Asymmetric DOM in coordination and why this is fatal for movement-based approaches

Laura Kalin & Philipp Weisser—Draft Nov 16, 2017

1 Introduction

Differential Object Marking (DOM) is a common crosslinguistic phenomenon whereby languages that have morphologically overt case-marking on objects only display this marking on a subset of objects, namely those that are high in definiteness or animacy (Comrie 1979, Croft 1988, Bossong 1991, Enç 1991, Aissen 2003, de Swart 2007, Dalrymple and Nikolaeva 2011, *i.a.*). In Spanish, for example, simplifying somewhat, overt case-marking of objects is required when the object is specific and animate and banned when the object is nonspecific or inanimate (Rodríguez-Mondoñedo 2007):

(1) a. Juan bes-ó [*(**a**) María].
John kiss-3SG.PST DOM Maria
'John kissed Mary.' (p. 91)

b. Juan destruy-ó [(***a**) una/la ciudad].
John destroy-3SG.PST DOM a/the city
'John destroyed a/the city.' (p. 92)

In this squib, we set out to accomplish two things: (i) to introduce new findings related to DOM in coordinations, revealing that many DOM languages allow asymmetric marking in coordinations when conjuncts are mismatched in terms of animacy/definiteness, and (ii) to show that these findings deal a fatal blow to many popular (broadly) Minimalist accounts of DOM, namely, those that derive DOM via movement (de Hoop 1996, Torrego 1998, Woolford 1999, Bhatt 2007, Rodríguez-Mondoñedo 2007, Baker and Vinokurova 2010, Richards 2010, López 2012, Ormazabal and Romero 2013, *i.a.*).

Section 2 outlines two movement analyses of DOM. In Section 3, we discuss why movement accounts predict asymmetric DOM in coordinations to be impossible, and show in Section 4 that many DOM languages *do* in fact allow asymmetric DOM. Section 5 explores whether movement analyses can be salvaged, and we argue they cannot.

2 Prominent Movement Analyses of DOM

Movement-based accounts of DOM are those that take raising of the object out of VP to be a necessary (though perhaps not sufficient) ingredient of DOM, (2).

(2) $[_{\mathrm{TP}}$ T ... [object ... $[_{\mathrm{VP}}$ V t_{object}]]]

Here we lay out two specific accounts, which stand in as instantiations of more general types of accounts: (i) accounts in which movement of the object is to a Case position (e.g., Bhatt 2007, Rodríguez-Mondoñedo 2007, López 2012, Ormazabal and Romero 2013), and (ii) accounts in which raising of the object feeds case competition with the subject (e.g., Baker and Vinokurova 2010, Baker 2014, Levin and Preminger 2015). Across movement-based accounts, a common component of the motivation for movement is that the object must raise out of VP to escape existential closure (Diesing 1992).

The first type of account is exemplified by Rodríguez-Mondoñedo 2007. Rodríguez-Mondoñedo argues that transitive v in Spanish can only check [number] features, and so can only assign Case to an object that is φ-incomplete, i.e., one with only [number]. Case assigned by v has a null spell-out, and so appears on the surface as absence of marking. If an object has a [person] feature (which is carried by animate specific nominals), then the object is φ-complete and cannot have its Case checked by v. Such an object thus needs to raise to a higher position (ultimately, spec-DatP) in order to check its Case. Since the projection it checks Case with is DatP, the marking is dative *a*.

The second type of account is exemplified by Baker and Vinokurova 2010. Looking at the Turkic language Sakha, Baker and Vinokurova argue that DOM is derived by movement out of VP, which is a phase, into the higher CP phase. Since the subject is also in this higher phase (and is as-of-yet caseless), the object enters into case competition with the subject (Marantz 1991) and so, as per the case-assignment rules of Sakha, receives dependent accusative case. Unlike in Spanish, this case is not syncretic with dative, but rather is a unique accusative, *-(n)I*. Objects that do not raise remain caseless.

One preliminary problem with taking movement to be a general property of DOM is that not all DOM languages have (at least obvious) syntactic movement of the marked object; see, for example, Hebrew (Shlonsky 1997), Kannada (Lidz 2006), and North-eastern Neo-Aramaic languages (Kalin 2014). However, it might be that there is movement in these languages but this movement is not detectable with the normal tests or is covert, so this is not a fatal blow to movement-based accounts of DOM. In the following sections, we present data from the domain of coordination that we take to definitively show that movement is not a necessary ingredient of DOM cross-linguistically.

