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A long tradition in generative syntax holds that nominals have two basic needs (Vergnaud 1977/2008, Chomsky 1980 et seq):

(1) Licensing requirements for nominals
   a. theta role (semantic)
   b. abstract Case (syntactic)

Case in early Minimalism (Chomsky 2000, 2001): An unvalued abstract feature on nominals that is a uninterpretable, a “derivational time bomb” (Preminger 2011)
Successful agreement and Case-valuation (early Minimalism):

(2)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{TP} \\
\text{T} \\
\underline{[u\phi:\text{VAL}]} \\
\vdots \\
\text{DP} \\
\underline{[u\text{Case:}\text{NOM}]} \\
\underline{[i\phi:\text{VAL}]} \\
\end{array}
\]

Value, Delete
Introduction


Today I’ll focus on the Person Case Constraint (PCC) and Differential Object Marking (DOM) as problematic for the “traditional” view of nominal licensing.

> If we take seriously what the PCC and DOM are telling us, then it is valued features that are derivational time bombs, not unvalued features.

⇒ I’ll pursue an account of what nominal licensing could look like without Case as the driving force.
Introduction

The shape of the argument:

1. The PCC and DOM are fundamentally the same phenomenon.
   - **PCC**: 1st/2nd person nominals need special licensing
   - **DOM**: nominals high in definiteness/animacy need special licensing
   - PCC/DOM effects arise because of intervention

2. The PCC and DOM conspire to tell us that *valued* ("interpretable") features drive nominal licensing.
   - **One option**: Maintain the "traditional" picture of nominal licensing, but proliferate licensing conditions.
   - **Better option**: Reverse the burden of licensing, and put it on valued nominal features, \([F\Phi]\), instead of unvalued ("uninterpretable") features like Case.
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What is the PCC?

The PCC refers to the ungrammaticality of certain person combinations when two “weak” arguments (pronouns, clitics, agreement) occupy the same domain (Bonet 1991, 1994, Anagnostopoulou 2003, Béjar and Rezac 2003, *i.a.*).

(3) **Canonical Strong PCC**: *IO > 1/2.DO**
What is the PCC?

French (Béjar and Rezac 2003:49):

\[ \checkmark \text{IO} > \text{3.DO} \]

\((PCC \text{ respected})\)

(4) \(\text{Je } \text{la} \quad \text{lui} \quad \text{ai} \quad \text{présent-é.} \)
\(1.\text{SG.NOM} \quad 3.\text{FS.ACC} \quad 3.\text{SG.DAT} \) \text{have introduce-PART}
\('I \text{ introduced her (DO) to him (IO).'}\)

\[ \ast \text{IO} > 1/2.\text{DO} \]

\((PCC \text{ violated})\)

(5) \(\ast \text{Je} \quad \text{te} \quad \text{lui} \quad \text{ai} \quad \text{présent-é.} \)
\(1.\text{SG.NOM} \quad 2.\text{SG.ACC} \quad 3.\text{SG.DAT} \) \text{have introduce-PART}
\('I \text{ introduced you (DO) to him (IO).'}\)
What is the PCC?

(6) ... 

... vP

v

ApplP

✓1/✓2/✓3.IO

Appl

VP

V *1/*2/✓3.DO
Abstracting across theoretical accounts of the PCC ... (Anagnostopoulou 2003, 2005, Béjar and Rezac 2003, Adger and Harbour 2007, Preminger 2011, Rezac 2011, i.a.)

(7) **Person Licensing Condition** (Béjar and Rezac 2003)
Interpretable 1st/2nd-person features must be licensed by entering into an Agree relation with an appropriate functional category.

- **First/second person features require special licensing.**
- **The presence of the dative blocks/prevents this special licensing (“defective intervention”).**
What is DOM?
What is DOM?

For languages that mark (at least some) direct objects, DOM refers to the crosslinguistic tendency for direct objects to be differentiated into two groups:


1. Marked objects (*case, adposition, agreement, clitic-doubling*)

2. Unmarked objects

→ *Only some direct objects require overt marking.*
What is DOM?

What determines whether a direct object is marked or not? (Silverstein 1976, Croft 1988, Comrie 1989, i.a.)

(8) 
\[
\text{Animacy / person} \\
1/2 > 3 \text{ Pron} > \text{Name} > \text{Human} > \text{Animate} > \text{Inanimate}
\]

(9) 
\[
\text{Specificity / definiteness} \\
\text{Pron} > \text{Name} > \text{Definite} > \text{Specific Indefinite} > \text{Nonspecific}
\]

Other factors: affectedness (Næss 2004), information structure (Woolford 1999, Dalrymple and Nikolaeva 2011)
What is DOM?

