

## DOM under asymmetric coordination in Romanian: a diagnostic for the in-situ hypothesis?

Monica Alexandrina Irimia, University of Modena and Reggio Emilia

**Background.** The question whether differential object marking (DOM) is derived via scrambling is not trivial. Recently, Kalin and Weisser (2019) took *asymmetric* coordination as in (1) from Romanian to support the hypothesis that marked and unmarked objects must be found in the same *in-situ* position. Here an unmarked object is conjoined with an animate marked object, the latter introduced via a LOC(ative) preposition (oblique DOM). For one, if DOM licensing amounted to raising, a violation of the Coordinate Structure Constraint (CSC) would ensue, see (2). In this work we show that *asymmetric* coordination as in (1) is not a reliable diagnostic for the *in-situ* hypothesis in standard Romanian (sR), given the many problematic confounds in the data.

(1) Văd [<sub>&P</sub> o barcă și pe pescar ]. sR  
see.1SG a boat and LOC=DOM fisherman  
'I see a boat and the fisherman.' (Kalin and Weisser 2019:10, adapted)

(2) \*[<sub>TP</sub> T . . . [ <sub>DP<sub>DOM</sub></sub> . . . [ <sub>VP</sub> V [<sub>&P</sub> DO & <sub>t<sub>DOM</sub></sub> ] ] ] ]

**Some problems.** This study reports on judgments provided by 30 native sR speakers, from various age groups (22-78), living in Romania. We have adjusted Kalin and Weisser's (2019) original example [*Am văzut o barcă și pe pescarul*] (probably from a different variety), which is ungrammatical in sR; DOM cannot co-occur with the (suffixal) overt definite (*\*văd pe pescarul*), for unmodified nouns (Dobrovie-Sorin 2007, Mardale 2008, Nedelcu 2016, a.o.). For many speakers, intuitions regarding (1) include skepticism, correction to a conjunction with unmarked objects/two sentences or even outright rejection. Moreover, many respondents do not accept such examples under regular intonation, mentioning (in some cases, easily perceptible) acoustic effects such as special pitch, emphasis or a pause between the two conjuncts. For all speakers examples like (1) are clearly worse as compared to coordinations with DOs of the same type. This, at least prima facie, seems to suggest that an ellipsis analysis needs further attention (contra Kalin and Weisser 2019). In fact, Irimia (2018) noticed that some types of sR DOM (the equative DOM in Subsection 3) are best derived as a result of sentential ellipsis, similar to fragment answers. This implementation (see also Saab and Zdrojewski to appear) assumes a coordination of two clauses, with DOM raising to a high position in the left periphery of the second clause (eg., an Anchoring projection as in Belletti 2018, a.o.), followed by TP<sub>2</sub> deletion (7). In fact, the ellipsis analysis makes a right prediction: *asymmetric coordination* is anyway possible only in those phrases that have been argued not to function as direct arguments of the predicate (see especially Progovac 2005, et subseq., a.o.). Thus, wellformedness with 'exempt categories' such as Neg words (3), whose licensing constraints can be (more easily) suspended under certain (coordination) contexts, but absence in coordination under comparatives or right-dislocation (Subsection 3).

**Some more problems. 1.** However, one issue with (1) could be that the marked DP lacks the expected ACC clitic-double [cf.  $\hat{\text{Î}}_{\text{CL.3M.SG.ACC}}$  văd pe pescar]. As non-displaced unmarked DOs cannot be clitic-doubled ( $*\text{O}_{\text{CL.3F.SG.ACC}}$  văd o barcă), we need examples such as (3), where the DOM NEG Q(uantifier) *cannot* be clitic doubled. Such examples are accepted by native speakers with the caveats above. But, yet another problem arises. NEG Qs such as *nimeni* are N(egative) C(oncord) I(tems) which need an overt c-commanding negation [ $*(\text{Nu})$  ( $*\hat{\text{Î}}$ ) văd  $*(\text{pe})$  *nimeni*]. Thus, once again, the most plausible derivation for (3) involves ellipsis in the second conjunct; for example,

DOM raises to a Pol(arity) Phrase above the second TP (following Merchant 2013 or Saab and Zdrojewski to appear), on its way to [Spec, Anch].