3 DOM in Coordinations as a Movement Diagnostic

In the preceding section, we saw that one of the most popular types of syntactic analysis of DOM involves movement of the object to a higher position within the clause. This movement step feeds case marking of the object, leading to a distinction between objects that have not moved (unmarked) and objects that have moved (marked).

While the accounts cited previously apply various tests to establish the higher position of marked objects (e.g., adverb placement, binding), some of the most reliable tests of syntactic movement are typically not applied, namely, tests involving syntactic islands. Islands are syntactic configurations that prohibit movement out of them. If an alleged movement-derived effect fails in these configurations, then we can conclude that we really are dealing with movement. If, on the other hand, the effect is not blocked, then we must conclude that movement is not a crucial ingredient of the effect.

In the domain of DOM, many islands are not possible to test since the alleged movement step is very short. Fortunately, one of the most crosslinguistically robust islands is applicable. As is well-known since Ross' (1967) discovery of the Coordinate Structure Constraint (CSC), it is not possible to move one conjunct out of a coordination:

(3) a. *What did John eat [$_{\&P}$ pizza and t_{what}]?

b. *What did John eat [$_{\&P}$ t_{what} and pizza]?

Moving either just the second conjunct, (3a), or just the first, (3b), is ungrammatical.

In order to apply this test to the DOM cases at hand, we simply need to conjoin one element that is supposed to undergo movement (a marked object, DP_1 below) and one element that is supposed to stay in situ (an unmarked object, DP_2 below), (4).[1]

(4) Subject V [DP_1-DOM & DP_2]

If a marked and unmarked object cannot be conjoined, i.e., (4) is ungrammatical, then this indicates that there is indeed something wrong with the configuration, plausibly because it is ruled out by the corresponding CSC island violation schematized in (5).

(5) $[_{TP}$ T ... [DP_1 ... $[_{VP}$ V $[_{\&P}$ t_{DP1} & DP_2]]]]

If, however, (4)-like sentences are grammatical, and one conjunct is marked while the other is unmarked (or, the conjuncts bear different markers), then we can conclude that there is not a crosslinguistically-necessary connection between DOM and movement.

4 Asymmetric DOM is Robustly Attested

Here, we test the configuration in (4)/(5) against a sample of eleven DOM-languages from five different language families. Out of the eleven languages we examine, nine allow for one conjunct to be DOM-marked while the other one remains unmarked; further, for both of the languages that disallow asymmetric marking, there is a closely related language that allows it. These results strongly suggest that a movement analysis cannot be maintained for most of the languages in our sample, and thus not for DOM generally, though of course it is possible that in some languages movement plays a role in DOM.

Let us start with Romance languages. Recall that in Spanish, objects that are specific and animate bear the DOM marker *a* while other objects do not, as seen in (1). If we

[1] In all our examples, if the DOM marker is a preposition or a prefix we make the unmarked conjunct the first one, and if it is a suffix, we make the marked conjunct the first one. In doing so, we ensure that the DOM marker takes scope over only one conjunct and not over the whole coordination phrase.

now conjoin an animate nonspecific object and an animate specific object, we see that asymmetric DOM marking in coordinations is possible, (6).[2]

(6) Vi [$_{\&P}$ una mujer y **a** María juntas] en el parque.
see.PST.1SG a woman and DOM Maria together in the park
'I saw a (some) woman and Maria together in the park.' (G. Martinez-Vera, p.c.)

Preliminarily, then, even in a language for which a movement-based account has been specifically motivated by various authors (e.g., Torrego 1998, Rodríguez-Mondoñedo 2007, López 2012), asymmetric DOM-marking inside coordinations is possible.

DOM is also found in most Southern Italian dialects (D'Alessandro 2016). The exact trigger for DOM varies from dialect to dialect but all of these dialects have in common that first or second person pronouns bear DOM, (7b), while nonhuman objects do not, (7a). As in Spanish, DOM appears in the form of the dative marker *a*, and asymmetric DOM is allowed, (8). Data here come from the Neapolitan dialect.

(7) a. Aggia vist [o can] ndò parc.
AUX.1SG see.PCTP the dog in.the park
'I have seen the dog in the park.'

b. Aggia vist [**a** tte] ndò parc.
AUX.1SG see.PCTP DOM 2SG in.the park
'I have seen you in the park.' (R. Petrosino, p.c.)