(10) Palatinate German (Philipp Weisser p.c.)

a. Du hast dea æma gseje.
you have.2sg DEM.NOM bucket see.PRT
‘You saw that bucket.’ (non-human obj; NOM)

b. Du hast den man gseje.
you have.2sg DEM.ACC man see.PRT
‘You saw that man.’ (human obj; ACC)
What is DOM?

(11) TP
   \[ \text{def/indef.} S \]
   \[ \text{uniform marking} \]
   T
   ...
   ...
   VP
   \[ V \]

\[ \text{def/indef.} \text{DO} \]
\[ \text{marked/unmarked} \]
What is DOM?

Abstracting across syntactic accounts of DOM, marked objects seem to...

A. ...have more internal structure/features than unmarked objects do.

B. ...raise out of VP, while unmarked objects do not.

Definiteness/animacy/etc. features require special licensing.
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PCC $\approx$ DOM

One phenomenon or two?

- **PCC:** In the context of an indirect object, the direct object must be 3rd person.
- **DOM:** Objects high in definiteness/animacy must be marked.

Despite being framed/presented as fundamentally different and despite accounts of the two phenomena typically being fundamentally different...

→ One phenomenon
PCC \approx DOM

One phenomenon or two?

- **PCC**: In the context of an indirect object, the direct object must be 3rd person.
- **DOM**: Objects high in definiteness/animacy must be marked.

New framing:

- **PCC**: In the context of IO > DO, if DO is 1st/2nd person, then IO or DO must be specially marked.
- **DOM**: In the context of S > DO, if DO is high in def./anim., then S or DO must be specially marked.
1. Both the PCC and DOM crucially involve two arguments...

(12) a. PCC

\[
\begin{array}{c}
... \\
\text{ApplP} \\
\text{Appl} \\
\text{IO} \\
V \\
DO \\
\end{array}
\]

b. DOM

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{TP} \\
\text{S} \\
T \\
\text{VP} \\
V \\
DO \\
\end{array}
\]

2. ...and the phenomenon targets the lower of the two, 
3. ...while the higher argument is immune from the effect.

**Intervention? What if higher nominal is removed?**
4. Removing the higher nominal removes the effect.

\[(13)\]  
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \textbf{PCC} \\
& \cdots \\
& \text{ApplP} \\
& \text{Appl} \quad \text{VP} \\
& \text{V} \quad \text{DO} \\
\text{b. } & \textbf{DOM} \\
& \text{TP} \\
& \text{S} \\
& \text{T} \\
& \text{VP} \\
& \text{V} \quad \text{DO}
\end{align*}

\text{(A confound: If S removed, then DO is “promoted” to S.)}
4. Removing the higher nominal removes the effect.

\[
PCC \approx \text{DOM}
\]

PCC (French)

With IO, *1/2 DO:

(14) \*Je \ te \ lui \ ai \ présenté-é.
1.SG.NOM 2.SG.ACC 3.SG.DAT have introduce-PART
Intended: ‘I introduced you (DO) to him (IO).’

With IO removed, √ 1/2 DO:

(15) Je \ t’-ai \ présenté-é.
1.SG.NOM 2.SG.ACC-have introduce-PART
‘I introduced you (DO).’
4. Removing the higher nominal removes the effect.

\[
\text{DOM} \quad \text{(Senaya; transitive vs. unaccusative)}
\]

With agent, nonspecific theme → *agreement, specific theme → ✓ agreement

(16) Axnii **xa ksuuta** kasw-ox(*-laa).
we one book.F write.IMPF-SBJ.1PL(*-OBJ.3FS)
‘We (will) write a/some book.’

(17) Axnii **oo ksuuta** kasw-ox*(-laa).
we that book.F write.IMPF-SBJ.1PL*(-OBJ.3FS)
‘We (will) write that book.’

(Kalin 2014)
4. Removing the higher nominal removes the effect.

DOM (Senaya; transitive vs. unaccusative)

Without agent, nonspecific theme $\rightarrow \checkmark$ agreement,
specific theme $\rightarrow \checkmark$ agreement

(18) Xə ḳsuuta mpel*(−aa).
    one book.F fall.PFV*(−SBJ.3FS)
    ‘A/some book fell.’

(19) Oo ḳsuuta mpel*(−aa).
    that book.F fall.PFV*(−SBJ.3FS)
    ‘That book fell.’ (Kalin 2014)

(Also holds in other dialects with passives and anticausatives.)
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4. Removing the higher nominal removes the effect.

