PCC-effects are closely linked to animacy. The data came from clitic clusters in leista varieties of Spanish. Here, direct object clitics can have distinct case morphology, as a type of differential object marking (DOM). As shown in (2), animate DO clitics must be signaled via dative case, although behaving syntactically as accusatives (under an ‘oblique DOM as structural accusative’ strategy, which is otherwise very common cross-linguistically, see especially Bossong 1998 or Manzini and Franco 2016, a.o.). Inanimate DO clitics, on the other hand, surface with accusative case morphology (1). The problem, illustrated by (4), is that an IO clitic cannot co-occur with the animate (DAT=) DOM clitic.

\[(1) \text{Lo vi.} \quad \text{vi.} \quad \text{Te di.} \quad \text{Di.} \quad \text{Me manda.} \quad \text{Manda.} \quad \text{Le/Te a la doctora.} \quad \text{Usaron todos los enfermos la doctora.}\]
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Now, assuming that full nominal DOM needs obligatory Case licensing, examples similar to (11) would imply that non-clitic-doubled IOs are Caseless (introduced just by a locative preposition). However, this assumption has repeatedly been shown to be problematic. Moreover, the hypothesis that non-DOM-ed full DPs (inanimates, etc.) are caseless is untenable at least in other Romance varieties, which exhibit similar co-occurrence restrictions with lexical DOM.

2. PROPOSAL. We put forward a proposal with four components: a) the difference between PCC-like effects of the clitic type in (4) and of the full DP type in (10) is not (necessarily) the result of two distinct operations (AGREE vs. Case licensing); b) animacy-based DOM signals a specification beyond structural Case, connected instead with sentience or/and how the speakers relates to other entities in the discourse (see also Zubizarreta and Pancheva 2017, a.o.); c) there is more than one locus of (structural) accusative Case licensing (see also Starke 2017); d) sentence can bundle with structural accusative features. Following recent decompositions of the low verbal domain (Legate 2014, etc.), we assume the presence of both Voice and υ. Putting together observations about accusative Case, we individuate three loci of accusative licensing: at υ (structural ACC for inanmites), at α (see López 2012) for full DP DOM or certain types of low clitic DOM, and at Voice, for certain types of clitic DOM. Full DP DOM in (10) contains a sentience feature that needs to be licensed beyond Case. The structure in (10) also contains a clitic-doubled IO, which similarly contains a sentience feature beyond DAT Case. As there is only one sentience licenser available (α), the structure results in ungrammaticality. DOM clitics as in (2) license their sentience feature with Case, involving Voice. Thus, the problem boils down to understanding the status of sentience and the ways in which it bundles with Case.

(12) ... [Voice [Sentence+AccCase] \(\ldots[\alpha[\text{sentience}][\text{Appl}[\text{DatCase}]\ldots[\text{V}[\text{AccCase}]\ldots[\text{VP DO}]实践中]]]]

2.1. Extensions. Another case study we illustrate here is Romanian. As we see in (13), full nominal DOM (built on a locative) cannot co-occur with a DAT clitic, interpreted as possessor (raising). When a DAT clitic acts as a high applicative (the quantifier blocks a possessor reading in (14)), full nominal DOM is possible. This indicates that the problem is not a morphological restriction on a string containing DAT clitics and full nominal DOM. Romanian provides evidence that DOM does not signal the difference between Case licensed and caseless nominals (i.e., non-DOM-ed inanmites, etc.). For example, the latter are possible in ECM contexts (see Irimia in press, Cornilescu and Tigău 2017, a.o.), signaling a reflex of structural Case (licensed by υ). Assuming that oblique DOM sends a sentience specification beyond Case accommodates these facts. There is also evidence that non-clitic-doubled full nominal DOM can be licensed below the EA (by α projection in López 2012), as it does not bind into the EA. Similarly, the DAT clitic interpreted as a possessor (the so-called possessor raising) is lower than the EA. This indicates that both full nominal DOM and the DAT clitic contain a sentience specification that needs licensing in a configuration (below EA) where there is only one relevant licenser (α). For example, the presence of an sentience feature on possessor DAT can explain the intuition native speakers express regarding its high affectedness. High applicatives are licensed higher than EA, not interacting with DOM licensed by α. Also, Romanian does have a clitic PCC (the Me-first type). The grammaticality of (15) and (16), as opposed to (13), can only be captured under the assumption that sentience can be licensed in distinct positions, and relates to Case in more than one way.

(13) "Și/mi-(l) ajută pe prieten.  
CL.3/1DAT-3M.SG.ACC helps DOM friend  
Intended: ‘S/he helps her(his)/my friend.’

(14) ˆIs ¸i trimite pe cineva.  
CL.3DAT sends LOC=DOM somebody  
‘S/he sends somebody to his/her benefit.’

(15) Mi te trimit.  
CL.1SG.DAT CL.2SG.ACC send.3PL  
‘They send you to me.’

(16) I te trimit.  
CL.3SG.DAT CL.2SG.ACC send  
‘They send you to her/him.’
References