- (3) Văd copilu-**l** și ... [<sub>PolP</sub> [**pe** nimeni altcineva] Pol<sup>0</sup><sub>[Neg]</sub>] <[<sub>TP</sub> văd *t*]>.  
 see.1SG child-DEF and DOM nobody else see.1SG  
 ‘I see the child and nobody else.’

2. Sentences such as (4) are also relevant. Here the first conjunct is a Cl(itic)-doubled DOM which shows binding into and outscopes the EA. The second one is an inanimate DO (5); it cannot take DOM (\*caută **pe** paltonul lui), therefore no clitic doubling either (Cl can only be *singular*) and thus no binding into EA. Romanian ACC clitic doubling, a distinct type of DOM, has the profile of a pronominal D<sup>0</sup> element co-occurring and co-referring with a DP associate, as opposed to instantiating genuine  $\phi$  agreement (Tigău 2010, a.o.). Under the ‘Big DP Hypothesis’, Cl raising from oblique DOM would violate the CSC (5). High generation of Cl (in the *vP* layer) implies a nominal licensing operation into &P applying *asymmetrically*, only to the first conjunct. For Kalin and Weisser (2019) only  $\phi$  Agree can apply asymmetrically, but this will make (4) underivable under coordination at the DP level. Also, we cannot prove Cl-licensing is *not* implemented after &P raises to a position above VP. And we also need evidence that oblique DOM itself does *not*, in fact, involve *asymmetric* licensing of a (PERSON) feature beyond Case, once again *above* VP.

- (4) Mama sa<sub>i/j</sub> **îl**<sub>i</sub> caută [**pe** fiecare copil]<sub>i</sub> și paltonul lui.  
 mother.DEF his CL.3SG.ACC.M search.3SG DOM every child and coat.DEF.N.SG his  
 ‘His own mother is looking for each child and his coat.’

- (5) \*[D<sup>0</sup><sub>Cl-v</sub> ... [V [<sub>&P</sub> [<sub>DO<sub>1</sub></sub> *t*<sub>DO-Cl</sub> DO<sub>DOM</sub>] & DO<sub>2</sub>]]]]

3. In *sR* DOM can/must show up on DO standards in sentential equatives/equality comparatives. An equative such as (6) with asymmetric coordination, despite being semantically well-formed, is *ungrammatical for all speakers consulted* (PE must either precede both pivots or be removed). Building on Irimia’s (2018) clausal ellipsis analysis, we can provide the derivation in (7). This structure contains sentential coordination with objects extracted from each conjunct, followed by backward clausal ellipsis in each conjunct, violating Langacker’s (1969) Backward Anaphora Constraint (as Saab and Zdrojewski also note for Spanish).

- (6) \*Mi-o amintesc ca o bună colegă și **pe** o prietenă.  
 CL.1.DAT-3SG.ACC.F remember.1SG as a good colleague and DOM a friend  
 Intended: ‘I remember her as I remember a good colleague and a friend.’

- (7) ...ca [<sub>PolP</sub> [o colegă]<sub>i</sub> Pol<sup>0</sup><sub>[Pos]</sub>] <[<sub>TP</sub> ...*t*<sub>i</sub>] > și [<sub>AnchP</sub> [**pe** o prietenă]<sub>j</sub> Anch<sup>0</sup>] <[<sub>TP</sub> ...*t*<sub>j</sub>]

4. Equally problematic are data from (clitic) left/right dislocation. No speaker accepted asymmetric coordination in right dislocation (which, like the stark ungrammaticality of (6) is a mystery if marked and unmarked DOs share the same position). For (clitic) left dislocation, a minority of speakers might (marginally) accept some examples, such as (8), which are not unproblematic. The first DP is not possible DOM-less under non-dislocation ((*Îl*<sub>CL.M.3SG.ACC</sub>) *invit* \*(**pe**) *domnul acela*), indicating direct merge of in the high left periphery (and not low in *vP*), and a further connect-edness mechanism with the host clause (Cinque 1990, etc.). Also, (8) is underivable without *asymmetric* DOM licensing, assuming &P at DP level (instead of &P of independent fragments).