PCC ≈ DOM

The PCC and DOM involve intervention.
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PCC \(\approx\) DOM

5. The featural make-up of the lower nominal is responsible for the effect and (un)grammaticality.

(20) a. PCC
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High in definiteness/animacy & unmarked → ungrammatical

1st/2nd person → ungrammatical
5. The featural make-up of the lower nominal is responsible for the effect and (un)grammaticality.

Specific object: *unmarked

(21) *Axnii oo ksuuta kasw-ox.
    we that book.F write.IMPF-SBJ.1PL
    Intended: ‘We (will) write that book.’

Nonspecific object: ✓ unmarked

(22) Axnii xa ksuuta kasw-ox.
    we one book.F write.IMPF-SBJ.1PL
    ‘We (will) write a/some book.’

(Senaya; Kalin 2014)
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PCC \(\approx\) DOM

6. There is crosslinguistic variation as to precisely which features trigger the effect.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PCC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Super strong \((*1/2/3.IO>1/2.DO; *3.IO>3.DO)\)  
  \textit{Kambera} (Doliana 2013) |
| • Strong \((*1/2/3.IO>1/2.DO)\)  
  \textit{Greek} (Anagnostopoulou 2003) |
| • Weak PCC \((*3.IO>1/2.DO)\)  
  \textit{Sambaa} (Riedel 2009) |
| • Me-first PCC \((*2/3.IO>1.DO)\)  
  \textit{Romanian} (Nevins 2007) |
PCC $\approx$ DOM

6. There is crosslinguistic variation as to precisely which features trigger the effect.

**DOM**

- Only [+specific] objects require marking
  Senaya (Kalin 2014)
- Only [+definite] objects require marking
  Hebrew (Danon 2006)
- Only [+human] objects require marking
  Palatinate German (Philipp Weisser, pc)
- Only [+human, +specific] objects require marking
  Spanish (Rodríguez-Mondoñedo 2007)

The PCC and DOM are triggered by valued features.
7. Violations are fixed via “repair”.

PCC violation

(23) *Lucille nous leur présentera.
Lucy 1PL.ACC them.DAT introduce.3SG.FUT
Intended: ‘Lucy will introduce us to them.’

PCC repair (repair targets higher nominal, IO)

(24) Lucille nous présentera à elles.
Lucy 1.PL.ACC introduce.3SG.FUT to them
‘Lucy will introduce us to them.’

(French; Rezac 2011:180)
7. Violations are fixed via “repair”.

**DOM “violation”**

(25) *Bes-ó María.
    kiss-3SG.PAST Mary
    Intended: ‘He kissed Mary.’

**DOM “repair”** *(repair targets lower nominal, DO)*

(26) Bes-ó a María.
    kiss-3SG.PAST P Mary
    ‘He kissed Mary.’

(Spanish; Rodríguez-Mondoñedo 2007:16)
8. “Repairs” take largely the same form.
   • The repair most typically surfaces as adding case or an adposition.
   • The repair can target the higher nominal OR the lower nominal in the configuration.

(27)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Repair higher nom.</th>
<th>Repair lower nom.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PCC</td>
<td>French, Basque</td>
<td>Catalan, Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOM</td>
<td>Niuean, E. Ostyak</td>
<td>Spanish, P. German</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. “Repairs” take largely the same form.

- The repair can target the higher nominal OR the lower nominal in the configuration.

*Catalan (Bonet 2002:953, cited by Walkow 2013:66)*

**(PCC violation)**

(28) *Te m’ha recomanat per a la feina la subdirectora.*

2 1-has recommended for the job the deputy.director

‘The deputy director has recommended you to me for the job.’

**(PCC repair (repair targets lower nominal, DO))**

(29) M’ha recomanat a tu per a la feina la subdirectora.

1-has recommended P 2 for the job the deputy.director

‘The deputy director has recommended you to me for the job.’
8. “Repairs” take largely the same form.
   - The repair can target the higher nominal OR the lower nominal in the configuration.

   *Niuean (Massam 2000, cited in Woolford 2015)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOM “violation”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ne inu kofe a Sione.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAST drink coffee ABS Sione</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Sione drank (*the) coffee.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOM “repair” (repair targets higher nominal, SBJ)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ne inu [e] Sione e kofe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAST drink ERG Sione ABS coffee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Sione drank the coffee.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. “Repairs” take largely the same form.

- The repair most typically takes the form of adding case or an adposition.
- The repair can target the higher nominal OR the lower nominal in the configuration.