(8) Aggia vist [$_{\&P}$ o can e **a** tte] ndò parc.
AUX.1SG see.PCTP the dog and DOM 2SG in.the park
'I have seen the dog and you in the park.' (R. Petrosino, p.c.)

In yet another Romance language, Romanian, the main trigger for DOM is animacy (Dobrovie-Sorin 1994). Animate objects are marked with the preposition *pe* while inan-

[2]For Spanish, this test has previously been used by Rodríguez-Mondoñedo (2007) and Fábregas (2013). However, in contrast to what they report, our Spanish consultants accepted the examples with asymmetric case marking without indicating that the tested sentences were ungrammatical or even marked. This difference may either be due to dialectal variation or due to the fact that the examples Fábregas gives include a possessive pronoun that precedes its antecedent, e.g., **Vi* [$_{\&P}$ *su$_i$ coche y* ***a*** *Juan$_i$*] (p. 36), while the examples Rodríguez-Mondoñedo (2007) uses only test asymmetric marking on the first conjunct, e.g., **Menciaron* [$_{\&P}$ ***a*** *Juan y el libro*] (p. 272).

imates are not, (9). Again, asymmetric marking in coordinations is possible, (10).

(9) a. Văd [o barcă].
see.1SG a boat
'I see a boat'

b. Văd [**pe** pescar-ul].
see.1SG DOM fisherman-DEF
'I see the fisherman.' (V. Petroj, p.c.)

(10) Văd [$_{\&P}$ o barcă şi **pe** pescar-ul].
see.1SG a boat and DOM fisherman-DEF
'I see the boat and a fisherman.' (V. Petroj, p.c.)

Romance languages seem to consistently allow asymmetric DOM.

Turning to another branch of Indo-European, Indo-Iranian, we find mixed evidence. In Nepali, dative *-laai* is also used to mark animate and specific direct objects (Schikowski 2013), (11), and mismatched objects can be conjoined, (12), like in Romance.

(11) a. Raam-le [kitaab] Dekh-yo.
Ram-ERG book see-3SG.PAST
'Ram saw a book.'

b. Raam-le [ma-**laai**] Dekh-yo.
Ram-ERG 1SG-DOM see-3SG.PAST
'Ram saw me.' (S. Pokharel, p.c.)

(12) Raam-le [$_{\&P}$ ma-**laai** ra mero kitaab] Dekh-yo.
Ram-ERG 1SG-DOM and 1SG.GEN book see-3SG.PAST
'Ram saw me and my book.' (S. Pokharel, p.c.)

In Hindi, dative *-ko* also marks specific and animate direct objects (see Mahajan 1990, Bhatt & Anagnostopoulou 1996, *i.a.*), (13), but notably does not allow asymmetric marking, (14). Any combination of a marked and unmarked object is ungrammatical.

(13) a. Nadya=ne [gaṛi] cala-yi hɛ
Nadya.F.SG=ERG car.F.SG.NOM drive-PERF.F.SG be.PRES.3SG
'Nadya has driven a car.'

b. Nadya=ne [gaṛi=**ko**] cala-yi hɛ
Nadya.F.SG=ERG car.F.SG=DOM drive-PERF.F.SG be.PRES.3SG
'Nadya has driven the car.' (Butt & King 2004)

(14) ???/* Vo shikaari [$_{\&P}$ sher=**ko** or hiran] maar degaa
that hunter tiger=DOM and deer kill give.FUT.3SG
'The hunter will kill the tiger and a deer.' (A. Mahajan, p.c.)

In contrast to all the languages we saw earlier, Hindi disallows asymmetric DOM.

Moving on to another language family, we take a look at Finnish. In Finnish, non-pronominal objects bear genitive case, (15a), while pronominal objects bear accusative, (15b).[3] It is possible to conjoin a pronominal object with a non-pronominal one, (16).

(15) a. Tuo-n [karhu-n].
bring-1SG bear-GEN
'I'll bring a bear.'

b. Tuo-n [häne-**t**].
bring-1SG 3SG.M-ACC
'I'll bring him.' (Kiparsky 2001)

(16) Me nä-i-mme [$_{\&P}$ häne-**t** ja karhu-n].
1.PL.NOM see-PAST-1PL 3SG-ACC and bear-GEN
'We saw him and the bear.' (A. Vainikka, p.c.)

We thus have evidence from Uralic for the acceptability of asymmetric DOM.

