



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) *sentience* 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 *v*. Putting together observations about *accusative Case*, we individuate three loci of accusative licensing: at *v* (structural ACC for inanimates), at  $\alpha$  (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 ( $\alpha$ ), 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 [*Sentience+AccCase*] ... [ $\alpha$  [*sentience*] [Appl<sub>[DatCase]</sub> ... [*v* [*AccCase*] ... [VP DO]]]]]

**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 inanimates, 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 *v*). Assuming that oblique DOM signals 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  $\alpha$  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 ( $\alpha$ ). 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  $\alpha$ . 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) | * <b>Și/mi</b> -(l)<br>CL.3/1DAT-3M.SG.ACC<br><i>Intended:</i> ‘S/he helps her(his)/my friend.’ | ajută <b>pe</b> prieten. | (14)   | <b>Își</b> trimite <b>pe</b> cineva.<br>CL.3DAT sends LOC=DOM somebody<br>‘S/he sends somebody to his/her benefit.’ |
| (15) | <b>Mi te</b> trimit.<br>CL.1SG.DAT CL.2SG.ACC send.3PL<br>‘They send you to me.’                | (16)                     | <b>I te</b> trimit.<br>CL.3SG.DAT CL.2SG.ACC send<br>‘They send you to her/him.’ |   |

## References

- Anagnostopoulou, Elena. 2003. *The syntax of ditransitives: evidence from clitics*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Bonet, Eulàlia. 1991. *Morphology after syntax. Pronominal clitics in Romance languages*. Doctoral Dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, MA.
- Bossong, Georg. 1998. Le marquage différentiel dans les langues de l'Europe. In *Actance et valence dans les langues d'Europe*, ed. Jacques Feuillet, 193–259. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Cornilescu, Alexandra. 2000. On the interpretation of the prepositional accusative in Romanian. *Bucharest Working Wapers in Linguistics* 2:91–106.
- Irimia, Monica Alexandrina. in press. Types of structural objects. Some remarks on differential object marking in Romanian. In *Case, agreement and their interactions. New perspectives on differential argument marking*.
- 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.
- Manzini, M. Rita, and Ludovico Franco. 2016. Goal and DOM datives. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 34:197–240.
- Ormazabal, Javier, and Juan Romero. 2007. The object agreement constraint. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 25(2):315–347.
- Ormazabal, Javier, and Juan Romero. 2013a. Differential object marking, case and agreement. *Borealis: an International Journal of Hispanic Linguistics* 2(2):221–239.
- Ormazabal, Javier, and Juan Romero. 2013b. Non accusative objects. *Catalan Journal of Linguistics* 12:155–173.
- Starke, Michal. 2017. Resolving DAT=ACC ( $\neq$  GEN). *Glossa* 2(1):104:1–8.
- Zubizarreta, Maria Luisa, and Roumyana Pancheva. 2017. A formal characterization of person-based alignment. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 35(4):1161–1204.