(32)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Repair higher nom.</th>
<th>Repair lower nom.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PCC</td>
<td>French, Basque</td>
<td>Catalan, Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOM</td>
<td>Niuean, E. Ostyak</td>
<td>Spanish, P. German</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The PCC and DOM are about licensing.
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PCC \approx DOM

9. Found outside of their “canonical” environments.

**PCC** (canonically IO > DO)

- S > O (e.g., Jewish Zakho; Kalin and van Urk 2015)
- Double unaccusatives (e.g., Chinook; Rezac 2011:Ch. 5)
- DO > IO (e.g., Slovenian; Stegovec 2015)

**DOM** (canonically S > O)

- Subjects of nominalized clauses (e.g., Turkish; Kornfilt 2008)
- Arguments of adjectives (e.g., Hebrew; Danon 2006)

The PCC and DOM are not just about direct objects.
In sum:

- The PCC and DOM both involve the lower of two arguments being restricted featurally, with overlapping strategies of “repair” to lift the restriction.
  - The PCC and DOM are about licensing.

- The higher argument is typically immune from the effect, and if it is removed, the effect goes away.
  - The PCC and DOM arise due to intervention.

- Different languages care about different features/feature combinations on nominals, leading to different varieties of the effect.
  - The PCC and DOM are triggered by valued features.

- Neither effect is restricted to just one particular argument configuration.
  - The PCC and DOM are general, configurational effects.
Big picture take-away:
The PCC and DOM have too much in common too be completely unrelated.

⇒ The PCC and DOM are surface manifestations of the same underlying phenomenon.
A better way to state the PCC and DOM:

**PCC:**
- In the context of IO > DO,
- if DO is 1st/2nd person,
- then IO or DO must be specially marked.

**DOM:**
- In the context of S > DO,
- if DO is high in definiteness/animacy,
- then S or DO must be specially marked.
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PCC \neq DOM

Harbour (c. 9:13 a.m.) on Tewa (Kiowa-Tanoan):

- 1st/2nd person: [+participant]
- 3rd pers. animate direct object (default): [–participant]
- 3rd pers. animate direct object (PCC enviro), and
- 3rd pers. inanimate direct object: no [±participant]

⇒ Both PCC and DOM are triggered by [±participant].

What this captures:

⇒ DOM = [±participant]-sensitive agreement.
⇒ Where [+participant] agreement is ruled out, so is
  [–participant] agreement.
⇒ In PCC environments, DOM is impossible.
PCC $\neq$ DOM

At least on the specificity/definiteness side of DOM, Neo-Aramaic shows us that DOM is in fact not blocked in environments that block 1st/2nd person, e.g., Jewish Zakho:

(33) ’āna zwīn-[ā]-li ūlīmsa.  
I buy.PFV-[OBJ.3FS]-SBJ.1MS flatbread.\text{f}  
‘I bought the flatbread.’ (marked DO)

(34) ’āna zwīn-ni ūlīmsa.  
I buy.PFV-SBJ.1MS flatbread.\text{f}  
‘I bought some flatbread.’ (unmarked DO)

(35) *’āna zwīn-[it]-ti.  
I buy.PFV-[OBJ.2MS]-SBJ.1MS  
Intended: ‘I bought you.’ (*1/2 DO)  
(Kalin and van Urk 2015)
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PCC $\neq$ DOM

This observation extends to classic PCC environments, e.g., in Senaya (Kalin and McPherson 2012):

(36) *Aana maxw-an-aa=y[-et].
I show.IPF-SBJ.1FS-IO.3FS=Aux-DO.2MS
Intended: ‘I (will) show you to her.’ (*IO > 2.DO)

(37) Aana maxw-an-ox=ii[-laa].
I show.IPF-SBJ.1FS-IO.2MS=Aux-DO.3FS
‘I (will) show her to you.’ (√IO > 3.DO)

(38) Aana xa ksuuta maxw-an-ox.
I one book show.IPF-SBJ.1FS-IO.2MS
‘I (will) show a/some book to you.’ (unmarked DO)
While it may be, then, that DOM in some languages (espec.
animacy-based DOM) can be treated as involving the same
features as the PCC, it cannot be that they are reducible to
one feature across the board.

**Goal for the reminder of the talk:** To develop a picture of
nominal licensing consistent with all of these findings.
Nominal licensing is driven by valued (phi-)features

Laura Kalin
Princeton University

Introduction
What is the PCC?
What is DOM?
PCC $\approx$ DOM
PCC $\neq$ DOM

A new model of nominal licensing

Conclusion
References
A new model of nominal licensing

A few starting assumptions:

A given nominal always has the same features, no matter where it lives structurally, no matter what its grammatical role is, no matter what other nominals are around, etc.

- This runs counter to many previous accounts of DOM and the PCC.
- But, if it can be achieved, this would simplify our theory of nominal features.