The next family we consider is Turkic. In Turkish, specific objects are marked with a unique accusative case while nonspecific objects are unmarked (Enç 1991, Kornfilt 1997), (17). Like Hindi, Turkish does not allow conjunction of objects with asymmetric marking, (18). (Similar judgments are reported in Kornfilt 1997.)

(17) a. Ali [bir piyano] kirala-mak isti-yor.
Ali one piano rent-INF want-PROG.3SG
'Ali wants to rent a (nonspecific) piano.'

b. Ali [bir piyano-**yu**] kirala-mak isti-yor.
Ali one piano-DOM rent-INF want-PROG.3SG
'Ali wants to rent a certain piano.' (Enç 1991)

(18) *Hasan [$_{\&P}$ dondurma-**yı** ve pasta] ye-di.
Hasan cake-DOM and ice.cream eat-PAST
Intended: 'Hasan ate the cake and some ice cream.' (Ü. Atlamaz, p.c.)

[3]This DOM characterization of Finnish presupposes Kiparsky's (2001) decomposition of inflection. For traditional Finnish grammarians, accusative is simply syncretic with genitive on non-pronominals.

However, Caucasian Urum, a related Turkic language spoken by ethnic Greeks in Georgia, exhibits a DOM system that looks nearly identical to the Turkish system on the surface, (19) (Böhm 2015), but *does* allow asymmetric DOM, (20).

(19) a. Lara [pismo] yoll-ier.
Lara letter send-3SG
'Lara is sending a letter.'

b. Lara [pismo-**yi**] yoll-ier.
Lara letter-DOM send-3SG
'Lara is sending the letter.'

(20) Mesut [$_{\&P}$ araba-**i** da biräz pul] ist-ier-di.
Mesut car-DOM and some money ask-IPFV-PAST.3SG
'Mesut asked for the car and (some) money.' (V. Moisidi, p.c.)

Turkic languages, then differ as to whether they allow asymmetric DOM.

Next we turn to Semitic languages, most of which exhibit DOM. In Hebrew (e.g., Danon 2006), for example, definite objects are case-marked by the proclitic *et* whereas indefinite objects are not, (21). Asymmetric marking of conjuncts is possible, (22).

(21) a. Ha-seret her'a [milxama].
the-movie showed war
'The movie showed a war.'

b. Ha-seret her'a [**et**-ha-milxama].
the-movie showed DOM-the-war
'The movie showed the war.' (Aissen 2003)

(22) Dan axal [$_{\&P}$ uga ve **et**-ha-ugiyot].
Dan ate cake and DOM-the-cookies
'Dan ate some cake and the cookies.' (I. Kastner, O. Preminger, p.c.)

In Amharic, a Western Semitic language, the accusative marker *-n* attaches only to definite objects; indefinite objects remain unmarked, (23). As in most of the languages we have seen so far, it is possible to conjoin marked and unmarked objects, (24).

(23) a. Ləmma [wɨʃʃa] j-aj-al.
Lemma dog 3M.SG-see-AUX
'Lemma sees a dog.'

b. Ləmma [wɨʃʃa-w-**ɨn**] j-aj-əw-al.
Lemma dog-DEF-DOM 3M.SUBJ-see-3M.OBJ-AUX
'Lemma sees the dog.' (Baker 2012)

(24) [$_{\&P}$ liǰ-u-**n** ɨnna wɨʃʃa] ajjə-h^{w}.
child-DEF-DOM and dog see-1SG
'I saw the child and a dog.' (Fábregas 2013, attributed to Baker 2012)

Semitic thus seems to consistently allow asymmetric DOM.

Finally, speakers of Tamil, a Dravidian language, mark definite objects with accusative, while others are usually unmarked (cf. the discussion in Lehmann 1989), (25). In Tamil, it is also possible to conjoin objects with different case markers, (26).[4]

(25) a. Kumaar [paṇam] keeṭ-ṭ-aan.
kumaar money.NOM ask.PAST-3M.SG
'Kumaar asked for (some) money.'

b. Kumaar [kar-**aik**] keeṭ-ṭ-aan.
kumaar car-DOM ask.PAST-3M.SG
'Kumaar asked for the car.' (N. Selvanathan, p.c.)

(26) Kumaar [$_{\&P}$ kar-**aiy**-um paṇam-um] keeṭ-ṭ-aan.
kumaar car-DOM-COORD money.NOM-COORD ask.PAST-3M.SG
'Kumaar asked for the car and money.' (N. Selvanathan, p.c.)