- (8) ??Domnul acela și **pe** Ion, nu **îi** mai invit la petrecere.  
 gentleman.DEF that and LOC=DOM Ion NEG CL.3PL.M.ACC more invite at party  
 ‘That gentleman and Ion, I’m not inviting them to the party ever again/after all.’

To **conclude**, asymmetric coordination is not a reliable diagnostic for the DOM in-situ hypothesis in sR (confirming similar results for Spanish in Saab and Zdrojewski to appear). Other tests (secondary predicates, reflexive SE) do not indicate constituency, and thus are not useful here.

**Selected references.** Kalin, L. and P. Weisser. (2019). Asymmetric DOM in coordination. A problem for movement-based approaches. *LI* 50(3): 662-676. Saab, A. and P. Zdrojewski. (to appear). Against asymmetric DOM in Spanish. *LI*.

## References

Belletti, Adriana. 2018. On the *a*-marking of object topics in the Italian left periphery. In *From sounds to structures. Beyond the veil of Maya*, ed. Roberto Petrosino, Cerrone Pietro, and Harry van der Hulst, 445–466. de Gruyter. Mouton.

Cinque, Guglielmo. 1990. *Tpes of A' dependencies*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Dobrovie-Sorin, Carmen. 2007. Article drop in Romanian and extended heads. In *Pitar Moş: A building with a view*, ed. Gabriela Alboiu, Andrei Avram, Larisa Avram, and Daniela Isac, Oxford Studies in Comparative Syntax, 99–107. Oxford: Bucharest: Editura Universităţii din Bucureşti.

Irimia, Monica Alexandrina. 2018. When differential object marking is obligatory: some remarks on the role of case in ellipsis and comparatives. In *Proceedings of the Penn Linguistics Conference*, ed. Ava Irani and Milena Šereikaitė, volume 24(2), 105–114. University of Pennsylvania.

Kalin, Laura, and Philipp Weisser. 2019. Aymmetric DOM in coordination: A problem for movement-based approaches. *Linguistic Inquiry* 50 (3):662–676.

Langacker, Ronald W. 1969. On pronominalization and the chain of control. In *Modern studies in English*, ed. David A. Reibel and Sanford A. Shane, 51–81. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Mardale, Alexandru. 2008. Prépositions et article défini en roumain. In *Actes des 21<sup>mes</sup> journées de Linguistique*, ed. Adèle de Saint-Pierre and Mélanie Thibeaut, 78–93. Québec: Centre Interdisciplinaire de recherche sur les activités langagières/Universitaire de Laval.

Merchant, Jason. 2013. Polarity items under ellipsis. In *Diagnosing syntax*, ed. Lisa Lai-Shen Cheng and Norbert Corver, 458–479. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nedelcu, Isabela. 2016. Prepositions and prepositional phrases. In *The syntax of Old Romanian*, ed. Gabriela Pană Dindelegan, 424–444. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Progovac, Ljiljana. 2005. Coordination, C-command and ‘Logophoric’ N-words. In *Negation and polarity. Semantic and syntactic perspectives*, ed. Laurence Horn and Yasuhiko Kato, 88–115. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.

Saab, Andrés, and Pablo Zdrojewski. to appear. On the nonexistence of asymmetric DOM in Spanish. *Linguistic Inquiry*.

Tigău, Alina M. 2010. Towards an account of differential object marking in Romanian. *Bucarest Working Papers in Linguistics* 12(1):137–158.