Licensing of nominals/nominal features takes place through Agree.
A new model of nominal licensing

A. What unifies the PCC and DOM?

(i) Both phenomena are driven by valued nominal features that require licensing.

(ii) Both reveal configurations where a nominal feature fails to be licensed, unless a licener is added.

B. What differentiates the PCC from DOM?

• The nominal features involved in the PCC have stricter licensing requirements (are licensed in fewer configurations) as compared to the nominal features involved in DOM.

We will pursue A first, then turn to B.
What unifies the PCC and DOM?

(i) Nominal features

Certain valued nominal features require licensing.
- Valued feature \( F \) that requires licensing = \([\text{F} \it{3}]\)
- \([\text{F} \it{3}]\) is a “derivational time bomb”, defused through Agree.

→ Which features exactly need licensing?
- \([\text{PARTICIPANT} \it{3}]\) (\(\approx\) Person Licensing Condition)
- Languages differ as to which other nominal features are \(\it{3}\), e.g., \([\text{DEFINITE} \it{3}]\), \([\text{ANIMATE} \it{3}]\).

This is typically assumed to be behind the PCC (Anagnostopoulou 2003, Béjar and Rezac 2003, Preminger 2011, i.a.).

What is new here is the extension to other nominal features.
What unifies the PCC and DOM?

How does this relate to the traditional picture of nominal licensing?

- **Chomsky (2000, 2001):**
  Nominals bear $[u\text{Case:__}]$ and $[i\varphi:\text{VAL}]$

- We could maintain this system, while adding $[i\varphi:\text{VAL}].$
  - This is the strategy of Béjar and Rezac 2003 for the PCC.
  - All nominals require Case; some additionally require valued feature licensing.

- But is there a motivation to maintain two sources of “derivational time bombs”?
  - We need, at the very least, $[\text{F}].$ since $[u\text{Case:__}]$ cannot capture DOM/PCC.
  - Do we need $[u\text{Case:__}]$?
What unifies the PCC and DOM?

There is converging evidence that not all nominals are abstractly licensed.

- Massam (2001): Pseudoincorporation of objects in Niuean
- Danon (2006): Indefinite arguments of Adj in Hebrew
- Kalin (2014): Nonspecific nominals in a caseless position in Senaya

Not all nominals need abstract licensing.

- **Possibility 1:** Not all nominals have a Case feature?
- **Possibility 2:** Case is not a derivational time bomb.

→ Given that (e.g.) nonspecific nominals as subjects participate in case/agreement processes, only the latter is compatible with a view where nominals have stable features, and so this is the direction I pursue.
A new model of nominal licensing

A. What unifies the PCC and DOM?

(i) Both phenomena are driven by valued nominal features that require licensing. ✓

(ii) Both reveal configurations where a nominal feature fails to be licensed, unless a licenser is added.
What unifies the PCC and DOM?

(ii) Adding licensers

- To start, we need a theory of licensers:
  What they are (\(\phi\)-probes),
  where they are (T, Asp, v, Appl, P), and
  when they are there, and when they are not there.
- I will adopt an early insight by Levin and Massam (1985) that is echoed in much later work (Bobaljik 1993, Laka 1993, 2000, Rezac 2011, i.a.):

(39) a. Every clause has one Case that must be assigned—this is the “obligatory” or “primary” Case assigner.

b. All other Cases are secondary.
What unifies the PCC and DOM?

(ii) Adding licencers

(40) a. Every clause has one Case that must be assigned—this is the “obligatory” or “primary” Case assigner.
   b. All other Cases are secondary.

(41) NOM/ACC language: T is the obligatory Case assigner
   a. Unergative: [ T [ SBJ v [ V ] ] ]
What unifies the PCC and DOM?

(ii) Adding licensors

Adapting this for DOM and the PCC:

a) We have a distinction between obligatory and secondary licensing loci.
   - Obligatory loci—usually 1 per clause (typically T)
   - Secondary loci—language specific (e.g., ν, Appl, P)


   (42) **Licensing Economy Principle:** A secondary licenser is activated iff the derivation will otherwise not converge.
What unifies the PCC and DOM?

Certain valued nominal features require licensing.

+ 

Licensing Economy Principle (activate sec. licenser iff needed)

≡ DOM and the PCC
A new model of nominal licensing

How we get DOM:

- Imagine a language with $T$ as the obligatory licenser, $v$ as a secondary licenser, and the feature $[\text{DEFINITE}]$.