While DOM in each of these languages has many complexities that we cannot discuss here, it is clear from these eleven languages, from five different language families, that many (if not most) DOM languages allow for asymmetries in case marking with conjoined objects. Nine out of the eleven languages allow conjunction of DOM-marked objects with unmarked ones, while only two (Turkish and Hindi) do not. Since movement is prohibited out of coordinations, this data tells us there must be some non-movement-related mechanism that is behind DOM. This strongly suggests that movement analyses of DOM are on the wrong track to the extent that they are intended to be general, crosslinguistically applicable accounts of DOM.

[4]It should be mentioned that there is variation between different dialects of Tamil in this respect. Of the three speakers of Tamil we consulted, only two judged examples like (26) as grammatical.

5 Two Possible Ways Out and Why They Lead Nowhere

In this section, we discuss two possible lines of argumentation that could be pursued in order to maintain a movement analysis of DOM, and we refute both.

5.1 Languages without the Coordinate Structure Constraint?

The first potential challenge to our argument is that it might be that the coordination island is not as robust as we make it out to be. It has been observed occasionally that exceptions to the Coordinate Structure Constraint are attested. For example, Bošković (2009) has shown some speakers of Serbo-Croatian allow extraction of the left conjunct. Even though examples of this sort are very rare cross-linguistically, we might wonder whether the asymmetries we saw in Section 4 are due to one of the conjuncts being able to string-vacuously scramble out of the coordination phrase.

There are three reasons why a solution along these lines does not go through. First, violations of the CSC are very infrequent crosslinguistically. To our knowledge, no such exception has been reported for any of the eleven languages in our sample. Second, even in languages like Serbo-Croatian, we find that only the leftmost conjunct can be extracted from a coordination phrase; this would predict that only the leftmost conjunct could ever bear DOM. Crucially, this is the wrong prediction: the examples from Spanish, Italian, Romanian, and Hebrew above clearly show that the rightmost conjunct can be the only one that bears DOM, and for the most part, there are not linear restrictions on asymmetric DOM. (Tamil and Spanish may be exceptional here.)

Finally, we can simply test whether short movement allows for violations of the CSC, and we can see that it does not. Tamil, for example, allows for short scrambling of the direct object over the indirect object, (27) (see Sarma 2003). However, Tamil does not allow for scrambling of just one conjunct over the dative, (28).

(27) Shakuni { **daayatt-ait** } dharmaa-kkut { **daayatt-aik** } koDu-tt-aan.
Shakuni-NOM dice-DOM Dharma-DAT dice-DOM give-PAST-3SG
'Shakuni gave the dice to Dharma.'

(28) *Shakuni **kar-ai-yum** dharmaa-kkut daayatt-ai-yum koDu-tt-aan
Shakuni-NOM car-DOM-CONJ Dharma-DAT dice-ACC-CONJ give-PAST-3SG
'Shakuni gave the car and the dice to Dharma' (G.Murugesan, p.c.)

We therefore reject the idea that some languages lack coordination islands, and that this is responsible for the availability of asymmetric DOM in coordinations.

5.2 Asymmetric Case Assignment?

The second objection to our account might be that movement is in fact symmetric but case assignment is not. In other words, in a configuration where only one of the conjuncts is high in definiteness/animacy, it might still be that the whole &P moves higher in the structure, but in this higher position, only one of the conjuncts gets case-marked:

(29) $[_{\mathrm{TP}}$ T ... [F [$[_{\&\mathrm{P}}$ DP_1 & DP_2] ... $[_{\mathrm{VP}}$ V $t_{\mathrm{DP1\&DP2}}$]]]

There are two reasons why this proposal cannot save a movement account. First, Weisser (2016) argues that (non-DOM) case marking in coordinations is always symmetric. On the basis of 15 case studies, Weisser shows that, once we control for ellipsis and allomorphy, case is always distributed evenly amongst all of the conjuncts in nominal conjunction. Thus, if (29) were the right kind of analysis for asymmetric DOM, then this would entail that the grammar does not allow case-assigners to reach inside of a coordination and target just one conjunct, except in the case of DOM.

