Ways of being a dative clitic: case marked Ds vs. animate locatives

Teresa Cabré (UAB) & Antonio Fábregas (University of Tromsø)

THE GOAL. This talk argues that one can be a dative clitic at least in two ways, and that different varieties of Catalan illustrate both. In both Valencian and Non-Valencian Catalan (henceforth, VC and nVC) the singular dative is surface-identical (1); however, we argue that structurally the two forms are very different. While in VC *li* is a pronoun marked with dative case (à la Caha 2009), in nVC it corresponds to a locative adverbial subordinate to a D layer (2; cf. Rigau 1978).

(1)   li '3.sg.dat'
(2)   a. [KP^{dat} [D [NumP^{sg} [GenP]]]] <--> /li/   VC
        b. [D [NumP^{sg} [LOC]]]   nVC
          [l-   ø   -i   ]

Two facts provide initial evidence for this: (i) nVC has a locative clitic /i/ that VC lacks; (ii) while the *-i* marking remains in the dative plural in nVC (/əlzi/), it is absent from nVC. This is expected if the plural dative forms are build using the singular: a non-decomposable exponent in VC (3a) and an incremental form in nVC (3b).

(3)   a. [KP^{dat} [D [NumP^{pl} [GenP]]]] <--> /els/   VC
        b. [D   [NumP^{pl} [LOC]]]   nVC
          [(ə)l-   z-   -i   ]

THE PROBLEM. We contend that this distinction is behind the different solutions adopted by the different Catalan varieties in sequence of third person clitics (cf. Todolí 2008, Cabré 2016). In VC, two subvarieties are to be differentiated: in VC1 (4), it can be shown that the exponents for definiteness, gender and number are kept in both clitics when a dative and an accusative clitic are in a sequence. The only segments that disappear in the sequence are due to phonology: redundant epenthetic vowels or (in some colloquial subvarieties) an /l/ preceding an /s/.

(4)

VC1		Dative.sg *li*	Dative.pl *els*
Acc.m.sg	*el*	li'l [lil]	els el [e(l)zel]
Acc.f.sg	*la*	li la [lila]	els la [e(l)zla]
Acc.m.pl	*els*	li'ls [li(l)s]	els els [e(l)ze(l)s]
Acc.f.pl	*les*	li les [liles]	els les [e(l)zles]

In a second subvariety of VC, VC2, in contrast, there is surface impoverishment in the sequence; gender marking disappears and a neuter form emerges as accusative:

(5)

VC2		Dative.sg *li*	Dative.pl *els*
Acc.m.sg	*el*	li ho [liw]	els ho [e(l)zo]
Acc.f.sg	*la*	li ho [liw]	els ho [e(l)zo]
Acc.m.pl	*els*	li ho-s [liwz]	els ho [e(l)zo]
Acc.f.pl	*les*	li ho-s [liwz]	els ho [e(l)zo]

(4) and (5) contrast on whether the morphological content of each clitic is preserved in the sequence or one of them surface impoverishes with respect to the form outside

sequences. While VC allows both possibilities, nVC is forced to the second, as can be seen in (6).

(6)

nVC	Dative.sg [li] *li*	Dative.pl [əlzi] *els hi*
Acc.m.sg *el*	el+(l)i [li] *l'hi*	el+els hi [əlzi] *els hi*
Acc.f.sg *la*	la+(l)i [li] *l'hi*	la+els hi [əlzi] *els hi*
Acc.m.pl *els*	els+(l)i [əlzi] *els hi*	els+els hi [əlzi] *els hi*
Acc.f.pl *les*	les+(l)i [əlzi] *els hi*	les+els hi [əlzi] *els hi*

ANALYSIS. We propose that the two clitics can emerge in the sequence without surface impoverishment when they are each distinct specifiers (7): this allows for the projection of two functional sequences [D [phi features [N]]]:

(7)   Clitic area: [[clitic 1 D-ϕ-N] ... [clitic 2 D-ϕ-N]...]   VC1

In contrast, surface impoverishment takes place when both clitics share the same functional sequence, or in other words, when they are sequences of heads that have to share the same space.

(8)   Clitic area: [D-ϕ-N]   VC2 and nVC

In (8) there is only place for one gender marking, one D and one plural marking, which is the result we see in (5) and (6); in (4) there can be full duplication of categories (4). The question is when is (4) available as a structural possibility. We contend that it is restricted by Richards' (2010) Distinctness Condition, a syntactic OCP (cf. also Nevins 2012): within the same domain, two identically labeled objects are not allowed. Given that in VC dative clitics are dative marked DPs, they do not trigger a Distinctness infraction (9) with a non dative DP: (7) can be used. However, in nVC, dative clitics are Ds, like accusative clitics (10), so they trigger Distinctness.

(9)   [XP [DP^dat] [DP] X...]   (10)   *[XP [DP] [DP] X...]

Thus, nVC is forced to use (8); VC can use (7), but some varieties use (8), which is not excluded in principle. In the case of (8), the same functional sequence multiply-licenses, when necessary, the features of both dative and accusative arguments (assuming a Sportiche 1996 system for the clitic area as licensors of arguments). (11) and (12) illustrate one of the forms in VC2 and nVC:

(11)   Acc.m.pl *els* + Dat.pl *els*
        [DP dat [NumP   [GenP   [N]]]
        [elz   ][o]   elzo
(12)   Acc.m.pl els + Dat.pl /əlzi/
        [DP   [NumP   [LOC]]]
        [(ə)l-   z   i   ]   elzi

CONSEQUENCES. The analysis supports the family of analyses where the notion of dative is not monolythic: under the label 'dative' different objects have been put together. How clitic sequences are resolved is just one of the consequences of this distinction.

Selected references. Caha, P. (2009). *The nanosyntax of case*. Ph.D. dissertation, CASTL // Richards, N. (2010). *Uttering trees.* Cambridge, MIT // Rigau, G. (1978). Hi datiu inanimat. *Els Marges* 12.