$\Rightarrow$ Intransitive unergative, $\text{SBJ}$ does not bear $\phi$

(43)

$\text{SBJ}$ is marked

\[
\text{TP} \\
T \quad [\phi:] \\
\quad \downarrow \quad \uparrow \quad \text{vP} \\
\quad \text{NP} \quad \text{v} \\
\quad \quad \text{VP} \\
\quad \quad \quad \text{V} \ldots
\]
A new model of nominal licensing

How we get DOM:

- Imagine a language with $T$ as the obligatory licenser, $v$ as a secondary licenser, and the feature $[\text{DEFINITE}$]

$\Rightarrow$ Intransitive unergative, SBJ does bear $\diamond$

(44)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{TP} \\
\downarrow \\
T \\
[\varphi:] \\
\downarrow \\
\text{NP} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{PLURAL} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{FEMININE} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{DEFINITE}\n\end{array}
\]

SBJ is marked
A new model of nominal licensing

How we get DOM:

- Imagine a language with T as the obligatory licenser, v as a secondary licenser, and the feature [DEFINITE].

⇒ Intransitive unaccusative, SBJ does not bear ⬤

(45) TP

SBJ is marked

```
(45) TP
    \[\varphi:\_\]
    \[\phi:\_\]
    vP
    \[\phi:\_\]
    v
    VP
    \[\phi:\_\]
    V
    NP
    \[
    \text{PLURAL}
    \]
    \[
    \text{FEMININE}
    \]
```
A new model of nominal licensing

How we get DOM:

- Imagine a language with $T$ as the obligatory licenser, $v$ as a secondary licenser, and the feature [DEFINITE].

$\Rightarrow$ Intransitive unaccusative, SBJ does bear $\phi$

(46)
A new model of nominal licensing

How we get DOM:

- Imagine a language with $T$ as the obligatory licenser, $v$ as a secondary licenser, and the feature $[\text{DEFINITE}]$.

$\Rightarrow$ Transitive, no $\ddagger$ on SBJ, no $\ddagger$ on OBJ

(47) OBJ is unmarked
A new model of nominal licensing

How we get DOM:

- Imagine a language with T as the obligatory licenser, v as a secondary licenser, and the feature [DEFINITE•].

⇒ Transitive, no • on SBJ, • on OBJ

(48) OBJ is marked: DOM
A new model of nominal licensing

How we get DOM:

- Imagine a language with T as the obligatory licensor, v as a secondary licensor, and the feature [DEFINITE].

Interim summary

- The single obligatory licensor licenses the closest nominal regardless of whether that nominal bears ⚱.
  → Subjects are marked uniformly (non-differential).
- A secondary licensor is activated, triggering differential marking, only if...
  1. There are two nominals.
  2. The lower nominal bears ⚱.
     n.b. the higher nominal is an intervener, blocking the obligatory licensor from getting to the lower nominal.
- Objects without ⚱ do not require a sec. licensor; unmarked.
What about the PCC?

Recall French (Béjar and Rezac 2003:49):

✓ IO > 3.DO

(49)  Je la lui ai présenté.
1.SG.NOM 3.FS.ACC 3.SG.DAT have introduce-PART
‘I introduced her (DO) to him (IO).’

*IO > 1/2.DO

(50)  *Je te lui ai présenté.
1.SG.NOM 2.SG.ACC 3.SG.DAT have introduce-PART
Intended: ‘I introduced you (DO) to him (IO).’

Third person is licensed in PCC environments.
What about the PCC?

Recall that specificity-based DOM is also licensed in PCC environments, e.g., Senaya: (Kalin and McPherson 2012)

(51) *Aana maxw-an-aa=y\text{-et}.
I show.impf-Sbj.1fs-Io.3fs=aux\text{-Do.2ms}
Intended: ‘I (will) show you to her.’ (*Io > 2.Do)

(52) Aana oo ksuuta
I that book
maxw-an-ox=ii\text{-laa}.
show.impf-Sbj.1fs-Io.2ms=aux\text{-Do.3fs}
‘I (will) show that book to you.’ (√Io > 3.Do)

Features like definite, specific, and animate (?) can be licensed in positions where 1st/2nd person features cannot be licensed.
A new model of nominal licensing

What differentiates the PCC from DOM?

- In defective intervention (double-object) environments:
  - [PARTICIPANT] cannot be licensed.
  - But (e.g.) [DEFINITE] can be licensed.

- Note first that Appl is an obligatory licenser (of its spec):

(53)

A new model of nominal licensing

DO is unmarked
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A new model of nominal licensing

What differentiates the PCC from DOM?

- In defective intervention (double-object) environments:
  - \([\text{PARTICIPANT} \phi]\) cannot be licensed.
  - But, \([\text{DEFINITE} \phi]\) can be licensed.