The second argument against (29) is the same as one in Section 5.1. If case assignment could target a specific conjunct inside of an &P, then we would expect to find ordering/hierarchy effects, with only the highest or linearly closest conjunct able to receive DOM, as this is what is found with agreement into coordinations (e.g., Marušič et al 2015). But again, our data do not confirm this prediction. Spanish, Romanian, Italian, and Hebrew are all head-initial, and thus we would expect that the DOM-case assigner should be able to pick out only the left conjunct because it is (a) structurally higher and (b) linearly closer to the case-assigner. However, in all of these languages, we showed

that the second conjunct can be DOM-marked while the first one remains unmarked. We therefore conclude that an analysis utilizing asymmetric case assignment cannot be called upon to save a movement account of DOM.

6 Preliminary Conclusions

In this squib, we have shown that many DOM languages allow asymmetric DOM in coordinations, a finding which is extremely problematic for movement-based accounts of DOM. It is important to note that our claim is that *across languages* movement is not a necessary ingredient for the phenomenon of DOM. It may very well be, however, that *within* a particular language, movement is indeed necessary for DOM. For Hindi, for example, movement has been argued to be required for DOM (Bhatt and Anagnostopoulou 1996, *i.a.*); this analysis is in fact supported by our findings, as Hindi is one of the two languages that disallows asymmetric DOM in coordinations. For Spanish, on the other hand, while many movement accounts have been put forward (e.g., Rodríguez-Mondoñedo 2007, López 2012), these accounts are not supported by our findings; while it may be that marked objects raise when possible in Spanish (and thus movement *correlates* with DOM), it must also be possible for objects to get DOM in situ, namely, in asymmetric coordinations. (See also Preminger's (2011) discussion of object shift.)

At this point, one might wonder what sorts of accounts *can* deal with asymmetric DOM. First, purely morphological accounts that derive case alternations by means of impoverishment/feature freezing (e.g., Keine & Müller 2008, Glushan 2010) could have these post-syntactic operations locally target just one conjunct in a coordination. Second, analyses of DOM that take the fundamental ingredient to be different structural sizes of marked and unmarked objects (e.g., Danon 2006, Lyutikova & Pereltsvaig 2015) could appeal to the whole coordination getting Case, but only one of the conjuncts being of the right size to morphologically host Case. Finally, accounts that appeal to last-resort rescue strategies for deriving DOM (e.g., Kalin 2014) could explain single-conjunct DOM as a highly local rescue. We leave this open for future research.

Acknowledgments

Authors are listed in alphabetical order. We would like to thank Jonathan Bobaljik, András Bárány, and Stefanie Böhm for helpful discussions of this work, as well as all of our language consultants, as cited in the paper. This work was supported by the NSF (Research Grant Number BCS-1451098, PI: Bobaljik) as well as the Alexander-von-Humboldt Foundation (Projects: 'Case and Coordination' and 'Consequences of the SOCIC Generalization').

Author information

Laura Kalin
Princeton University
lkalin@princeton.edu

Philipp Weisser
Universität Leipzig
philipp.weisser@uni-leipzig.de

References

Aissen, Judith. 2003. Differential object marking: Iconicity vs. economy. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 21:435–483.

Baker, Mark. 2012. On the relation of object agreement and accusative case: Evidence from amharic. *Linguistic Inquiry* 43:255–274.

Baker, Mark. 2014. On dependent ergative case in Shipibo and its derivation by phase. *Linguistic Inquiry* 45:341–379.

Baker, Mark, and Nadezhda Vinokurova. 2010. Two modalities of case assignment: case in Sakha. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 28:593–642.

Bhatt, Rajesh. 2007. Unaccusativity and case licensing. Talk presented at McGill University.

Bhatt, Rajesh, and Elena Anagnostopoulou. 1996. Object shift and specificity: evidence from *ko*-phrases in Hindi. In *Papers from the 32nd regional meeting of the Chicago Linguistics Society*, ed. Lisa M. Dobrin, Kora Singer, and Lisa McNair, 11–22. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

Böhm, Stefanie. 2015. Differential Object Marking in Standard Turkish and Caucasian Urum. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung (STUF)* 68:421–438.

Bossong, Georg. 1991. Differential object marking in Romance and beyond. In *New analyses in Romance linguistics*, ed. Douglas A. Kibbee and Dieter Wanner, 143–170. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Bošković, Željko. 2009. Unifying first and last conjunct agreement. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 27:455–496.

Comrie, Bernard. 1979. Definite and animate direct objects: a natural class. *Linguistica silesiana* 3:13–21.

Croft, William. 1988. Agreement vs. case marking and direct objects. In *Agreement in natural language: Approaches, theories, descriptions*, ed. M. Barlow and C. Ferguson, 159–179. CSLI.

d'Alessandro, Roberta. to appear. When you have too many features: auxiliaries, agreement and clitics in italian varieties. *Glossa* .

Dalrymple, Mary, and Irina Nikolaeva. 2011. *Objects and information structure*. Cambridge University Press.

Diesing, Molly. 1992. *Indefinites*. MIT Press.

Dobrovie-Sorin, Carmen. 1994. *The syntax of romanian*, volume 40 of *Studies in Generative Grammar*. De Gruyter Mouton.

Enç, Mürvet. 1991. The semantics of specificity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 22:1–26.

Fabregas, Antonio. 2013. Differential Object Marking in Spanish: State of the Art. *Borealis: An International Journal of Hispanic Linguistics* 2:1–80.

Glushan, Zhanna. 2010. Deriving case syncretism in Differential Object marking systems. University of Connecticut.

de Hoop, Helen. 1996. *Case configuration and noun phrase interpretation*. New York: Garland.

Kalin, Laura. 2014. Aspect and argument licensing in Neo-Aramaic. Doctoral Dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA.

Keine, Stefan, and Gereon Müller. 2008. Differential argument encoding by impoverishment. In *Scales*, ed. Marc Richards and Andrej Malchukov, volume 86 of *Linguistische Arbeits Berichte*, 83–136. Universität Leipzig.

Kiparsky, Paul. 2001. Structural Case in Finnish. *Lingua* .

Kornfilt, Jaklin. 1997. *Turkish*. Routledge.

Lehmann, Thomas. 1989. *A grammar of modern tamil*. Pondicherry Institute of Linguistics and Culture.

Levin, Theodore, and Omer Preminger. 2015. Case in Sakha: are two modalities really necessary? *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 33:231–250.

Lidz, Jeffrey. 2006. The grammar of accusative case in Kannada. *Language* 82:1–23.

López, Luis. 2012. *Indefinite objects: scrambling, choice functions, and differential marking*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Lyutikova, Ekaterina, and Asya Pereltsvaig. 2015. The Tatar DP. *Canadian Journal of Linguistics* 60:289–325.

Mahajan, Anoop. 1990. The A/A-bar distinction and movement theory. Doctoral Dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA.

Marantz, Alec. 1991. Case and licensing. In *Proceedings of the 8th Eastern States Conference on Linguistics (ESCOL 8)*, ed. German Westphal, Benjamin Ao, and Hee-Rahk Chae, 234–253. Ithaca, NY: CLC Publications.

Marušič, Franc, Andrew Nevins, and William Badecker. 2015. The grammars of conjunction agreement in Slovenian. *Syntax* 18:39–77.

Ormazabal, Javier, and Juan Romero. 2013. Differential Object Marking, case and

agreement. *Borealis: An International Journal of Hispanic Linguistics* 2.2:221–239.

Preminger, Omer. 2011. Agreement as a fallible operation. Doctoral Dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA.

Richards, Norvin. 2010. *Uttering trees*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Rodríguez-Mondoñedo, Miguel. 2007. The syntax of objects: Agree and Differential Object Marking. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT.

Ross, John. 1967. *Constraints on Variables in Syntax*. Doctoral Dissertation, MIT.

Sarma, Vaijayanthi. 2003. Non-canonical word order: Topic and Focus in child and adult Tamil. In *Word order and scrambling*, ed. Simin Karimi, 283–272. Blackwell.

Schikowski, Robert. 2013. Object-conditioned differential marking in chintang and nepali. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Zurich.

Shlonsky, Ur. 1997. *Clause structure and word order in Hebrew and Arabic: An essay in comparative Semitic syntax*. New York: Oxford University Press.

de Swart, Peter. 2007. Cross-linguistic variation in object marking. Doctoral Dissertation, Radboud University of Nijmegen, Nijmegen, Netherlands Nijmegen, Netherlands Nijmegen, Netherlands.

Torrego, Esther. 1998. *The dependencies of objects*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Weisser, Philipp. 2016. Why there is no such thing as Closest Conjunct Case. Talk presented at NELS 47, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

Woolford, Ellen. 1999. Animacy hierarchy effects on object agreement. In *New dimensions in African linguistics and languages*, ed. Paul Kotey, 203–216. Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press.