(54)

DO is marked
A new model of nominal licensing

What differentiates the PCC from DOM?

- In defective intervention (double-object) environments:
  - \([\text{PARTICIPANT} \downarrow\!\!\downarrow]\) cannot be licensed.
  - But, \([\text{DEFINITE} \downarrow\!\!\downarrow]\) can be licensed.

(55) \[1/2 \text{ DO is impossible}\]
A new model of nominal licensing

(56) 1/2 DO is impossible

What happens now?

- Activation of an additional secondary licensing locus
  \[ \Rightarrow \text{PCC “repairs”} \]
A new model of nominal licensing

What differentiates the PCC from DOM?

In non-defective intervention enviros (e.g., $T\phi > SBJ > DO$):

- No $\phi$ feature can be licensed.

$\Rightarrow$ Necessitates the activation of a secondary licenser.

In defective intervention enviros (e.g., $v\phi > IO > DO$):

- $[\text{DEFINITEx}]$ (and other such features) can be licensed.

$\Rightarrow$ No additional secondary licenser needed ($v$ is sufficient)

- $[\text{PARTICIPANTx}]$ cannot be licensed.

$\Rightarrow$ Necessitates the activation of another secondary licenser.
Conclusion
In this talk, I have argued that the PCC and DOM conspire to tell us that valued features matter for nominal licensing.

- **Chomsky 2000 (et seq) ingredients of licensing:** Needy functional heads ($\varphi$), needy nominals (Case)
- **Revised ingredients of licensing:** Pushy $\varphi$-features

(57)

\[
\text{TP} \quad \text{TP}
\]

\[
\text{[u}\varphi:\_] \quad \text{[}\varphi:_]}
\]

\[
\text{...} \quad \text{...}
\]

\[
\text{vP} \quad \text{vP}
\]

\[
\text{AGREE} \quad \text{AGREE}
\]

\[
\text{NP} \quad \text{NP}
\]

\[
\text{[uCase:__]} \quad \text{([Case:__])}
\]

\[
\rightarrow \text{[i}\varphi:VAL]} \quad \rightarrow \text{[}\varphi:VAL\hat{\_}]
\]
Conclusion

Whether a nominal needs licensing—and in what configurations a nominal can be licensed—depends on its valued features.

What have we gained?

- We have unified two licensing phenomena that are typically considered non-canonical—but are in fact extremely common crosslinguistically—as core instantiations of licensing.
- We can do away with the proliferation of licensing conditions typically needed for accounting for the PCC and DOM—there is only one source of derivational time bombs on nominals: valued features.
- We can predict and understand where DOM and PCC effects appear.
Conclusion

Whether a nominal needs licensing—and in what configurations a nominal can be licensed—depends on its valued features.

What have we gained?

• We have done all this...
  • ...without having some nominals be “visible” and some “invisible”
  • ...without giving subjects and indirect objects special feature bundles as compared to direct objects
• No need to differentiate DOM from non-DOM languages in any deep way.
  • In some languages, is simply on all nominal features, or on some feature all nominals bear (all nominals need licensing)
  • In some languages, there may be more than one obligatory licenser (fewer nominals can escape licensing)
Why should certain nominal features be $\phi$s?

- Nominal features that are $\phi$s are those that need to be anchored to the speech act to be interpreted (in the spirit of Ritter and Wiltschko 2014).
  - The feature [PARTICIPANT] is inherently discourse-linked.
  - [DEFINIT] and [SPECIFIC] also rely on discourse.
- Copying of a feature to a functional head in the clausal spine serves to “anchor” nominals to the speech act.
  - At the CP level of every clause, there are null arguments designating the speaker and addressee (Baker 2008).
- It is not so clear, however, why features like [ANIMATE] and [HUMAN] need anchoring; perhaps related to likelihood of being a speech act participant.
Conclusion

Lots still to do!

- How does this system interface with morphological case (espec. when morphological case doesn’t line up with licensing)?
- Can this system account for all the various types of Differential Subject Marking?
- Can this system account for different “strengths” of the PCC?
- How does PRO fit into this system (if PRO is indeed regulated by this sort of licensing)?
- ...And a lot more.
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Last resort

- Many attempts to model various “last resort” effects have been made:
- Global strategies are better equipped to account for secondary licensers: a secondary licenser is merged iff...
  1. there is a nominal bearing \( \phi \), and
  2. that nominal can’t be licensed by a licenser already there.

  \( \rightarrow \) The “decision point” for activating secondary licensers (e.g., at \( \nu \)) is typically lower than the obligatory licenser and a potential intervener, i.e., the decision can’t be made locally.
Evidence for features

- **[SPECIFIC] and [DEFinite]**
  - Indefinite pronouns (Haskelmath 1997)
  - Non-scopal interp of indefinites (Fodor and Sag 1982)
  - Second language acquisition (Ionin et al. 2004, 2009)
- **[HUMAN] and [ANIMATE]**
  - Verbal marking in Algonquian languages (Piggott 1989, Wiltschko and Ritter 2014, i.a.)
  - Verbal prefixes in Abkhaz (Hewitt 1979; Mithun 1986)
  - Nominal marking in Selayarese (Finer 1997)
  - English relative pronouns (*who* vs. *which*)
  - Impersonal pronouns (Sigurðsson and Egerland 2009, Fenger 2015)
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(58) 
\[
\{ \begin{align*}
&[\text{PLURAL}] \\
&[\text{FEMININE}] \\
&\quad \text{etc.}
\end{align*} \} < \{ \begin{align*}
&[\text{DEFINITE}] \\
&[\text{ANIMATE}] \\
&\quad \text{etc.}
\end{align*} \} < [\text{PARTICIPANT}]
\]

(59) \(\phi\)-feature geometry (modeled after Harley and Ritter 2002)

\[
\begin{tikzpicture}
  \node (phi) {$[\phi]$};
  \node (pi) [below of=phi] {$[\pi]$} child { node (participant) {$[\text{PARTICIPANT}]$} } child { node (gamma) {$[\gamma]$} child { node (author) {$[\text{AUTHOR}]$} } child { node (feminine) {$[\text{FEMININE}]$} } child { node (plural) {$[\text{PLURAL}]$} } child { node (specific) {$[\text{SPECIFIC}]$} child { node (definite) {$[\text{DEFINITE}]$} } child { node (animate) {$[\text{ANIMATE}]$} child { node (human) {$[\text{HUMAN}]$} } } };
\end{tikzpicture}
\]
Types of features

(60) **Feature types (extended)**

a. \([F:\_\_]\) = unvalued/placement (= probe)

b. \([F]\) = valued/snippet (= potential goal)

c. \([F\dagger]\) = valued/snippet (= goal, DTB)

(61) 

```
      TP
     / \  
    T   AspP
   / \  /  
  [F:__] Asp vP
          /  
         AGREE Sbj v ... 
```
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOM $=\ $DAT</th>
<th>DOM $\neq\ $DAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hindi</td>
<td>Turkish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Bhatt and Anagnostopoulou 1996)</td>
<td>(Enç 1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Persian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Rodríguez-Mondoñedo 2007)</td>
<td>(Browning and Karimi 1994)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DOM O raises obligatorily

DOM O doesn’t raise obligatorily

unattested?

DOM O raises obligatorily

DOM O doesn’t raise obligatorily

unattested?

DOM O raises obligatorily

DOM O doesn’t raise obligatorily

unattested?

DOM O raises obligatorily

DOM O doesn’t raise obligatorily

unattested?
Unlicensed objects in Senaya

        we     sleep.PFV-SBJ.1PL
   ‘We slept.’                  (√ no object)

   b.  Axnii ksuuta ksuu-lan.
        we     book    write.PFV-SBJ.1PL
   ‘We wrote a/some book(fem.).’  (√ nonspec obj)

   c.  *Axnii oo  ksuuta ksuu-lan.
        we     that book  write.PFV-SBJ.1PL
   Intended: ‘We wrote that book.’     (*spec obj)

   d.  *Axnii oo  ksuuta ksuu(-laa/-a)-lan(-laa/-a).
        we     that book  write.PFV(-3FS)-SBJ.1PL(-3FS)
   Intended: ‘We wrote that book(fem.).’     (*obj agr)
Subject repairs


a. Ne inu kofe a Sione.
PAST drink coffee NOM Sione
‘Sione drank coffee.’ (indefinite O)

b. Ne inu [e] Sione e kofe.
PAST drink ERG Sione nom coffee
‘Sione drank the coffee.’ (definite O)

(64) Eastern Ostyak and S repair (Gulya 1966, cited in Baker 2014a)

a. Mä t’əkäkəylämnä ula mənyälem.
we.DUAL.NOM younger.sister.COM berry pick.PAST.SBJ.1PL
‘I went to pick berries with my younger sister.’ (indefinite O)

we-ERG them large tree beside put.PAST.OBJ.3PL/SBJ.1PL
‘We put them (pots of berries) beside a big tree.’ (definite O)
Subject repairs

(65)
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Subject repairs

(66)

TP

T

[φ: ]

vP

NP

[PLURAL FEMININE]

v

VP

NP

[φ: ]

V

[Φ: ]

[FEMININE DEFINITE]